
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

Founded 1853.
No. 206.

APRIL 1905.

Fourth Series.
No. 2.

The London Quarterly Review.

Contents.

London:
CHARLES H. KELLY,
2 CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, and 26 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

PRICE HALF A CROWN.

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

APRIL, 1905

THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature. By IRVING F. WOOD, Ph.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. 1904.)

The Revelation of the Holy Spirit. By J. E. C. WELLDON, D.D. (Macmillan & Co. 1902.)

The Spirit and the Incarnation. By Rev. W. L. WALKER. (T. & T. Clark. 1899.)

The Tongue of Fire. By WILLIAM ARTHUR, 1856. Twentieth Edition, 1885. (Methodist Publishing House.)

THE indescribable stir of spiritual awakening is in the air. The sound of marching is heard in the tops of the balsam trees, as when of old an omen was given to David that he should bestir himself against the Philistines. Not only in Wales—where a religious movement has mightily quickened all the Churches and aroused the greater part of a population imaginative by temperament and more or less inclined to religion by the training and habits of genera-

tions—but amongst comparatively stolid Saxons in town and country, have signs of 'revival' appeared. Special 'missions' are not rare phenomena, but during the last six months unusual interest has been excited by them, and unusually successful results have attended them. These occurrences have raised the usual crop of diversified comments—critical and scornful, or eager and enthusiastic, according to the point of view of the observer. The medical newspapers have had much to say concerning 'phenomena so interesting to the medical profession,' and have pointed to the 'rhapsodies of cataleptic ecstasy,' the 'manifestations of hysteria, most self-seeking of all diseases,' and other signs of 'epidemics of a more or less convulsive character,' as the features of chief importance in religious revivals of all ages. Many good persons, on the other hand, seem to regard the crowded services, with their atmosphere of impassioned feeling and abundance of physical and emotional excitement, as if they constituted the only manifestations of true religion, all quiet and orderly worship being tame and ineffective in comparison. More sober Christians, knowing the dangers, but conscious also of the religious blessing attending these times of religious awakening, have been hesitating or divided in their judgement. Certain Anglicans, of the type known amongst themselves as 'sound,' have characteristically expressed their contempt of 'conventicles' and 'ranters,' whilst some bishops and leading clergy have happily set a better example, and acknowledged that the Church of England itself needs, above everything else, a mighty spiritual quickening. Evangelical Free Churches have, with few exceptions, recognized that to them is being granted a great opportunity. It is said that many signs point not merely to a welcome increase of religious interest locally, in Wales and elsewhere, but to a great wave of impulse which is being felt far and wide, and which may move the whole English-speaking world.

Many reflections are raised by such events in thoughtful minds. Joy in the conversion of multitudes from an evil to a pure and devoted Christian life, and not less in the

renewed vitality of many merely nominal Christian Churches, is naturally the prevailing sentiment, coupled with an earnest desire to make the best use of a favourable, it may be a quickly passing, opportunity. But questions arise which cannot be easily answered. What is the reason of the fluctuations thus discernible in the life and feeling of Christian Churches? Are we to understand that these intermittent pulsations of religious energy are normal, that they are in all respects healthy and satisfactory, and that Christians ought to acquiesce in the condition of things which they indicate? If so, what are the causes of this strange periodicity which marks the course of Christian history? If not, what disease, or what deficiency of vital force, affects the Church of Christ on earth so that manifestations of grace and power occur only at intervals in her history, whilst under happier conditions they might be constantly enjoyed? It would indeed be a boon if a spiritual physician, who could 'read each wound, each weakness clear,' would 'strike his finger on the place,' and say, not to Europe but to an alternately languid and feverishly excitable Church, 'Thou ailest here, and here!'

Such spiritual diagnosis is practically impossible. But one thing may be done, and every decade it becomes a more incumbent, and even urgent, duty. Answers to many important practical questions might be gained by studying more closely the teaching of Scripture and of history concerning the work of the Holy Spirit. Such an inquiry, partly doctrinal, partly practical, has long been greatly needed. Not the publication of a book, or a series of books, will meet the case—though the literature of the subject is still scanty, considering its importance—but the turning of the attention of the whole Church more directly and constantly to the present-day meaning of a cardinal article in her creed, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost.' The fact that the Creed from which that clause is taken contains but one on the subject, as compared with ten which are devoted to the Person and Work of Christ, is significant. But there are reasons for the proportion of subjects observed in the historic

creeds into which we need not enter. Those who believe that the promised Comforter is the Spirit of Christ, that He comes in Christ's name, takes of His teaching to show it to men, and in all things glorifies the Son, will not admit that it would imply any diversion of thought from Christ as the centre of Christian thought and life, if closer attention were paid to His own words concerning the Spirit, who was to carry on His work when He was no longer on the earth. The question is whether the full significance of our Lord's words concerning the Spirit has ever been adequately apprehended by His Church; whether in this, as well as in other directions, there be not more light ready to break forth from God's Holy Word, when it is diligently and prayerfully pondered.

Those who desire assistance will not find it wholly lacking. Systems of theology, Bible dictionaries, devotional writings, are of service in their several departments. A list of useful books might easily be compiled, beginning with the classical treatise of Basil the Great, to which subsequent writers have been, often unconsciously and indirectly, much indebted. Amongst the Puritans, Owen and Goodwin may be consulted with advantage. Of Anglican writings, Julius Hare's *Mission of the Comforter* and Moberly's Bampton Lectures on *The Administration of the Spirit* are best known. The latter are chiefly devoted to showing that the supernatural powers conferred on the Church are wholly vested in an episcopally appointed priesthood of apostolic descent, and most readers will find Bishop Welldon's book named at the head of this article more interesting and helpful. In French Gaume's *Traité du S. Esprit*, and in German Gunkel's *Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes* and Koelling's *Pneumatologie*, may be mentioned,[1] whilst Dr. Kuyper's trenchantly Calvinistic book, *The Work of the Holy Spirit*, has been translated from the Dutch by De Vries. From north of the Tweed have come Smeaton's

[1] Kahnis's elaborately planned *Lehre vom heiligen Geiste* remains a fragment; von Lechler has dealt with the Biblical side of the subject.

excellent *Doctrine of the Holy Spirit*, and Dr. J. S. Candlish's *Work of the Spirit*, the only defect of which is its brevity.

But the seeker who starts with the questions in his mind which we suggested above will not be satisfied with dogmatic dissertations. Professor Irving Wood's book, mentioned at the head of this article, furnishes abundant food for thought. It contains a very careful and scholarly examination into the teaching of Scripture concerning the Spirit of God. Mr. W. L. Walker's volume is an original and suggestive contribution to the investigation on the theological side; his point of view is made plain in one of his opening sentences: 'Whatever "the Spirit" may mean, it is clear we are to find in it the distinguishing feature and the source of power in the Christian religion.' But books of a more practical kind should not be neglected, in this subject of all others. Amongst them we may name as coming from America A. J. Gordon's *Ministry of the Spirit* and *The Holy Spirit in Missions*, together with Finney's well-known *Lectures on Revivals of Religion*. Of a devotional type is Andrew Murray's *Spirit of Christ*, but above and beyond all others in its stimulating and uplifting influence is Arthur's *Tongue of Fire*. Published originally half a century ago, it has penetrated into all parts of the English-speaking world and been translated more than once. Unlike most books of its kind, it has lost none of its spiritual pungency and power after the lapse of years, and it still remains the most helpful book of a practical and devotional kind on the work of the Holy Spirit.

These, however, are but examples of contributions to the study of a great and fascinating subject. The treatise for which the Church waits must be comprehensive enough to include branches of it which have been treated in a disconnected and fragmentary way, whilst sufficiently instinct with spiritual life to blend them into one living and organic whole. It should briefly trace the development of revelation through the Old Testament, showing what fresh light on the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit is shed by the New. The bearing of the doctrine on the interior relations of the

Godhead should be expounded, so far as Scripture gives guidance on a profoundly mysterious subject. The offices of the Spirit in relation to Christ and the believer can more easily be explained and illustrated. On the question of the relation between the Spirit and the Church widely different opinions are held by different sections of Christendom, and it is on this ground that so many divergent paths have been taken by 'heretics' of various schools. The mere mention of such names as Montanism, Puritanism, Pietism, Quakerism, Moravianism, Methodism, Brethrenism, Stundism, is in itself suggestive, since all the various tendencies indicated by them have been developed in opposition to as serious a 'heresy' as any—Ecclesiasticism. A complete treatise on the work of the Holy Spirit should show the significance of these several religious movements and the measure of truth and falsity in each.

This kind of work has, however, been undertaken, and more or less imperfectly accomplished. What has not been attempted is a study of the chief 'building eras of religion,' under the guidance of the Spirit, as this is understood by Protestants and all who do not accept the Romanist doctrine of infallibility. If the history of the Church is a continuation of the Acts of the Apostles, how far have the principles therein laid down been observed? Was the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as indicated by the phrase used of the council of Jerusalem, 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us,' confined to the Apostolic period? To what extent, if at all, is the charismatic endowment, the bestowal of special 'gifts' so characteristic of the early Church, a peculiar and transient phenomenon? With these topics should be combined a careful inquiry into the relation between the illumination bestowed by the Spirit on the living Church of each generation on the one hand, and Holy Scripture as inspired by the same Spirit on the other. The measure of light and grace granted to the world outside the Christian Church, the operation of the Spirit in convicting the world of sin by the proclamation of the gospel, and the work of the same Spirit in the initiation and conduct of all aggressive

enterprise, are themes which greatly need to be thought out and expounded afresh by wise Christian teachers. Closely connected with them is the question of intermittent operation to which we have referred. The hindrances which prevent the Church of Christ from being 'filled with the Spirit,' and which therefore terribly retard the accomplishment of the great task of evangelization entrusted to her, together with the ways in which the Spirit Himself is seeking to remove these obstacles, need to be studied as a portion of the same great theme—manifold in its diversified parts, but one in its central conception and significance.

It will be said that the sketch thus outlined covers almost the whole field of dogmatics and Church history; that it would, almost absurdly, seek to include in one survey a multitude of topics very slightly related to one another. The answer is obvious. Only those aspects of Church thought and life should be considered which concern the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, and they should be treated from that point of view alone. The deficiency in Christian theology of which we have spoken does not lie in the fact that certain themes have not been considered—treatises on detailed portions of the subject abound—but that they have not been sufficiently considered from one special point of view and in the unity which that would give them. What is meant by our living 'under the dispensation of the Spirit'? The question is thus answered by Cardinal Manning in his *Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost:* 'To the Holy Spirit has been committed the office of applying the redemption of the Son to the souls of men. . . . We are therefore under the personal guidance of the Third Person in the Trinity, as truly as the Apostles were under the personal guidance of the Second Person, Incarnate.' A Protestant would thoroughly accept that statement, though he would not, like the Romanist, resolve the guidance of the Spirit into the utterances of an authoritative Church under an infallible Pope. But if the relation between the Church of Christ and the Holy Spirit be as stated, is it not clear that both Christian doctrine and Christian life need to be

contemplated more frequently and more fully from this standpoint? Do not many mistakes and failures arise from the neglect of this? The objects in a landscape do not in themselves change with the point of view of an observer, but they are differently seen; and to gain a new and well-chosen point of view is to gain new light, whilst the gaining of new light is often a long step towards the obtaining of new power.

In this article we propose briefly to illustrate a large subject by showing the great practical importance of one or two aspects of it. For example, a clear conception of the *personality* of the Holy Spirit is necessary if His living relation to the individual human spirit and to the Spirit-bearing community is to be adequately realized. More than thirty years ago Bishop Thirlwall, who could not be called either a dogmatist or an enthusiast, said in a time of serious theological conflict, 'The great intellectual and religious struggle of our day turns on the question whether there is any Holy Ghost.' Only a wise and far-seeing theologian could have made such a remark, and many will even now hardly perceive its relevance. But the question whether there is any Holy Ghost depends on whether there be a Divine *Person* so named. A prevailing tendency of our time, all the more fatal because unconsciously obeyed, would resolve the Spirit of God into an 'influence.' An influence is an abstraction, and an abstraction can save or help no one. The belief in a vague impersonal influence at work on the minds of men very soon becomes nothing more than a belief in the working of man's own higher faculties. God Himself disappears. For personal life is the highest form of existence we know. It implies intelligence as opposed to blind, unconscious activity; feeling, as opposed to apathy or insensibility; self-determined and purposive willing, as distinguished from a passive surrender to impressions. The combination of intellect, emotion, and will, when gathered into one centre of conscious unity and life, we call a Person. When a Theist contends for the personality of God against a Pantheist, this is what he means;

and when a Trinitarian argues against a Unitarian for the existence of personal distinctions in the Godhead, he gives the same meaning to the word 'Person,' though he would have it freed from those finite limitations which attach to personality as we know it in human life.

The personality of the Holy Spirit is not a mere question of technical theology, but an article of vital faith for the Christian, on which momentous issues depend. The Father is God *over* us, the Son is God *for* us, the Holy Spirit is God *in* us. If He to whom the administration of redemption is entrusted be not a Person, the very meaning of the phrase is gone. The Unitarian declares that the Trinitarian formula of baptism implies faith in God, a man, and an abstraction. If for the Third Person in the Trinity we substitute, even unconsciously, an abstraction, the living God present in our midst has vanished, we are 'orphans' indeed. To realize the personality of the Holy Spirit is indeed not altogether easy. And it is through lack of this that the Church has so largely failed to honour Himself, whilst rejoicing in His gifts. By dwelling on the human results of His operations, instead of directly recognizing the living Person—who strives and draws and convinces and witnesses and illumines and purifies, who rejoices or is grieved, unto whom men may lie, and against whom they may darkly and fatally sin, who pleads with them and for them in their aspirations and prayers, and Himself answers in and around them their own petitions—even Christians have often unwittingly robbed the Spirit of His characteristic glory and deprived themselves of some of their own highest privileges and blessings. It might inaugurate the beginning of a new Reformation or spiritual Renascence, if the whole Church of Christ could be brought to realize afresh what is implied in the personality of the Holy Spirit.

But here lies the difficulty. The personality of the Spirit can only be realized from a Christian point of view. In the Old Testament 'the Spirit of God' is an impersonal power or influence from God operating on men, though here and there, especially in the later writings, a measure of

hypostasizing is discernible and preparation is being made for what is, properly speaking, New Testament doctrine. Personal distinctions in the Godhead were not recognized in Israel, whose watchword was 'Jehovah our God is one Lord.' Revelation had not yet spoken clearly on this subject. Moreover, when fuller light came, and the doctrine of God in Christ, and of the Spirit to be sent in Christ's name, was made known, the Church had to guard carefully against seeming to proclaim three Gods. It needs to exercise the same care to-day. To ignore the personality of the Holy Spirit is to miss a great theological truth and to fail in apprehending a source of great spiritual power. But to insist on His personality involves to some minds a belief in three distinct agents: God the Father over all, the God-man Christ Jesus, and a third personal divinity—the Holy Spirit. It is unnecessary to say this is not sound Christian teaching. It can only be avoided by that deeper apprehension of the Person and Work of the Spirit of which we have spoken. The Christian knows but one God—the Father, of whom are all things; the Son, Incarnate in the fullness of time, through whom are all things; the Spirit, in whom all things have been from the beginning, but who now, as emphatically the Spirit of Christ and of God, dwells in man—in the Church as a living Person fulfilling the idea of an ever-present Christ, and in the world, ever striving against its evil, ever quickening its better aspirations, and seeking to win it from its sins and sorrows to its own and only Saviour and Lord.

It was a new conception to the earliest Christian disciples, who as Jews had been accustomed to think of men sent from God, when they were bidden to realize the idea of God truly incarnate in man. So difficult was it for the early Church to apprehend this doctrine with all that it implied, that nearly four centuries had passed before it was fully assimilated. The question is whether after eighteen centuries the Church of Christ has gained an adequate conception of what is meant by the presence of God the Holy Spirit in the Church and in the world. Most certainly it

was not apprehended in the early centuries, for all history shows that revealed doctrine is only assimilated gradually, as the experience of generations educates them to comprehend it. During the long night of the Middle Ages the teaching of the New Testament was obscured by the huge shadow of the Church, a building which, intended to point men heavenwards, gradually blocked out from view the sun in its splendour and the azure of the sky. Reformers before the Reformation and the great leaders in the sixteenth century did much to clear the air and bring men face to face with God in Christ. It was not their fault, nor was it in itself an error, that they pointed chiefly to a Book; for in this was the primitive record to which they appealed from the traditions which had obscured its meaning and stifled its teaching and influence. In reality they were building better than they knew. In vindicating the authority of the Scriptures against the encroachments of the Church they were helping to prepare the way for the complete supremacy of the Spirit. But they did not see—no reformer or traditionalist ever does see—the full scope and issue of their teaching: a portion of it is only beginning to dawn on us to-day.

No watchword has been more noteworthy as a helpful rallying cry through the last twenty or thirty years than these, which are virtually one: the living Christ—a present Christ—back to Christ! What is meant by this last well-worn expression? It has borne different meanings as employed by different schools. But on the lips of Christians to-day it ought to mean, Forward to a fuller realization of what is meant by the Spirit of Christ! Not, as the phrase is often written and understood, the spirit of Christ. What is needed by the Church is not that she should take as her standard man's thoughts of 'What would Jesus do?'—man's feeble echoes of the Saviour's words, man's faint reflection of the Master's mind and image. A present Christ means a present Spirit. It is His own word. Jesus told His disciples that it was expedient that He should leave them, that they might have a personal living Leader,

not simply amongst them, but in them—'He abideth with you, and shall be in you.' When Christ said, 'I will come to you,' He meant, I will come thus; when He said, 'Lo, I am with you alway,' He meant, I will be with you thus, in the person of another Comforter. The 're-discovery of the historical Christ,' of which many modern writers have much to say, is most important, but it may lead only to what is called a 'scientific' historian's view of certain ancient documents. The identification of the 'Christ of history' with the 'Christ of experience' is also most important and interesting in its place. But our Lord's own language, and that of the New Testament generally, are far better adapted to represent the facts and to meet men's needs than the passing catch-words of the hour. A Church does not live in virtue of certain 'dead facts stranded on the shore of the oblivious years,' the records of a certain marvellous human life, duly purged and sifted by twentieth-century criticism; nor by a gospel of Christian consciousness, carefully revised to date, which can no more raise man above himself than he can lift his body from the ground by his own waistband. What men need is not even a divine 'influence,' but a living, present God—who for the Christian must be God in Christ—more truly and intimately present than was Jesus of Nazareth with Peter and James and John, His presence more deeply and more potently, because more spiritually, realized. Such a gift is, according to true and full-orbed Christian doctrine, granted to the Church, and through it to the world, in the bestowal of the Holy Spirit. Has the Church adequately made this doctrine and this Presence its own?

This question does not mean, Is the Church perfect in theory and in practice? when every one knows how full it is of mistakes and imperfections. Rather does it ask whether in thought and in life the Christian Churches occupy the right point of view for the rectification of their own human infirmities and errors, and for the realization of the Christian's high ideals. It is well known that at an early stage in Church history a crisis occurred of great moment, the

effects of which have been felt ever since. It was at the time when the charismatic endowments of the Apostolic age began to make way for the establishment of 'orders,' offices, and ecclesiastical organization generally. By 'charisms' are not necessarily meant miraculous powers, but those gifts of grace which were traced directly to the Spirit of God, and which so pre-eminently fitted their subjects—whether prophets, teachers, or evangelists—for the special work they had to do. The transition to regularly appointed officers and the establishment of ecclesiastical machinery was a necessary one: in some form or other the change was bound to come. But everything depended upon the way in which that fundamental change was made, especially upon the degree in which the direct operation of the Holy Spirit was recognized, the extent to which the regular church order was under His control, and the measure in which His influence was admitted and discerned outside the formal channels which the Church carefully planned for the conveyance and distribution of the streams of grace.

Montanism was a protest against the ecclesiastical tendencies of the end of the second and the beginning of the third century. It was unsuccessful, and is consequently counted among the heresies, as indeed in many of its manifestations it was extravagant and even licentious. But, as a recent writer has said, 'The obscure prophet of Phrygia had raised the eternal question of the ages. On the one hand, administration and order, the well-being of the Church in its collective capacity, the sacred book, the oral voice of the Master, the touch of the vanished hand, the perpetuation as of a bodily presence, some physical chain, as it were, which should bind the generations together, so that they should continue visibly and tangibly to hand on the truth and the life from man to man; and, on the other hand, the freedom of the Spirit and the open heaven of revelation, . . . the vision by which each soul may see Christ for himself through direct and immediate communion with the Spirit of God—that Spirit whose testimony within the soul is the supreme authority and ground of certitude, who takes of the

things of Christ and reveals them to men with fresh power and new conviction, who can at any moment authorize initiations of change and progress which yet do not and cannot break the succession of a continuous life of the Spirit in the Churches,—such were the terms of real issue between Catholicism and Montanism, which still wait, after eighteen centuries, for some larger or final adjustment.'[1]

There is no essential antagonism between the two principles thus represented, neither is there any formula by which their apparently rival claims may be adjusted. The field belongs to both, and they must learn to work in harmony. The rights of the individual and the interests of society need not violently clash. The recognition of human organizations, the need of order and continuity and prescription, are quite consistent with the direct operation of the Divine Spirit upon the individual heart and the direct communication of Divine truth to the individual mind. The action and interaction of these forces correspond to the interweaving of warp and woof in the web of life. We see the two side by side in Scripture. Especially in Acts and in 1 Corinthians are presented remarkable pictures of communities, far indeed from being perfect—in some of them abuses existed which might seem inconsistent with the very existence of a Church—but distinguished at the same time by the regular observance of church order and the immediate presence and manifestation of the Holy Spirit. God did indeed 'glow above with scarce an intervention, pressing close and palpitatingly, His soul over theirs'—so near was His Spirit to man.

But times changed, and questions of church order have not always been considered under the dominating influence of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Wherever this has been forgotten, or limited to certain rites and organizations, ecclesiasticism has flourished, while the real Church of Christ has withered and decayed. The 'real

[1] A. V. G. Allen, *Christian Institutions*, p. 103. The whole chapter deserves study.

presence' of Christ is then to be discerned only in certain services, and mainly in certain 'elements.' The order of communion services in some great Churches contains hardly a single reference to the Holy Spirit; the invocation, which is found in the office of the Scotch Episcopal Church and in other liturgies, is not found in the Anglican Prayer-book. This is a detail, but under certain ecclesiastical systems it is easy to see how living belief in the Holy Spirit dwindles under the influence of a theory which practically limits His operations to certain humanly devised and externally prescribed channels. The whole doctrine of the Holy Spirit may be said to have been *developed* since the Reformation—of course it existed in the Church from the beginning. And during the last three hundred years it has enjoyed full and healthy growth only where the atmosphere of evangelical freedom has permitted it. Dr. B. B. Warfield goes so far as to say, 'The developed doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit is an exclusively Reformation doctrine, and more particularly a Reformed doctrine, and more particularly still a Puritan doctrine. . . . Indeed it is possible to be more precise still. The doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit is a gift from John Calvin to the Church of Christ.' This last statement is true only in a very restricted sense. Dr. Warfield means that Calvin was the first to give formulated expression to a description of the benefits bestowed by the Spirit on the individual believer, and that his outline of New Testament teaching has been largely followed by Protestant Churches since his day. But the formulation of the blessings of redemption under the headings of regeneration and sanctification forms but a small part of a large subject. The Calvinistic system as a whole was anything but favourable to an adequate appreciation of the work of the Spirit in the Church and in the world. Methodism did far more in this direction, and to the work of Methodism in the eighteenth century all Protestant Christendom has been indebted for a more vivid and life-giving apprehension of spiritual privilege, especially as regards the witness of the Spirit in adoption, and His fuller work in entire sanctification.

But it is idle to discuss the extent to which separate branches of the Church of Christ have contributed to the common stock. The fundamental danger of so-called 'Catholic' Churches is in the direction of formalism, salvation by sacraments and institutions, the restriction of the Spirit's influence, and the failure to secure a deep and radical change in the individual human heart. The danger of the Broad Churchman and the errors of the Deist and Pantheist lie in an opposite direction. These latter dwell on the immanence of God throughout creation, and the influence of the Spirit on every human mind, in such a way as to leave little room for that special manifestation of God in Christ by the Spirit which differentiates Christianity as a doctrine from other religions, and ought to differentiate Christians as men from the world around them. The Churches known as evangelical occupy a middle position. They rightly protest against the narrowing down of the supernatural influence of the Spirit on the one hand, and the explaining away of the supernatural altogether on the other. But, in order to occupy their central and Scriptural position rightly, more care and study are necessary than evangelical teachers have, for the most part, given to the subject. Dr. Dale, in a note to one of his sermons on Christian doctrine, points out the need of a more careful examination of those New Testament passages in which the operation of the Divine Spirit upon the spirit in man is referred to. Professor Irving Wood shows how closely allied is a study of the idea of the Spirit of God in history with the study of human psychology—that in Scripture the term 'Spirit of God' was often used to describe otherwise unaccountable phenomena in the life of man. Mr. Walker says, 'The Spirit, as that in which God and Christ are with us and operative within us, is the most important thing in Christianity.' The relation between the two fields thus indicated—the human and the divine in the inner life of the Christian—needs careful examination. Professor James of Harvard has given us his ideas of the relation between psychology and religion, but they are singularly inadequate, even from the human and scientific

side. A task lies here before the Church, in which the thinker and the active worker should combine. The theologian and the evangelist have too often stood aloof from one another, and each seems sometimes to have thought that he could dispense with the other's assistance. No mistake could be greater. In the matters of which we speak each will go wrong without the other; but if both unite and vie with one another in doing honour to the direct operation of the Holy Spirit, a rich harvest may be reaped by both.

It is impossible within reasonably brief compass to enumerate all the fields in which a clearer realization of the Personal Leadership of the Holy Spirit would prove of great practical value to the Church. But one or two may be named by way of illustration. For example, one of the chief names given by Christ to the promised Comforter is the Spirit of Truth, and His function is described as being a 'way-guide' into all the truth—that is, all that man needs to know, 'as truth is in Jesus.' Many current controversies concerning inspiration might be ended, if a clear conception were gained of the unity of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in history, from those early days in which Israel had some dim conception of His operations, up to the time when revelation culminated in Christ, and some of His followers were inspired to write the records concerning Him so precious to us. Provided always it be clearly understood that the influence of the Holy Spirit in relation to Christian truth did not cease when the last document of Scripture was composed. His guidance of the Church in all subsequent generations is to be looked for—guidance which in all things is to be described as a taking of the things of Christ, as a bringing of His words to remembrance, but which carries on and carries out the principles of His revelation in a way that man could not foresee, suited to the constantly changing needs of the constantly changing generations. Only in this way can Christians fully understand St. Paul's distinction between the letter which killeth and the Spirit which giveth life. Only thus, whilst faithful to the traditions of the past, can they be freed from the

bondage which tradition by itself always entails, and enjoy the liberty which their Master intended them to enjoy, moving in that 'large room' in which they who are guided by the Spirit of Christ walk with ease and freedom, yet without any danger of losing their way.

Another department in which the guidance of a living Spirit is constantly needed by the Church is that of ethics. Sufficient direction is given in the New Testament to enable the Church fairly to delimitate the realm of Christian ethics; and this work has been done, not unsuccessfully. Beyond this, however, living guidance and personal direction is necessary. The Church of Rome insists on this; and as she claims that in the region of doctrine her head, the Pope, is endued with the power of infallible pronouncement, so in the department of morals she claims to be able to give unerring guidance to the conscience through the priest. How far she has been able to make good these claims in the past, let history decide. Those, however, who reject her assumptions, yet believe that guidance is given to the Christian Church by the Spirit, should be prepared to define their meaning with some approach to accuracy, and to show that they look for the fulfilment of divine promises in this matter. They might find, for example, a precedent in St. Paul's action described in the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians. The Apostle, in giving directions to the Corinthian Church in what we should call cases of conscience, partly fell back upon Christ's express command, partly gave his own judgement as one who could say, 'I think that I also have the Spirit of God.' Granted that Paul was an apostle inspired in a special way for a special purpose, and that, strictly speaking, he has no successors, it is none the less true that the Church of every generation should look for and claim such a personal leadership of the Holy Spirit, as that, with all the freedom of a spiritual religion, she may be able to bring the ethical principles of the gospel to bear, with more than human insight and authority, upon the current needs of the time.

Another mark of the plenary presence of the Spirit in

the Church may be described by the one word 'power,' though its manifestations are very various. What these are may be understood by a careful study of the Acts. Some of the 'powers' there indicated were what we call miraculous; and discussion has often taken place concerning the cessation or continuance of miracles in the Church. Perhaps the sharp distinction drawn between natural and supernatural, as if these were two entirely separate regions always marked off from one another by the same boundary line, has been in many respects misleading. It should rather be understood that they are two provinces of one great realm, governed by the same God, their mutual relations continually varying according to the extent of man's knowledge. The border line which distinguishes them is a shifting one, and is more frequently crossed than some philosophers are prepared to admit. A true believer in the Holy Spirit as ever present in the Church cannot on the one hand accept the statement that 'miracles do not happen,' nor on the other does he find the sole or the chief evidence of the Spirit's presence in the rare, the anomalous, and the inexplicable incidents of life. The 'boldness' with which the Apostles testified before kings and governors could not be exactly described as a natural nor as a supernatural phenomenon. In every age the Spirit has enabled the followers of Christ to transcend nature, so that the startling words have been fulfilled: 'Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto the Father.' Precisely what is meant by a moral miracle we leave those to determine who are more disposed than we are sharply to distinguish 'nature' from the supernatural. What we desire to urge at the moment is, that in and through the Holy Spirit power may be claimed by Christians in every generation to enable them to do God's will, which cannot be restricted by the bounds of the very ambiguous word 'nature.' On this point Mr. Arthur says wisely and well:

We do not see that the miraculous effects which followed the Pentecost are promised to all ages and all people, and therefore we do not look for them to reappear; but we feel satisfied that he who

does expect the gift of healing, and the gift of tongues, or any other miraculous manifestation of the Holy Spirit, in addition to those substantial blessings of which these were, as we have said, the ushers and the heralds, has ten times more spiritual ground on which to base his expectation than have they for their unbelief who do not expect supernatural sanctifying strength for the believer, supernatural aid in preaching, exhortation, and prayer for pastors and gifted members, and supernatural converting power upon the minds of those who are yet of the world.[1]

Sober Christians, who are neither fanatics nor enthusiasts nor credulous devotees, know enough of the power of faith in history to make them very slow to limit its capacity, when the Holy Spirit has a work for His followers to do in the world.

The subject of limitations brings us round once more to the point from which we started. How is it that the work of the Spirit in the Church and in the world is marked by so many fluctuations, such apparent irregularity and intermittency, in its energies and effects? The answer is simple. It has been substantially given, both by prophet and apostle: 'Ye are not straitened in us, but ye are straitened in your own affections.' The restriction does not lie in the Divine power or grace, but in the human capacity, a lack either of power or will on the part of the Church to receive and use the resources ready to her hand. The deficiency may sometimes be the result of ignorance, or it may imply real inability; but too frequently it springs from carelessness, neglect, unfaithfulness, or actual sin. The spasmodic character of many religious manifestations is not due to physical causes—though physical accompaniments of religious excitement are familiar and easily intelligible features in them—but to the fluctuating and uncertain character of the instruments through whom the Spirit works and the medium in which His work is of necessity carried on. Doubtless, if our knowledge of all the causes and conditions were adequate, we could discern a law of periodicity

[1] *Tongue of Fire* (Author's Uniform Edition, pp. 292–3).

in what are called 'revivals' of religion, and to some extent explain why they recur when and as they do. Finney, who is generally regarded as a somewhat too enthusiastic revivalist, writes: 'A Revival is not a miracle, nor dependent on a miracle. It is a purely philosophical'—as we now say, scientific—'result of the right use of the constituted means—as much so as any other effect produced by the application of means. . . . I fully believe that, could the facts be known, it would be found that when the appointed means have been rightly used, spiritual blessings have been obtained with greater uniformity than temporal ones.'

If, however, we have been right in our previous exposition of Christian doctrine, it is not to the operation of laws, or the scientific connexion between spiritual cause and effect, to which we should in the first instance turn, but to the presence and work of a personal indwelling Spirit and the personal relation between Himself, and the individuals of whom the Church is composed, or that Church in its corporate life of union and communion with Him. It is the failure here which is fatal to the steady and triumphant progress of the Spirit's work in the world. Here lies the real tragedy of Church history. The heart of the world has been touched by the spectacle of the Man of Sorrows, as God manifest in the flesh, bearing the burden of the world's sin and pain, and dying on the cross for the world's salvation. The Holy Spirit, in some sense incarnated in the Church, bears throughout the ages the burden of its imperfection, vacillation, and sin, together with the greater burden of the sin of the world which ought to be saved through her means. But He is invisible, inaudible, intangible, and few hear His unutterable groaning, as He longs to carry on a work of purification, but is hindered by the Church's unfaithfulness. The meaning of the obscure verse, Jas. iv. 7, cannot be dogmatically determined, but there is little doubt that it may be substantially rendered by the paraphrase, 'The Spirit which He made to dwell in us jealously yearns for the entire devotion of the heart.' In any case, Scripture teaches us to think of the Holy Spirit as the personal God

within man thus yearning for his redemption. A pathetic interest attaches to the proverbial transiency of periods of revival, when they are regarded as the brief opportunities in which the Spirit breaks through the barriers of fleshly hindrance which obstruct His working in the Church and world alike. The door opened into heaven is all too quickly closed; the heavy veil which shrouds spiritual realities from men's eyes, lifted for a moment, falls all too quickly down again; and once more 'custom lies upon us with a weight heavy as frost and deep almost as life.'

It is for the Church of Christ to see that this victory of flesh over Spirit is prevented. The Church cannot save the world, but the world cannot be saved without it. One chief source of access which the Holy Spirit has to the conscience of mankind is through the Church's faithful witness-bearing to Christ's truth. He can and does convict the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement, when Christ is clearly and adequately proclaimed. But he cannot speak without a mouthpiece. True, as the Spirit of God, He has access to every conscience, and silently yet mightily He utters His message there. But, as Spirit of Christ, His work of conviction depends upon the fidelity with which Christ is set forth not only by the minister in the pulpit and the teacher in the class, but by all Christians in their lives. Are miracles ended? Anskar, the missionary to Scandinavia in the ninth century, prayed, 'God, give me grace to show the miracle of a holy life.' Said a Brahmin to a modern missionary in India, 'We are finding you out; you are not so good as your book: if you were, you would convert India in five years.' The reproach is severe—it is not easy to be as good as that book. But a smaller measure of fidelity would preserve Churches from many of the fluctuations in religious life which have brought discredit upon Christianity from the time when a heart-searching message, now of stern warning, now of tender entreaty, was given to changeful Ephesus and dead-alive Sardis and lukewarm Laodicea—'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.'

All true progress of man depends upon the victory of the

Spirit over the flesh. If evolution means anything in the history of the race, it means that man should 'move upward, working out the beast, and let the ape and tiger die.' But there are no forces of spiritual gravitation to move him upward without effort, and the ape and tiger, when left to themselves, do not die a natural death. Evolution is not a *vera causa*, and there is no secure hope for the progress of mankind to be gained from a study of the history of civilization, the rise and fall of dynasties and empires, or the improvement discernible in the condition of the nations at large. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God and of Christ, is the true hope of man. Not the Church, not the Bible, but the Spirit who inspired both, who inhabits both, and who alone can enable either to do the work for which both are given to the world. If ecclesiasticism and sectarian strife and bigotry are to be driven out of the Church, and the Bible is to be the living Word of God, and not a dead letter, it must be through the operation of that Holy Spirit, whose vitalizing energy in the beginning brought life and peace and ordered beauty out of physical chaos, and who alone preserves a moral world stained with sin and honeycombed with corruption from sinking into utter decay and ruin.

W. T. DAVISON.

EDWARD BURNE-JONES.

Memorials of Edward Burne-Jones. By G. B.-J. Two Volumes. (Macmillan & Co. 1904.)

Religion in Recent Art. By P. T. FORSYTH. (Hodder & Stoughton. 1901.)

Sir Edward Burne-Jones. By MALCOLM BELL. (George Bell & Sons. 1898.)

SIR E. J. POYNTER once told some students that 'the true object of art is to create a world, not to imitate what is constantly before our eyes.' Tried by that canon, Burne-Jones takes rank among the masters of English art. He created, says Mr. Malcolm Bell, 'a world of beauty and poetry, a world in which a great French painter declared he found memories of what he possibly had never seen, of what he certainly should never see again.' The result of his life-work is 'such a legacy of perfected beauty as has seldom, if ever, been equalled.'

Every lover of art is anxious to know how this genius found its sphere, and to study the methods by which it was perfected. That is the desire which Lady Burne-Jones has set herself to meet in these entrancing volumes. Her husband questioned the possibility of writing the biography of any but men of action. 'You can tell the life of those who have fought and won, and been beaten, because it is clear and definite; but what is there to say about a poet or an artist? I never want a life of any man whose work I know, for that is his day of judgement, and that is his doom; the shapeless mess that other people make for one to deal with I won't have called a life. It is more like one's death—so many things are one's death more than the pale face that looks in at the door one day. My life is what I long for

and love and regret and desire.' That is true and forcible; yet when some master stands beside us as we face the finished canvas, and supplies us with hints as to its interpretation, new meaning and new beauty shine forth upon us. Lady Burne-Jones has played that part with rare discrimination and ample knowledge. She has spent six years upon her task, but this toil has borne worthy fruit. Her book helps us to trace the development of her husband's genius step by step from his boyhood to his crown of accomplished work, and fills us with wonder and delight.

Genius is always shrouded in mystery, but it is not often that so little clue to the marvel can be gained as in the case of Burne-Jones. His father was a carver and gilder, who kept shop on Bennett's Hill, in the heart of Birmingham. So far as is known, there was no foreshadowing of the gifts of the painter in the family of either parent. Mrs. Jones died in September 1833, a week after the birth of her son. For four years her husband could scarcely bear to take into his arms the son of his sorrow. He was so frail that when 'the great day arrived for him to be put into "short sleeves," they had to cut off the sleeves of his little dresses an inch at a time lest a sudden chill might undo all' Miss Sampson's work. In summer his father used to send his delicate boy to lodge in the country with the housekeeper. These holidays were a great delight to a child who was already a dreamer. Miss Sampson was often puzzled by his spells of quiet, and would ask suddenly, 'What are you thinking of, Edward?' He guarded his charmed domain by inventing an answer in one word, 'Camels.' Some friends of his father, Mr. and Mrs. Caswell, who lived a short distance out of Birmingham, did much to brighten his childhood. He often stayed with them, and they early recognized his gifts. Mr. Caswell was the first to notice his drawing, and gave him engravings to copy. A group of deer which the boy drew at the age of seven is still preserved. The little painter never forgot the irritation he felt when Mr. Caswell wrote some criticisms of this effort right across the sky. These holidays left happy memories. Only a few years ago the painter took a wall-

flower from the centre of the dinner-table and smelt it. 'I'm four years old again, in Mr. Caswell's garden. How kind they were to me, Mr. and Mrs. Caswell, and I never thought about it.'

One of his aunts had married a farmer, and he often went to stay with her at Wootton, in Worcestershire. His drawing was thought very clever for a boy of five. He used to sketch all the household. The curls of the young ladies he could manage, but he was baffled by the 'big heads' of the servants, as he called their caps. An artist once said to Burne-Jones that he never remembered feeling unhappy when he was left alone as a child. 'Ah,' was the reply, 'that was because you could draw. It was the same with me. I was always drawing. Unmothered, with a sad papa, without sister or brother, always alone, I was never unhappy, because I was always drawing. And when I think of what made the essence of a picture to me in those days, it's wonderful how little I have stirred. I couldn't draw people, of course, but I never failed to draw mountains at the back of everything, just as I do now, though I'd never seen one.'

On September 3, 1844, the boy entered King Edward's School. His father had cultivated his taste for poetry. 'He used to read in a very touching voice, melodious and pathetic, believing everything he read. I have never heard such sympathetic reading. And he believed all good things that were ever said of any one, and was altogether unworldly and pious. Like his countrymen, he knew nothing at all of art, and couldn't understand what it was about, or why it should be; but for nature he had a passion, and would seldom miss a sunrise if it could be seen, and would walk tired miles to see a cornfield.' Edward was fortunate enough to find a congenial friend in Cormell Price, afterwards Head of the United Services College, Westward Ho. They spent many an afternoon in the cemetery at Icknield Street, repeating Ossian. The future painter was brimming over with fun, and was known by his merry laugh. In this respect he never grew old. Lady Burne-Jones says: 'Gentle and lambent at times, wild enough and noisy at others,

whimsical in words, ominous in silence, whilst some swiftly conceived Puck-like scheme of mischief took shape, carrying all things before it, compelling the least likely to join in it, always ending in the laugh that we remember, the cloud-scattering laugh.' He had a wonderful faculty of searching out information about anything that interested him. An astonishing instance of this is given in two letters to his cousin about the tenets of the Calvinistic Methodists. Here also he never changed. 'To the last he would steadily read the dullest books through in order to find in them the one fact he wanted, or to make sure that it was not there; he would buy a long series of a magazine for the sake of one special article in a few numbers, and nothing that bore even the name of the subject he was studying was despised beforehand. He read slowly as a man; I do not know whether it was the same with him as a boy.'

For three nights a week he went to the School of Design, where he studied under Thomas Clark, the drawing master of King Edward's School. There is no proof that his masters discerned promise of special gifts in their pupil. Looking back on these days, he once said, 'They never saw anything in me.' Every spare moment at school was given to drawing. A schoolfellow writes: 'Figure after figure, group after group, would cover a sheet of foolscap almost as quickly as one could have written, always without faltering or pausing, and with a look as if he saw them before him. I have seen him look straight before him into space as if his copy were there. All the time he would be joyfully talking, and saying what he was doing or going to do.' His wife says: 'This habit continued as long as he lived; he must have covered reams of paper with drawings that came as easily to him as his breath. At every friend's house there are some of them. They filled up moments of waiting, moments of silence, or uncomfortable moments, bringing every one together again in wonder at the swiftness of their creation, and laughter at their endless fun.'

Before he left King Edward's School he had read widely in philosophy and religious polemics, and had 'a perfect

rage for logic and metaphysics.' His neatly kept school-books were filled with finely written notes. The School Library was a great delight to him. Layard's *Nineveh*, Curzon's *Monasteries of the Levant*, Lockhart's *Scott*, and the best English poetry, were prime favourites. As to stories, he was 'omnivorous.' He seems to have met Newman's *Sermons* when staying at Hereford, when he was fifteen or sixteen. From them, he says, I learned 'things that will never be out of me. In an age of sofas and cushions he taught me to be indifferent to comfort, and in an age of materialism he taught me to venture all on the unseen, and this so early that it was well in me when life began, and I was equipped before I went to Oxford with a real good panoply, and it has never failed me. So, if this world cannot tempt me with money or luxury—and it can't —or anything it has in its trumpery treasure-house, it is most of all because he said it in a way that touched me, not scolding, nor forbidding, nor much leading—walking with me a step in front. So he stands to me as a great image or symbol of a man who never stooped, and who put all this world's life in one splendid venture, which he knew as well as you or I might fail, but with a glorious scorn of everything that was not his dream.'

His friend, Richard Watson Dixon, first saw Burne-Jones when he came from the English into the Classical School. 'He would then be about fifteen. He was a tall, strong boy, and I remember noticing his appearance as he sat, proud and erect, at his desk among the somewhat younger boys of his class. I soon made him out, and found him a great joker among them, with a peculiar catch of a laugh, which had in it disdain tempered with good-nature and amusement. I noticed that at once: how often was I to hear it afterwards!' In 1850 the Rev. George Browne Macdonald was appointed to one of the Methodist circuits in Birmingham. He removed his elder son from Wesley College, Sheffield, to King Edward's School. Burne-Jones thus found his way to the Macdonalds' house, in Nursery Terrace, Handsworth. He was then eighteen. Lady Burne-

Jones describes him as rather tall and very thin. His face was pale, his forehead wide and high. Power flashed from his eyes, and when anything moved him his whole face seemed to be lit up from within. 'He was easily stirred, and then his speech was as swift and clear as possible, yet well ordered and going straight to the mark.'

In January 1853 he went up to Exeter College, Oxford. The city of his hopes disappointed him, but it provided him with a friend, who shaped his whole course. He had sat beside William Morris at their matriculation, but had not spoken to him. They were not long at Exeter before they became close companions. Burne-Jones had not found his vocation. He was hoping to enter the Church of England, and was greatly impressed by the works of Archdeacon Wilberforce, who had not yet seceded to Rome. The religious perplexity through which he passed in 1854 was nothing less than agony. He went for counsel to Charles Marriott, then vicar of St. Mary's. 'This interview gave some relief, but the whole-hearted, enthusiastic, and uninquiring days were gone.' Canon Dixon believes his friend experienced a great inward change in his early days at Oxford. 'He said to me and Morris that he knew the time when he felt his heart burst into a blossom of love to his friends and all the men around him. Certainly at the time he began to show a more decided and stronger character than at school, though still full of vivacity and amusement.'

He and Morris came gradually to see that the life of a clergyman was not the path for them. Art was beginning to assert its empire. Burne-Jones had fallen under the spell of Malory's *Morte d'Arthur*. He was not able to buy Southey's edition. 'I used to read it in a bookseller's shop day after day, and bought cheap books to pacify the owner; but Morris got it at once, and we feasted on it together.' Lady Burne-Jones says: 'Sometimes I think the book never can have been loved as it was by these two men. With Edward it became literally a part of himself. Its strength and beauty, its mystical religion and noble chivalry of action, the world of lost history and romance in the names of

people and places—it was his own birthright upon which he entered.'

When in London at the beginning of 1856, he went to the Working Men's College in Great Ormond Street to get a sight of Rossetti. The face, he says, 'satisfied all my worship.' Vernon Lushington found out why he had come, and invited him to his rooms a few nights later, when Rossetti was to be present. There he had his first talk with the painter. Rossetti had felt his tribute in the *Oxford and Cambridge Magazine* 'the most gratifying thing by far that ever happened to me—being unmistakably genuine.' He invited the Oxford man to come next day to his studio by Blackfriars Bridge. He found him painting 'Fra Pace,' and stayed a long time watching him at work and talking about Morris, one or two of whose poems Rossetti knew already. 'He showed me many designs for pictures: they tossed about everywhere in the room; the floor at one end was covered with them, and with books.' The visitor carefully concealed the desire to be a painter, which he now cherished. He returned to Oxford, but became too restless to stay for a pass degree.

In May he was settled in rooms at Sloane Terrace, Chelsea. Morris used to run up from Oxford to spend the week-end with him, and they saw more and more of Rossetti. A month later he was engaged to Miss Macdonald, and brought her a royal gift in the shape of all his Ruskin volumes. Rossetti tried to find him some work by which he might earn a living. He had not yet realized what gifts his recruit possessed. One day, however, Morris showed the painter one of his companion's designs. When Burne-Jones returned to the room, Rossetti put his arm round his shoulder and said, 'There are not three men in England, Ned, who could have done these things.' This generous appreciation from such a master was a wonderful encouragement in this time of struggle. One day when he was painting and Morris drawing in Rossetti's studio, Holman Hunt came in—'the greatest genius,' Burne-Jones wrote to his father, 'that is on earth alive, such a grand-looking

fellow, such a splendour of a man, with a great wiry golden beard, and faithful violet eyes—oh, such a man!'

The Macdonalds had now moved to the Hinde Street circuit. They lived at 17 Beaumont Street. Burne-Jones used to bring his portfolio under his arm in the evening, and go on with his pen-and-ink designs. 'He used to spin them out of his mind with unfailing certainty and swiftness, and with such apparent ease that at first I did not know how astonishing it was.' He seemed to have the faculty of withdrawing into himself, and could carry on his work amid what to another man would have been hopeless distractions. That faculty he never lost. His studio servant hit it exactly when, noticing his master's inattention to visible things, he said quietly, 'Mind elsewhere, sir.'

In November 1856 Morris and Burne-Jones took rooms together at 17 Red Lion Square. Rossetti was a frequent visitor. All that Burne-Jones learned from him as to the technicalities of painting was represented by a few mornings' work in his studio, but in other directions his debt was lasting. 'He taught me to have no fear or shame of my own ideas, to design perpetually, to seek no popularity, to be altogether myself—and this not in any words I can remember, but in the tenor of his conversation always, and in the spirit of everything he said. What I chiefly gained from him was not to be afraid of myself, but to do the thing I liked most; but in those first years I never wanted to think but as he thought, and all he did and said fitted me through and through. He never harangued or persuaded, but had a gift of saying things authoritatively and not as the Scribes, such as I have never heard in any man. In the miserable ending years I never forgot this image of him in his prime, and upbraided any fate that could change him.'

The young painter's wings were now spread for some worthy flight. He became conscious that he no longer needed a guide. In 1857 he joined Rossetti and other friends in decorating the walls of the Union at Oxford. His picture was 'Nimuë luring Merlin.' Gradually his powers unfolded. His health broke down seriously, but, after much

care and nursing, strength returned. In April 1860 Miss Macdonald came up from Manchester, where her father was then stationed, to stay with Mr. and Mrs. Madox Brown. There it was suddenly settled that she should be married on June 9, the fourth anniversary of her engagement. The young people had about £30 in hand. The bride's chief contribution to their stock was a small deal table with a drawer that held her wood-engraving tools. Three days before the marriage, a generous patron, Mr. Plint, sent £25 on account of work done and promised. After their marriage, in Manchester, the young people travelled to Chester. There the bridegroom was taken with a sore throat, and a doctor had to be called in on the day after the wedding. No one guessed 'how ignominiously newly married' they were. They had arranged to meet Rossetti and his bride in Paris, but that plan was perforce abandoned. They made haste to their own rooms in Russell Place, Bloomsbury. Nothing was prepared for them. There were no chairs in the dining-room, and of all the furniture ordered only an oak table had arrived. Sitting on this the bride received her first visitors. Happy days followed. At the end of July they met the Rossettis at the Zoo, and a little later visited Morris and his wife at Upton, Bexley Heath. When they got back to town, Swinburne became a constant visitor. Meanwhile the young husband found his hands full of work. He carried out a commission for an altarpiece in St. Paul's Church, Brighton; painted a water-colour of 'Clerk Saunders,' and a small water-colour 'Laus Veneris,' which contained the germ of one of his most elaborate pictures. He studied certain flowers till he knew them by heart. He writes: 'Did you ever draw a sunflower? it is a whole school of drawing and an education in itself. Do you know what faces they have —how they peep and peer, and look arch and winning, or bold and a little insolent sometimes? Have you ever noticed their back-hair, how beautifully curled it is?'

Burne-Jones soon moved into a larger set of rooms opposite the British Museum, 62 Great Russell Street. There his first child was born, and the little household was

launched on a new set of experiences. The young wife had been much with her husband, reading aloud to him while he worked, and sharing the company of the studio. She still remembers how she sat with her little son on her knee, listening with a feeling of exile to the well-known voices of friends and her husband's familiar laugh.

A great compensation followed. On May 15, 1862, the painter and his wife started for Italy with Mr. Ruskin, who treated them as his 'children,' and bore all expenses of the tour. He agreed to ease their minds by accepting the studies which the artist might make while in Italy. Ruskin was in a somewhat pensive mood, as befitted one who had just signed the preface of *Unto this Last*, the essays on economic questions which had so greatly disturbed his father's mind. In Paris, Mrs. Burne-Jones went to see an English friend, wife of the Wesleyan minister. Ruskin visited his first love, Adèle. 'They called me John,' he said on his return; and his companions felt how few people could ever do that, and how sweet it must have been to him. Then he told them of Adèle and her sportsman husband, whom she used to amuse by translating *Punch* to him. The travellers had a glorious drive over the Pass of St. Gothard, and gradually dropped down into their promised paradise. They were soon feasting eyes and heart on the masterpieces of Italy. Burne-Jones wrote: 'The look of the pictures has done me good; I feel that I could paint so much better already.' Before long he was restless to return. The ancient pictures set him on fire, yet his own originality was dwarfed. 'I should never paint another picture if I lived in Italy.' Ruskin persuaded him to stay a little longer, but after ten weeks of never-failing delight they returned to London.

Many commissions from the firm established by Morris and his friends were waiting Burne-Jones. One for coloured tiles supplied him with a welcome outlet for his abounding humour; for some stained glass he designed a scene in the story of King Mark and La Belle Iseult. Such designs were prepared in the evening, the presence of friends making no difference to the artist. On Mr. Ruskin's return to

England, he invited Mr. and Mrs. Burne-Jones to dine at Denmark Hill. Old Mr. Ruskin's dignity and simplicity, together with a latent tenderness of manner, were very reassuring to his son's friends. 'The little old lady who ruled the house from her low seat by the fireside was less easy to understand.' She had injured herself by a fall, and when dinner was announced 'she walked from the drawing-room to the dining-room, leaning upon a chair which moved easily on castors as she pushed it before her, and evidently carrying out an established custom. Edward was repelled by the old lady's sharp, decisive manner, and could not like her thoroughly. At dinner, if anything her son said, though not addressed to herself, did not reach her ear, she demanded to have it repeated, and from her end of the table came a clear thread of voice, "John—John Ruskin, what was that you said?" When the sharply questioning sound at last penetrated to him, he never failed, with the utmost respect, to repeat his words.'

On a later occasion, when John Ruskin was abroad, Burne-Jones and his wife dined at Denmark Hill. Mr. Ruskin gave him a copy of his son's poems, and told him how heartbroken he had been over Adèle's departure. The mother said, 'Yes, any trouble that has happened to him since then was nothing compared to that.' Italy had made the painter a severe critic of his own performances. He had no complacency about failure. 'He had passed the pleasant wayside places where the labourer rests with his friends after a day's work, and had begun the world-long day of those who seek no rest or reward but that of contenting the rigour of the Judge Invisible.' His wife tells us how she began to know something of the difficulties with which he wrestled as she saw the misery that he passed through at one stage or other of almost every finished picture. He said, 'I work daily at "Cophetua and his Maid." I torment myself every day—I never learn a bit how to paint. No former work ever helps me—every new picture is a new puzzle, and I lose myself and am bewildered—and it's all as it was at the beginning years ago. But I will kill myself, or else Cophetua

shall look like a king, and the beggar like a queen, such as kings and queens ought to be.' Still more impressive is a later outburst: 'It takes an artist fifty years to learn to do anything, and fifty years to learn what not to do—and three hundred years to do it; and when it is done, neither heaven nor earth much needs it nor heeds it. Well, I'll peg away; I can do nothing else, and wouldn't if I could.' We may add another suggestive saying: 'When is a picture finished? Never, I think—and is a symbol of life itself in that way; so, when I say it is finished, I mean it is cut off, and must go away.' He used to say that it was only the van coming to take it away that finished a picture for him.

In 1865, after a time of severe sickness and trouble, the artist and his wife moved to 41 Kensington Square. Their first youth seemed now left behind them. Mr. E. J. Poynter, who took their rooms in Great Russell Street, became engaged to Agnes Macdonald the same summer, and a few months earlier her sister Alice was married to Mr. Lockwood Kipling, and sailed for Bombay, where Rudyard Kipling was born the next year.

In 1867 Burne-Jones moved to The Grange, North End Lane, Fulham, which was his home for thirty years. It had a garden of about three-quarters of an acre, with a fine old mulberry tree on its lawn, peaches against the walls, and apple-trees enough to earn one corner the name of orchard. A legacy from his mother's half-brother came opportunely, and enabled him for the first time in his life to lay something by. He had large schemes of work in his mind, though he did not live to carry all of them into effect. Friends flocked around him, and 'to him each fresh acquaintance was newborn.' Beauty and misfortune had tremendous power over the painter, and he would go far to serve them. He was quick to recognize spiritual beauty, though he liked it best when allied to physical beauty. 'Some of the last words he uttered were about a plain woman who had done excellent work in the world. "What a beautiful soul that woman has!' he exclaimed; but, he added, with gentle humour, "I think I'd better not see her."'

The friendship with Morris was 'like one of the forces of nature.' He came to The Grange for breakfast every Sunday, and spent the morning in the studio. In February 1868 a happy intimacy with George Eliot began. Burne-Jones wrote the year before her death: 'There is no one living better to talk to, for she speaks carefully, so that nothing has to be taken back or qualified in any way. Her knowledge is really deep, and her heart one of the most sympathetic to me I ever knew.' Mr. Heeley, an old schoolfellow, who was at home from India in 1868, took part of The Grange during his furlough. He found that most of the men whom he knew in earlier life had 'given in to the world,' though Morris and Burne-Jones had quite escaped. Lady Burne-Jones says that Morris never drew near or seemed to take the least possible pleasure in 'the world,' but her husband from time to time did both. 'He loved many who belonged to it, and the whole spectacle interested and beguiled him amidst the stress of his own life and work.' His wife noticed this change, and felt a kind of power at work changing her, though she could not lay her hand on it or name it.

In 1870 the painter resigned his connexion with the Old Water-Colour Society. 'Upon that,' he said, 'followed the seven blissfullest years of work that I ever had; no fuss, no publicity, no teasing about exhibiting, no getting pictures done against time.' He did not like exhibitions, but felt a longing to design on a large scale for special places where common people might see them and say, 'Oh!' only 'oh!' In 1871 he had sixty pictures, oil and water, in his studio, and every day would gladly have begun a new one.

When Sir Coutts Lindsay opened the Grosvenor Gallery in 1877 the English public soon came to endorse the opinion of Rossetti, that the name of Burne-Jones represented 'the loveliest art we have.' He sent eight pictures: 'The Days of Creation,' 'Venus's Mirror,' 'The Beguiling of Merlin,' and his great single figures 'Temperantia,' 'Spes,' 'Fides,' 'St. George,' and a 'Sibyl.' 'From that day he belonged to the world in a

sense that he had never done before, for his existence became widely known and his name famous.' In 1880 the house at Rottingdean was bought, and the time spent here was a never-failing delight and refreshment to the whole household. It was a great joy when in 1896 Rudyard Kipling, whose books he read with delight and pride, came to live close to his uncle. Lady Burne-Jones refers to that moment of the Diamond Jubilee when 'a few verses in a daily newspaper seemed to bring the nation to its knees.' Her husband wrote, 'I love your hymn—it is beautiful and solemn, and says the word that had to be said.'

Honours now came crowding in upon a man in whose gifts England delighted. In June 1881 Oxford gave him the degree of D.C.L., which he received with much pleasure. After the degrees had been conferred, Mr. J. W. Mackail, the winner of the Newdigate, read his poem aloud. Little did the painter dream that here was the future husband of his only daughter. In May 1883 Mr. Ruskin devoted one of his lectures at Oxford on 'The Art of England' to his friend. He wrote, 'I want to reckon you up, and it's like counting clouds.' The critic said that the essential gift and habit of thought in Burne-Jones lay in personification. He laid stress on 'indefatigable scholarship and exhaustless fancy' which had fitted the painter for his special work, and on the quiet purity of his outline, 'as pure as the lines of engraving on an Etruscan mirror.' In 1885 Burne-Jones was elected an associate of the Royal Academy on the nomination of Mr. Briton Riviere. This mark of goodwill both touched and surprised him, though he hated exhibitions and was never quite happy under the yoke. He resigned his associateship in 1893. The crowning honour came in January 1894, when Mr. Gladstone offered him a baronetcy. Morris was now taking an active part in the Socialist propaganda, and would leave his friend in the middle of Sunday morning to attend his street-preaching. Once when Burne-Jones was at Rottingdean, Morris wrote: 'It is a beautiful, bright autumn morning here, as fresh as daisies; and I am not over inclined to my morning preachment at Walham Green, but go I must, and

also to Victoria Park in the afternoon. I had a sort of dastardly hope that it might rain. Mind you, I don't pretend to say I don't like it in some way or other; like it when I am on my legs, if I flow.'

Burne-Jones did not share his friend's Socialism, but nothing weakened the bond between them. 'Such strength as his I see nowhere,' is one tribute to Morris out of many recorded in these volumes.

The last years of the painter's life were full of activity. In 1890 he writes: 'One thing is luck, that I can invent as easily as ever, and could make ten pictures a day if believing was seeing.' In 1891 the famous Kelmscott Chaucer was on the stocks. The preparation of his eighty-seven designs was a constant source of delight and refreshment to the artist. Lady Burne-Jones says of these years: 'In them were no beginnings of things which mark time so gloriously, but rather a continuous flow of the stream of life—full to its banks, and with little to disturb the swift silence of its current.' The painter laboured harder than ever, and with increasing method and regularity. He had a strong desire to finish the mass of work that he had begun, and curbed his inclination to start new subjects. He shrank much from the exhibition of his own collected works at the New Gallery in 1892, but was glad when he found friends like Du Maurier speaking of his special glamour, the gift of 'so strangely impressing the imagination and ever after haunting the memory.'

Morris died on October 3, 1896. This blow had been foreseen, but his old friend's cry was, 'I am quite alone now, quite, quite.' The first work he turned to after this sore stroke was his designs for cartoons in glass. He said, 'I must confess death makes the glorious more glorious, and already I feel him far removed, and cling in my memory most to the days when we seemed equal and began the tale.' He described death as 'a magnificent peerage.' He had dreaded it in earlier years as the only irremediable thing which cut short the story of life and work. Now there was a change. Lady Burne-Jones says, 'After Morris went, death

was frequently mentioned between us, and the fear of it was gone.'

He told a friend in 1890, 'You don't really need to read anything along with the Old Testament—it stands alone; and the Renans and people, I wonder what their like a hundred years hence will say of them. They are so cocksure.' Once he heard some one say that Christ would have been a more effectual teacher if He had been more cultivated. Burne-Jones was in a white heat. 'As I live,' he said, 'these were his very words. And I wanted to smash him with the coal-scuttle and wipe my boots on his face. And in a figure of speech I did, and for days I railed at education and pined for the company of cabmen.' He was always reticent about the things of the soul, but his heart came out in his letters. 'I never doubt for a moment the real presence of God; I should never debate about it any more than I should argue about beauty, and the things I most love.' He thought more and more of the mother he had never seen. 'If ever I see her,' he wrote, 'why, she will be a young thing, as young as Margaret. But we won't say "if"—*when* I see her: let us die in the faith.'

He died of angina pectoris on June 17, 1898, at the age of sixty-five. He had been full of work to the end, and on the last afternoon of his life had told a young visitor, 'I only get tired when I am doing nothing.' His own words were fulfilled: 'I believe I shall go out of life blessing it and grateful for it. I have seen glories and wonders, have known the fullness of admiration and worship for splendid work, and splendid lives I have seen. I suppose I might have made the vision better still if I had washed my eyes seven times in Jordan—whatever that may mean.'

English art owes a great debt to Burne-Jones. Rossetti's verdict that his name represented 'the loveliest art we have' was uttered in 1877. All the painter's later work confirmed it. He had no patience with the French artist who lavished his skill on a horrible picture of two lovers who quarrelled and killed themselves. 'It sticks in my memory to this day, though I wish it wouldn't. But for the sake of

this very doubtful gain, a man gives up his proper *metier* of creating beauty.' Nothing was more hopeless to Burne-Jones than empty prettiness, yet he could not understand why some painters seemed to select the ugliest models they could find. He was by no means blind to the fact that under existing conditions a man's sense of beauty might be 'his private torment,' yet he steadily cultivated the faculty of seeing beautiful things, and of fixing them on his canvas. For him the triumphs of war and of commerce had little interest. 'I love the immaterial. You see it is these things of the soul that are real—the only real things in the universe.' His sense of beauty, his passion for the realities of spiritual life, were controlled by a strong and abiding feeling of responsibility. 'The real fool,' he said, 'is the man who hears the call and doesn't obey it. To do any real good, you must work to the best advantage. What you have to do is to express yourself—utter yourself, turn out what is in you—on the side of beauty and right and truth, and of course you can't turn out your best unless you know what your best is. You, for instance, start a rag of a newspaper—I cover an acre of canvas with a dream of the deathbed of a king who, you tell me, was never alive—why? Simply because, for the life of us, we can't hit on any more healing ointment for the maladies of this poor old woman, the world at large. Our religion is the same. There is only one religion. "Make the most of your best" is common-sense and morals. "Make the most of your best for the sake of others" is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.' The painter felt that the Day of Judgement was a synonym for the present moment. It was eternally going on. 'We are a living part, however small, of things as they are. If we believe that things as they are can be made better than they are, and in that faith set to work to help the betterment to the best of our ability, however limited, we are, and cannot help being, children of the Kingdom. If we disbelieve in the possibility of betterment, or don't try to help it forward, we are and cannot help being damned.'

That was the artist's creed. All the world knows how he translated it into visions of spiritual beauty which have sent an illuminating flash into minds that were in danger of being choked with the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches. To stand in front of his great archangels, which glorify the windows of the little church at Rottingdean, is to be lifted above all that is sensual and earthly. Two other windows which he gave to the same church represented Jacob's Ladder and a Jesse tree, on one of the branches of which Hezekiah is seen grasping a sundial in his hand, Josiah holds the Law, David his harp, and Solomon his temple. The San Graal story never ceased to stir the painter's heart. He designed five scenes from it for some tapestry. First, we see that Pentecost morning when the damsel of the San Graal summoned all the knights to ride forth on their quest. The next scene shows the knights starting on their adventure. The third and fourth describe the ways in which they were foiled. Only three of the knights may set foot on Sarras, the land of the soul. Bors and Percival behold the Graal afar off. 'Then comes Galahad who alone may see it—and to see it is death, for it is seeing the face of God.' Burne-Jones did not care for 'minute archæological accuracy.' His endeavour was to reach and reveal the soul. Each picture was an expression of his own self. We have seen how Rossetti opened to him the doors of the world of art. But the pupil passed beyond the master. Rossetti does not reveal character, but contents himself with visions and types of beauty. No one man, Burne-Jones thought, had ever been such a master in the two arts of painting and poetry as Rossetti, but his later poetry seems 'at times as if overmastered by a kind of sensuous hysteria.' The effect of his work both with pen and pencil in the closing years of his life is enervating. He who used to move about among his friends as an acknowledged prince, lost his kingly throne. We watch that change with a deepening sense of disappointment. The stream dries up before it reaches the sea. Burne-Jones and Morris took a nobler course than their master. They never ceased

to see visions. The world was not able to overpower them. Their friendship was based on a common passion for the unseen and eternal. Burne-Jones bore witness: 'The things that in thought are most of me, most dear and necessary, are dear and necessary to no one except Morris only.' Morris appears in these pages as a man of resolute purpose, brimming over with restless energy, always his own straightforward self. His friend tried to put down some of his rare sayings, but found that he could convey no idea of their singularity and independence. His noble poetry and his inspiring work as designer and artist are the abiding memorial of a man to whom all English homes and English craftsmen are debtors.

The achievement of another painter has been before our eyes during the first months of this year. The Watts Exhibition has astonished visitors to Burlington House by its extraordinary variety. Watts is more manifestly a teacher and preacher of righteousness than Burne-Jones. His painted parables appeal to the imagination and heart, and kindle all that is best and noblest in those who come beneath their spell. He is more in touch with the world of realities than Burne-Jones. His imagination was fed by the life around him, which he studied with unfailing sympathy. This prophet never lost his passion for the salvation of the world, or his faith in his gospel. His seventy years of strenuous labour have left a legacy in which England will not cease to glory. So far back as 1877 Rossetti said: 'Watts has long held a nobly distinct position, and every year of his life has advanced his art.' Here also the lapse of years has confirmed the verdict. Our age has been sorely tempted to worship force and material success; if in some measure it has escaped that fascination, we must not fail to recognize the influence of such masters as those whose work we have tried to describe. Burne-Jones chose for his heraldic bearings Wings and Stars, with the motto *Sequar et attingam*. 'I will follow and attain' was the secret of his life and his art. He followed the gleam faithfully to the very end.

JOHN TELFORD.

THE CHURCHES AND THE PEOPLE.

The Religious Life of London: The Census of Public Worship. (Hodder & Stoughton. 1904.)

The Captive City of God. By RICHARD HEATH. (Arthur C. Fifield. 1904.)

The Church Problem in Edinburgh. By Two Churchmen. (William Hodge & Co. 1904.)

The New Evangelism. By Professor W. RAUSCHENBUSCH. (New York Independent. 1904.)

Report of the London Commission of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1904.

THESE five documents deserve the earnest and immediate consideration of all those who are interested in the Church of Christ. They are the outward and visible signs of an inward invisible spirit, a spirit working in men's minds as silently, as subtly, and as powerfully as the hidden forces of nature in the earth; a spirit destined, like those forces, to transform the long 'winter of our discontent' into radiant spring, if not into 'glorious summer.' They are tremors preceding and foretelling a mighty upheaval in men's thinking, which may change the face of the familiar landscape of their creeds, displace the age-long accumulation of vain traditions, and reveal the eternal rock upon which the Christian religion rests.

Mr. Richard Heath sees the divine Society which centres in Christ bound hand and foot by the powers of this world, and looks to the democracy for a deliverer. The 'Two Churchmen' of Edinburgh find the hold of the Churches on the masses growing feebler every year, and implore them to give heed to the mute appeal ascending day by day to Heaven from the dehumanized of our cities, ere that hold is

entirely lost. Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, of Rochester, U.S.A., thinks the powerlessness of the old evangelism the most striking and painful demonstration of the general state of the Churches, and pleads for a new evangelism, with an ethical imperative, to meet modern conditions and modern needs. The Report of the Commission appointed by the Wesleyan Methodist Conference in 1903 to inquire into the returns of the *Daily News* census, though it takes too optimistic a view of the situation, realizes nevertheless the clamant call for a change of methods if the people are to be reached; and, in response to that call, advocates the drastic and far-reaching reforms suggested in *The Religious Life of London.*

What is the problem confronting the Churches, and how can it be solved? Are the people alienated from organized religious societies? and if so, how can their interest and affection be gained? The recent examination of attendances at public worship in London and Greater London should aid us in replying to these pregnant questions, for the conditions obtaining in the metropolis are reproduced on a smaller but equally intense scale in most cities and provincial towns. London and Greater London have a population of 6,240,336 persons, excluding dwellers in institutions. The *Daily News* enumerators recorded for this area, during the eleven months of our investigations, 1,514,025 attendances. By a method I need not here detail, we discovered that 38 per cent. of these were what Mr. Gladstone called 'twicers,' so that 1,514,025 attendances only represent 1,252,433 worshippers; in other words, one person in five of the population attends a place of worship.[1] After careful examination of available data, I came to the conclusion that 50 per cent. of the population could not, even if it would, attend a place of worship. This estimate includes the inmates of institutions, to whom I have already referred, and, in addition, all who are: (1) Too young to go to church; (2) too old; (3) too busy; (4) too

[1] The exact percentage is: London, 1 in 5.37; Greater London, 1 in 4.21; London and Greater London combined, 1 in 4.98.

unwell. Presuming this estimate to be correct, the number of those who could, if they would, go to a place of worship regularly in London and Greater London is 3,120,168. Bringing these facts together, we see that out of every ten persons in the metropolis five are unable to be present at public worship; three are hostile or indifferent to the claims of public worship; two attend public worship. Or, again, out of 3,120,168 persons who could, if they would, go to church, 1,867,735 do not avail themselves of that privilege. But from what class, or classes, are those drawn who are church-goers? By far the majority come from the upper middle and lower middle classes; these form the backbone of the church-going public. The remainder is made up of representatives of the upper and lower—lower, not lowest—strata of the social soil. The absence of a gigantic layer, a layer representing between one-fourth and one-fifth of the population, will at once be remarked.[1]

The attitude of Labour, skilled and unskilled, organized and unorganized, toward the Churches to-day is one of quiet antagonism, if not of loud defiance. This fact is undeniably patent. It glares at us from the census, lurks in the reports of Labour congresses, darts out in speeches of Labour representatives, waylays us in the columns of news-

---

[1] Total population of England and Wales in 1901 . 32,678,213
Total male population, occupied and unoccupied, over ten years of age 12,134,259
Total number of males, aged twenty years and over, engaged in occupations 8,315,784

This estimate of 8,315,784 includes:

(*a*) Those engaged in governing the country;
(*b*) " " defending the country;
(*c*) " " professional occupations;
(*d*) " " commercial occupations.

Excluding these four classes, 7,331,689 male workers (aged twenty and over twenty years of age) remain. This estimate of 7,331,689, however, includes employers. The odd 331,689 more than accounts for this class (seeing that the total number of Income Tax payers in the United Kingdom is only 900,000), leaving 7,000,000 working men. These form between one-fourth and one-fifth (4.45) of the whole population of England and Wales.

papers, mocks us in the pages of magazines, is bawled in the parks, cried aloud at the street corners, revealed in innumerable letters to the press, and overheard in railway carriages and restaurants.

'Christianity,' says Bebel, 'the prevailing spiritual expression of the present economic order, must pass away as a better social order arrives.' Liebknecht maintains that 'Socialism sets itself against Christianity, because Christianity is the religion of private property and of the respectable classes.' Karl Marx affirms that 'the idea of God must be destroyed.' Leaving the Continent and coming to our own shores, we find Mr. Robert Blatchford writing, 'I am working for Socialism when I am attacking a religion that is hindering Socialism.'

These are a few illustrations of the way in which the Churches have not simply failed to exhibit an accurate image of Christ and a true conception of His teaching, but have given such a defective portrait of the former, and such an inadequate presentation of the latter, that both are attacked for lacking what they possess, and possessing what they lack. What the writers I have quoted are condemning is not Christianity, but what they imagine is Christianity. Could they but get behind the veil to the Christ of the Gospels their remorse would equal their amazement, for, as Professor Harnack has told us, Christ's message is 'profoundly socialistic, just as it is also profoundly individualistic, because it establishes the infinite and independent value of every human soul. Its tendency to union and brotherliness is not so much an accidental phenomenon in its history as the essential feature of its character. The gospel aims at founding a community among men as wide as human life itself, and as deep as human need. As has been truly said, its object is to transform the socialism which rests on the basis of conflicting interests into the socialism which rests on the consciousness of a spiritual unity. In this sense its social message can never be outbid.' Again: 'No religion, not even Buddhism, ever went to work with such an energetic social message, and so strongly identified itself with that message, as we see to be

the case in the gospel. How so? Because the words, "Love thy neighbour as thyself," were spoken in deep earnest; because with these words Jesus turned a light upon all the concrete relations of life, upon the world of hunger, poverty, and misery; because, lastly, He uttered them as a religious, nay, as *the* religious maxim.' I do not think if Mr. Blatchford had seen the Churches swayed by the same mighty, overwhelming enthusiasm for humanity which characterized their Founder, impelling them to agonizing endeavours to redeem all that mankind has lost—lost bodies as well as lost souls; lost homes as well as lost hopes; lost culture as well as lost faith; lost justice as well as lost charity; lost leisure as well as lost peace; lost living as well as lost lives —he would have come to the conclusion that he must attack Christianity in order to serve his fellows. I am not surprised at Mr. Blatchford's words. In their efforts to attain a higher standard of living, the workers have found the Churches among their foremost opponents. Lord Shaftesbury exclaimed at the outset of his crusade for redeeming the child life of the nation, 'All the Churches are against me,' and the fiercest opposition to Charles Kingsley and Frederick Denison Maurice came from the official Christian societies. The Factory Acts, the right of combination, the repeal of the Corn Laws, the reform of Criminal Law, the amendment of Poor Law, the erection of sanitary dwellings, each 'painful inch' indeed in social reform, has been won not with the aid but in spite of the opposition of the Churches. Now that Trade Unions are upon their feet, they, not unnaturally, turn round and say to the Churches: 'We will have nothing to do with you. When we needed your help you refused it. To-day we can dispense with it.' At the present time are the Churches demanding, with a united, insistent, and persistent voice, better housing, shorter hours of labour, a living wage, equality of opportunity, a fairer distribution of the world's leisure, treasure, and pleasure? I fear not.

The failure of the Churches to reach the outer belts of the Labour sphere is only a degree less marked than their

failure with Labour itself. Wherever we went in enumerating London's worshippers, we found that the poorer the district the smaller the attendance at a place of worship. If you have an attendance of one person in 3.86 on a very wet day in Hampstead, you have only one person in 6.89 attending divine worship on an extremely fine day in Shoreditch. If you have one person in 1.96 at church in Ealing (on a fine day), you have but one person in 4.80 at church in West Ham (on a fine day). Mr. Charles Booth, in his *Religious Influences of London*, corroborates this state of things. 'Where the streets are "red"' (that is, 'well-to-do'), 'we find a vigorous middle-class religious development combined with active social life. Where "pink"' (that is, 'fairly comfortable'), 'there is, as regards organized religion, a comparative blank. Where "blue"' (that is, 'poverty and comfort mixed'), 'we have the missions; and step by step as it deepens to "black"' (that is, 'lowest class') 'more hopeless becomes the task. The map thus seems to give the key. From these broad conclusions there is no escape.' North, South, East, and West repeat the same story. Mr. Walter R. Warren, speaking in *The Religious Life of London* concerning St. Pancras, says, 'The great mass of poor people are unaffected by the religious centres in their midst.' Mr. Charles F. G. Masterman, writing on South London, affirms that the poor (except the Roman Catholic poor) 'do not attend service on Sunday, though there are a few churches and missions which gather some, and forlorn groups can be collected by a liberal granting of relief.' Mr. Percy Alden, interpreting the returns for East London, states, 'The poorer the district the less inclination there is to attend a place of worship.' Mr. Arthur Sherwell, dealing with West London, finds the same law: 'The church attendance is highest where the general social and economic conditions are superior.' Again: 'High attendances are due to the prosperous classes.'

Briefly, the Churches are out of touch with (1) the labour class; (2) the poor and the very poor. Certain figures from Mr. Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People* make clear what this means. His figures are based on the census

of 1891. In that year the population of London proper, excluding dwellers in institutions, was 4,211,743. (In 1901 it was 4,470,304.) Of these 4,211,743 persons no less than 2,256,852 are living at *least* one person to one room, or 54.9 per cent. of the population. This percentage accounts for the poor and the very poor. The comfortable working classes account for another 1,340,882 persons, or 32.6 per cent., making a total of 3,597,734, or 87.5 per cent. of the population. The magnitude of the failure is poignantly distinct.

Let me not be misunderstood. I am not affirming that the Churches do not reach certain workers and certain poor people. I am affirming they only affect a comparatively few individuals from each of these classes; the mass remains unimpressed. This is the indictment of the *Daily News* census. The Churches are out of touch with the people. This is their condemnation. To fail here is to fail at the very core, for it was here Christ always succeeded. The field which marked His most signal victory is the scene of His followers' most ignominious defeat. His teaching, which irritated and alarmed the middle and upper classes, the wealthy and the cultured, drew an immediate response from the democracy. 'The common people heard Him gladly,' hung upon His utterances, trudged in His wake, sat at His feet, welcomed His message, obeyed His voice, adopted His methods, cheered Him with their 'great faith,' ministered to Him of their scanty substance, gave Him His devoted friends, thronged about Him so persistently and in such numbers that He 'had no leisure so much as to eat,' formed the first-fruits of His harvest, the nucleus of His kingdom, and the basis of His new society. One cannot read a chapter of the Gospels without perpetually meeting a 'multitude,' 'a great multitude,' 'a very great multitude,' following Christ. Did He pass through a town, 'all the city was gathered together at the door.' We still have a town, we still have Christians; but the city is gathered together *within*, not 'at the door.' Was it by accident that in the synagogue at Nazareth, when for the first time 'the eyes of

all were fastened on Him,' 'He found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor'? Did He not rather advance it as one of the proofs of His claim to be 'the one who should come,' that at last that scripture was fulfilled in their ears? I am not forgetting that 'when we come across the expression "the poor" in the Gospels, we must not think, without further ceremony, of the poor in the economic sense,' but, according to Dr. Harnack, 'in those days the economical sense was also, as a rule, included in the word "poor."' Christ said, 'I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Myself'; and, as has been finely remarked, 'if men are not thus drawn, it is because the Churches have lifted up something which is not Christ.'

Since, then, Jesus Christ experienced no difficulty in reaching the people, may it not be worth while to endeavour to make our methods harmonize with His spirit?

To the best of my ability I have diagnosed the disease: what is the remedy? I have been accused of proposing a change of methods in order to effect a cure for the ineffectiveness of religion in modern England, and have been reminded of the observation of Mr. Matthew Arnold, to the effect that the worship of machinery was a national characteristic of Englishmen. Did I for an instant imagine that a change of methods could effect anything without a change of spirit, the criticism would be just. But I imagine nothing of the kind. The first thing the Churches need is conversion; a change of standpoint; a realization of the truth that they are means, not ends; the scaffolding veiling the growing walls of that mighty fabric of character which now stands 'half built against the sky,' existing only that the busy masons may finish their task, destined to be removed 'in that day' when the last stone has been put in its place, and the completed towers of a glorified humanity 'rise unperturbed and vast.' No amount of galvanizing will make the dry bones of religious organizations live; only the breath of the Almighty can transform the dusty skeletons

into throbbing, moving men; only the dew of the Lord wake the wilderness and the solitary place into gladness, and cause even the desert to blossom as the rose. No efficiency of tools will compensate for lack of soul; nor will the most perfect spectacles restore sight to the blind. The Church's enemy is within, not without, her gates. It is not 'aggressive infidelity' but numbed sensibility she has to fear.

Nevertheless, the census returns relentlessly enforce certain broad, definite, unmistakable conclusions it were foolish to disregard. With these figures before us it is easy to discern elementary practical lessons which the Churches will have to learn and apply if they are to win the respect and affection of the people. In the first place, the results make clear the kind of clergyman or minister required in cities and towns. It is desirable he should possess a strong body; or, if not a strong body, a wiry constitution. This is absolutely essential, for he will have to dwell in neighbourhoods which, to say the least, do not include 'a salubrious climate' among their attractions. Jesus Christ lived 'in the midst' of the people, and the disciple must not be above his Lord in this respect. The flock inhabits mean houses, in mean streets, in mean neighbourhoods; frequently the shepherd is discovered in what the house agents describe as a 'commodious villa residence,' occupying 'an eligible site' at a convenient distance away. I am sure that his departure from his people is a departure from Christianity; he cannot possibly enter their life by leaving it. He may work among the people; he is not of the people; and they, quickly noting his pilgrimage to 'an ampler, purer air,' justly question the sincerity of his devotion. He must identify himself with them, dwell where they dwell, shop where they shop, breathe what they breathe. The 'Two Churchmen' are quite right. 'The masses see in the minister one who claims to have been called by Jesus Christ to be a special representative of His among men, and naturally they look not for the sign of the Cross, but for the Cross itself. With the utmost relentlessness they lay the life of the Master and

the disciple side by side, and weigh them with cruel exactness. And they are puzzled, because, after making allowance for frail humanity, they note some grave discrepancies.'

Nor must his income contradict his message. Professor Harnack says: 'I entertain no doubt that the time will come when the world will tolerate a life of luxury among those who are charged with the cure of souls as little as it tolerates priestly government. Our feelings in this respect are becoming finer, and that is an advantage. It will no longer be thought fitting, in the higher sense of the word, for any one to preach resignation and contentment to the poor, who is well off himself and jealously concerned for the increase of his property. A healthy man may well offer consolation to the sick; but how shall a man of property convince those who have none that worldly goods are of no value? The Lord's injunction that the minister of the Word is to divest himself of worldly possessions will still come to be honoured in the history of his communion.'

I wish that the excellent compulsory system of the Wesleyan Methodist Church could become the voluntary system of all the Churches. It is a system which does away with the truly monstrous inequalities in ministers' salaries; a system which, whilst guaranteeing any man against want, also guarantees him against wealth; a system which does not permit even the President of the Conference to receive more than £300 per annum, or allow the youngest probationer to receive less than £80 a year.

I have said that the minister who is to serve his day and generation effectively must have a strong body; he must also have a strong brain, and not only a strong but a drilled brain. Working men are men who think, who reason, who argue, and to confront them with one whose intellect is flabby or ill fed is to bring religion into contempt. Let the prospective minister go to college, but not if it means his getting out of touch with life and with realities. He enters college to be taught how he may assist God in making men, not, Paracelsus-like, to acquire knowledge for its own sake. Supposing he has six years' training—and he should not

have less—the first three years should be set apart for his Arts course; during the remaining period a portion of the time devoted to Theology might well be allocated to the study of Sociology. I would have the student spend a certain portion of each year in a poor and populous neighbourhood under a master worker, in order to try his book knowledge upon life, to put his theories into practice, to make mistakes, to gain 'hints of the proper craft; tricks of the tool's true play.'

Leaving the minister, I come to the buildings. What can the Churches learn from the census with regard to these? I hope one of the results of our effort will be a total revolution in church architecture. The Gothic is extremely beautiful, but we are paying too high a price for it. If stones are worth more than souls, by all means let us go on erecting Gothic structures; but if church buildings are not ends in themselves, but means to ends, as I hold they are, let us halt at once. Every age must express itself in its own language, or remain unintelligible. The Gothic was a true expression of the spirit and ideas of the twelfth century; it is not a true expression of the spirit and of the ideas of the twentieth century. It is admirably adapted for the performance of an ornate ritual, the participation in which is necessarily restricted to an elect and select few, but is utterly unfitted for a simple form of worship in which every person present can unite. It lends itself to the chanting of a choir, not to the singing of a congregation; to the discoursing of elaborate music, not to the discoursing of the preacher.

I can perfectly understand Gothic architecture being maintained by those who believe the conception of worship held by the Roman Church to be the ideal conception, who wish to have a service of a dramatic character, and who welcome 'the introduction of symbolic action, procession, and some elements of movement and drama into the drabness of our churches'; who desire the pulpit to be removed, the preacher expelled, and the worshippers transformed into spectators; but I cannot understand those upholding the Gothic who think that the highest form of worship is one

which is spiritual rather than sensuous, simple rather than gorgeous, catholic rather than partial, plain rather than perplexing.

We found expensively dressed and comfortably dressed people in Gothic churches, but 'the common people' were conspicuous by their absence. They were, however, to be discovered in the large central mission halls—such, for example, as the Wesleyan Methodist Great Central Hall in Bermondsey, where there were 2,387 persons at night. I instance this place because it has been admitted by those who criticize these structures that here 'the poor in bulk' were collected. The critics in question allege that these central halls are filled by depleting the smaller places of worship in the neighbourhood: 'The smaller chapels round are emptied to swell the great congregations.' I cannot prove that those who are found in the central halls would not have attended the smaller churches in the district had the hall not existed, though I very much doubt whether they would have done so. It has yet to be proved that the little churches referred to were better attended *before* these halls were erected than they are to-day.

I am anxious for an increase in the number of these modern churches. Every closely populated district should possess two, at least; large, handsome, spacious buildings, surrounded by class-rooms and game-rooms, lit by electric light and well ventilated, furnished with a platform instead of a pulpit, a good organ, and seats of a uniform pattern permitting of no social distinctions. A residence for the superintendent and his staff should be attached to the main premises. This hall or institutional church, equipped in every detail for active, aggressive religious and social work, open seven days a week, will be used for the redemption and development of body, mind, and soul; and those in charge of it, whilst seeking to transform the lives of men, women, and children, will at the same time be no less anxious to transform their environment. The old mission hall in the back street, guided and governed by an under-paid, over-worked missioner, has gone for ever, and will only be

preserved, if preserved it be, as an interesting relic of a bygone age. The departure of pew rents must naturally follow the unlamented decease of pews, and in time we may hope to obtain a church which, alike in architecture and adornment, in atmosphere and equipment, in methods and governance, reflects the mind and heart of Jesus Christ.

Having dealt with the type of minister or clergyman we need, with the kind of building we require, I will endeavour to describe the character of the preaching that, judging by the census returns, is appreciated. Before doing so there is a preliminary question to be answered, viz. Is preaching necessary? For, strange as it may seem, there are those who regard it as an unwarrantable intrusion in divine worship, and would either strictly limit its appearance or expel it altogether. An Anglican layman voices this feeling when he says: 'One sermon a month is quite sufficient at evensong all through the year.' Again: 'Evensong, with no sermon and well-sung devotional hymns, is a service which benefits, attracts, and elevates both rich and poor, and in most cases "makes for righteousness."' 'The sermon,' continues this writer, 'is apt to bore, to encourage irreverence, to promote whispering and giggling, and an earnest hope that the preacher will cut it short.' Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, too, 'would not reiterate the demand for "good preaching," which seems to me to confuse the purposes of the service of the Church. We meet, not for edification'—mark these words—'not for edification, but for worship—to confess our sins, to obtain spiritual succour, to renew the visible guarantee of fellowship.' These citations show that the preliminary question is not superfluous. Nevertheless, the teaching and practice of Jesus Christ seem to yield an affirmative reply. Judging by the amount of space devoted to reports of His sermons in the records of the historians, He laid the utmost emphasis upon preaching, devoted no inconsiderable portion of His brief ministry to the proclamation of the gospel, and took especial pains, after He had selected His disciples, in training them for this especial work, finally sending them forth with the

command, 'As ye go, preach.' A certain word frequently occurring in a man's speech is a key to the place the idea it represents occupies in his mind. In the New Testament the words 'preach' and 'teach' are perpetually employed. 'From that time began Jesus to preach.' 'And it came to pass, when Jesus had made an end of commanding His twelve disciples'—commanding them to preach, that is—'He departed thence to teach and preach in their cities.' 'And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation.' 'And He appointed twelve, that they might be with Him, and that He might send them forth to preach.' 'And He began to teach by the seaside.' 'And when the Sabbath was come He began to teach in the synagogue.' 'And He went round about the villages teaching.' 'And He called unto Him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two, . . . and they went out and preached.' 'And He came forth and saw a great multitude, and He had compassion on them, because they were as sheep not having a shepherd; and He began to teach them many things.' 'And He was preaching in the synagogues of Galilee.' 'He went about through cities and villages preaching, and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God.' 'So then the Lord Jesus, after He had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. And they went forth and preached everywhere.' Moreover, that this impression of Jesus Christ is an accurate one is proved by the example of the primitive Church. 'They therefore that were scattered abroad went about preaching the word.' 'Preach the word,' writes Paul to Timothy; 'be instant in season, out of season.' 'Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all; the testimony to be borne in its own times; whereunto I was appointed a preacher.' Those who gathered about Jesus Christ were drawn by 'the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth,' and dispersed ruminating on 'the strange things' they had heard. The census sheds no little light on this matter. Men were only found in any quantity where preaching is considered of importance. In

the Established Church the sermon is subordinated to the service, and it is this depreciation which, I believe, largely explains the difference between the number of men attending Anglican and Nonconformist services; for whereas we enumerated 153,375 men at places of worship belonging to the Established Church, in London and Greater London, we enumerated 213,474 men at Nonconformist places of worship in the same area—a difference between the two totals of 60,099. There is not the same disproportion in the attendance of women: 292,720 were enumerated at Anglican services, and 279,890 at services in Nonconformist places of worship in London and Greater London. In the Free Churches (this term includes those Churches represented upon the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, viz. the Baptist, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, the Methodist Societies, and the Society of Friends) a far larger proportion of men is found than in the Established Church. The number of women attending Anglican services in London and Greater London is almost double the number of men; whereas the number of men attending Free Church services in the same area is only 50,000 less than the number of women. The exact figures are:

Men at Established Church services . .	153,375
Women „ „ „ . .	292,720
Men at Free Church services . . .	153,558
Women „ „ „ . . .	213,901

The better proportion in the attendance of men at Free Church services is not solely due to there being a higher standard of preaching in the Free Churches than in the Established Church. One among other reasons is the simplicity of the Free Church service. No one who studies the census returns can fail to observe the following law:—That the attendance of men falls, and the attendance of women rises, with the increasing ornateness of the service; in other words, the simpler the service the larger the number of men; the more complex the service the greater the number of women. In the Established Church men are chiefly seen

at 'Low,' not 'High' Church services. Even where large attendances were enumerated at places of worship where the services were of a ritualistic character, the proportion of men was small. For example, I select one church of this type in South London, especially marked by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman as being 'High,' viz. St. Stephen's, Lewisham, which had a total for the day of 1,443 persons, but only 316 of these were men. At, perhaps, the 'Highest' church in West London, St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington, we enumerated 863 persons on the day of our visit; the men only accounted for 152 of this total. At All Saints', North Kensington, an extremely ritualistic church, out of a total for the day of 1,236 persons only 198 were men; whereas at St. James-the-Less, Bethnal Green, a church as strikingly 'Low' as the churches I have already named are strikingly 'High,' we counted 738 men, out of a total for the day of 1,699 persons. Mr. Masterman himself says that 'the working man has no affection for elaborate ritual; he accepts with resignation, as part of an inexplicable activity, the ornaments, the processions, and the ceremony. If they processioned round the churches standing on their heads he would accept it with the same acquiescence.' When I say men are attracted by a simple service, I mean one which all can understand, one in which all can engage. Too often it is imagined, too often it is the case, that simplicity and beauty are divorced. But there is no necessity for this:

> Often ornateness
> Goes with greatness;
> Oftener felicity
> Comes of simplicity.

I do not myself think that there is any incompatibility between the idea that we assemble and meet together to render homage to God, and the idea that we assemble and meet together for mutual edification. Mr. Masterman, whom I have already quoted, admits that we meet 'to obtain spiritual succour,' although in the previous line he states that we do not meet 'for edification.' I have yet to learn

how one can be spiritually succoured *without* being spiritually edified. It seems to me that that service is most worshipful which best aids the growth and development of a holy life. In this work the sermon plays, or should play, no unimportant part. If the preacher is to apologize for his presence, it will not be long before Christianity has to apologize for its absence. Those who advocate the removal of the pulpit might well hesitate. A Church that is not a preaching Church will soon be a non-existent Church. A Church which does not seek to propagate the truth which called it into being, and is the *raison d'être* of its existence, has lost faith in that truth, and faith in itself. How are men to be converted, how is character to be constructed, or Christ's kingdom increased, without preaching? Worship—however sublime, ritual—however magnificent, will neither acquaint a sinner with the error of his ways, nor instruct him concerning the right path when he is enlightened. Once the pulpit is restored to its rightful place, preaching of good quality will follow as a matter of course; but, so long as the pulpit is despised, preaching will naturally and inevitably remain despicable. To-day in many churches the sermons delivered are out of touch with daily life. The 'Two Churchmen' admirably analyse this defect: 'The ministry gives the people credit for thinking, and it is right, but it mistakes the line of the people's thought. The pulpit gives much time to mental and theological problems. Within limits this is of course legitimate; but not all men are qualified to deal with these, and, besides, popular thought does not run mainly along these lines. The truth or falsehood of Christianity is not amongst the mass of Scotch people' (this observation applies no less accurately to English people) 'the burning question that many ministers suppose it to be. Christianity may be false or true; but, assuming it to be true, the world looks for its profession to be accompanied by its practice. The gospel contains the principles of several social and moral revolutions, and the steady insistence of these principles would slowly change the face of society. The generality

are much more concerned about the moral and social side of religion than the mental side. The dominant cry to-day is—

> There may be heaven, there must be hell,
> Meantime there is our earth here;

and the note of despair has been struck so deep in some souls that they only think about the hell upon earth.' It is the work of the Churches, as the author of *Commerce and Christianity* has remarked, 'to teach the world how to put all the affairs of life on a basis of true principles, and on that basis to work in a right spirit.'

But even when the right man has been procured, the right building secured, the right service and sermon obtained, a large proportion of the population will still remain outside the direct influences of religion. There is only one method by which this section can be reached: since they will not come to us, we must go to them. In nothing, perhaps, does the contempt of the Churches for the people appear more distinctly than in their neglect of this work. If it is undertaken at all it is by those least able, because least fitted to cope with it. The well drilled, fully equipped, thoroughly trained clergyman or minister is, with exceedingly rare exceptions, content to remain in his pulpit, preaching Sunday after Sunday to almost the same congregation, to those who by the mere fact of their presence show they are predisposed to listen, leaving the more difficult task of attracting the non-disposed in the park, at the street corner, or the open space, to the man whose sole weapons consist of strong lungs, a string of texts, and abundant zeal. I wish I could think that my experiences as an auditor of open-air preaching were exceptional, for in nine instances out of ten I have hastened away after listening for a few minutes, angry that such a parody of the religion of Jesus Christ should be displayed, glad that there were so few persons present to witness it; my ears battered by the raucous bawling, my soul sickened at the raw and clumsy grasping of spiritual nerves, the rough handling of delicate fibres, the coarse exposure of

sacred things, the utter lack of tenderness, winsomeness, and refinement, the narrow exposition, and the lurid, dogmatic, exaggerated language. If one who sympathizes with the aim of open-air preachers feels thus, what likelihood is there of men and women who are antagonistic or indifferent to religion being won? On rare occasions I have heard open-air preachers of a very different stamp to those described. Their rarity is my grievance. It is urged as an excuse for our neglect that the English climate is not by any means an Eastern one. This may be immediately admitted; nevertheless, during certain months of the year—from May to September—the plea is an evasion rather than an exoneration.

Another method of preaching still remains to be mentioned, namely, the conversational, or Socratic method. This is by far the best and most effective form of preaching, because it is the only form by which, instead of dealing with a mass of possible objections, of possible temptations, of possible sins, of possible difficulties, the real objection, the real temptation, the real sin, the real difficulty, is diagnosed. I am not for a moment advocating anything remotely resembling the system of the Confessional. I have guarded myself, carefully, against such misinterpretation by defining the method I am recommending as the Socratic method, and anything more unlike the Roman Catholic system than that adopted by Socrates in order to stimulate the intellect of the young Athenians it would be impossible to discover. Jesus Christ practised it habitually and successfully—notably with Nicodemus, with the woman of Samaria, and in the training and educating of the Twelve. Its great advantage over oratorical preaching consists in speech being mutual instead of one-sided. In the pulpit the preacher must of necessity address himself to general conditions and needs; in his study, or when out for a walk, he can apply his wisdom and experience to the demands of a particular case. Too often the man in the pulpit, 'aiming at a million misses a unit'; whereas in gossip with an individual it will be strange if he does not drive one nail well home.

This article would be incomplete without a reference to the radical change which, in the opinion of the writer, must be made in the polity of the Established Church if it is ever to become a Church of the people, namely, the substitution of a democratic form of government in place of the present hierarchical system; the Free Churches also have still a considerable distance to travel before they reach the ideal of the early Church in this respect.

In conclusion I would point out that intense spasmodic effort will not atone for the lack of steady, plodding toil. The progress of religion does not depend upon the popular preacher, whose place of worship is crowded, and whose every word and action is the subject of comment, eulogistic or otherwise, but upon the small church and the obscure minister. Christian societies are not exempt from the law of solidarity. It operates in them no less powerfully than in races. The latter cannot advance until the weakest has been brought into line; the nation must wait for the individual. In like manner the Church's step is regulated by the ability, or lack of ability, of the lowliest group of sanctified men and women to keep pace with it. However deeply we are indebted to the captains and leaders for pointing out the way, no advance can be made unless they are supported in all portions of the field by brave, reliable men. On these the brunt of the battle falls. They have to maintain the honour of the cause in small buildings with little congregations and meagre funds; some in villages and hamlets, others in cities of dreadful night, in densely populated areas, whose filaments of ugly streets affect the imagination with a sense of pain almost physical. Grey, dogged toil it is that tells. Patient labour is the only road to true and enduring success. From time to time efforts are made to reach the goal more quickly, but short cuts in religious work are invariably the longest way round. For a brief moment such endeavours arrest the attention; people turn aside to see the strange sight; but the burning bush, unlike that which inspired the wonder of the Hebrew chieftain, *is* consumed. These startling performances, which are going to do all that

the wisdom of saintly souls throughout the ages has failed to accomplish, spring up, like Jonah's gourd, in a night, and their history is similar to the history of that sensitive plant. Having no deepness of earth, they wither away, and their end will not be fruitless if it inculcates the lesson that the Kingdom which is 'not of this world' cannot be established by adopting this world's methods.

The cry 'Back to Jesus Christ!' though hackneyed, is none the less imperative. 'To whom shall we go,' if not to Him? He still walks in the midst of the golden candlesticks; He still has a message for the Churches. Is it: 'I know thy works, thy toil, thy patience, thy tribulation, thy poverty, thy love, thy faith, thy ministry, thy growth, thy keeping of My word and faithfulness to My name'? or is it the awful sentence passed on the Church at Sardis: 'Thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead'?

RICHARD MUDIE-SMITH.

THE PSEUDO-PHILOSOPHY OF PROFESSOR HAECKEL.

The Riddle of the Universe. By ERNST HAECKEL. (Watts & Co. 1903.)

Die Welträthsel. Mit einem Nachworte. Von E. HAECKEL. Volksausgabe. (Stuttgart: Emil Strauss. 1903.)

The Wonders of Life. By ERNST HAECKEL. (Watts & Co. 1904.)

Die Lebenswunder. Von E. HAECKEL. (Stuttgart: A. Kröner. 1904.)

The Confession of Faith of a Man of Science. By ERNST HAECKEL. (A. & C. Black. 1903.)

Haeckel's Critics Answered. By JOSEPH M'CABE. (Watts & Co. 1903.)

IT cannot be denied that the publication of Professor Haeckel's *Welträthsel* marks the popular starting-point of the present-day recrudescence of 'Rationalism.' Issued in Germany in 1899, the sale of ten thousand copies within a month, and afterwards of more than a hundred thousand in the 'People's edition,' naturally created something of a sensation. The strenuous opposition which it aroused—more than a hundred reviews and a dozen large pamphlets having been published against it during the first twelve months—is not generally known in this country, seeing that these expressions of counter opinion have remained hidden in a foreign language.[1]

[1] Four of these issues deserve special mention. Indeed it may be safely affirmed that the careful student of them will find therein more than enough to convince him conclusively of the shallowness of all the main pretensions of the Haeckelian philosophy. These are: *Kant contra Haeckel, Erkenntnisstheorie gegen naturwissenschaftlichen*

In its English dress Professor Haeckel's work loses nothing and gains much, thanks to the unconcealed and fervid animus of its skilful translator. Published soon after, by the Rationalist Press Association, at the popular price of sixpence, its phenomenal sale was greatly assisted by the eager advocacy of the versatile editor of the *Clarion*. Hence it became naturally the forerunner of a long series of issues from the same source, in which everything at all known and available which was likely to tell against Christian beliefs was set at the same price before the English public. The effect of such vigorous propagandism could not but be considerable. It is not, indeed, yet fully known, though it is certainly larger than Christian teachers, in general, either own or are aware. To say that 'Haeckel does not count' is simply a soothing delusion, in which the wish is father to the thought. It may be true, as Sir Oliver Lodge has recently hinted,[1] that such philosophy as Haeckel's appeals most 'to an audience of uneducated persons.' But if there be any validity at all in the Christian faith, it is just for these that believers should be especially concerned. It is confessedly difficult to make many of those who live esoteric lives within the pale of the Christian Church, see how differently the great world outside thinks and feels. But the policy of assuming and ignoring has real limits. The imagination that because so many avowed believers have not read and do not appreciate what is moving the minds of modern men, therefore all such movements may just be 'let severely alone' without loss or danger, constitutes a mere paradise of self-deception. The reasons, indeed, why all those who set highest value upon spirituality, and are most eager to welcome 'revival,' should also be most careful to keep a

---

Dogmatismus, von Dr. Erich Adickes (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard); *Philosophia militans*, von Friedrich Paulsen (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard); *Die Wahrheit über Ernst Haeckel und seine Welträthsel*, von Dr. E. Dennert (Halle a. S. E. Muller); *Probleme Kritische Studien uber den Monismus*, von Dr. H. v. Schoeler (Leipzig: W. W. Engelmann).

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 327.

keen eye upon the developments of so-called 'Rationalism,' are manifest and manifold. It is not merely a question of the numbers involved, although every honest thinker must acknowledge both that for real Christianity numbers are a serious consideration, and that the majority, even in this 'Christian' country, are far from counting upon the right side. The times in which we live differ from those of a century ago, far more than did those days from the era of the Wesleys. The ever-accelerating pace and increasing pressure of twentieth-century life; the everywhere prevalent 'atmosphere' of education, with the inevitable consequences in unprecedented discussion of all great questions; the manifest development and growing influence of science; the serious extent of religious indifference, charged as it is with all those potentialities which the ceaseless propaganda of unbelief seeks to turn into positive aversion to Christian sanctions; the unmeasured contribution of the modern press to that liberality of thought which not seldom tends—even within the borders of Christendom—to become rather the nemesis than the enlargement of faith: these all constitute reasons enough and to spare why the authoritative command to be 'wise as serpents' should to-day be especially heeded by all to whom 'God, the soul, and immortality,' so oft derided by Haeckel and his friends, are realities worth preserving.

The four works above mentioned serve only too well as object-lessons in this regard. Some dozen years ago the *Confession of Faith of a Man of Science* appeared at Berlin, having been first delivered at the anniversary of a scientific society at Altenburg. The author refers then to a 'rising tide of pamphlets and books upon the subject'; and, judging from his own plainly expressed sentiments, it can scarcely be matter for surprise that he should soon after provide a fuller statement for a larger audience in his now famous *Welträthsel*. Then his translator, working with all the fervour and often acrimony of a pervert, was not content with his strenuous effort to popularize in this country teachings which would support his own marked transition

'from Rome to Rationalism,' but sought, with unquestionable acumen, to conserve and extend the results of his labour by buttressing Haeckel's positions and thence bombarding all and sundry in a popular brochure of his own.

His first contribution, however, to the cause of 'Monism' is by no means the less weighty for having passed generally unnoticed. It consisted in falsely rendering the title of the work he avowedly translated. For every tyro in the study of German knows well that 'Die Welträthsel' does not in English signify 'The Riddle of the Universe.' Viewed popularly, it must be acknowledged as a shrewd proceeding, but it is none the less a serious misrepresentation, inasmuch as it involves an entirely unwarranted assumption. Certainly the Professor at Jena affirms, *suo more*, that 'only one comprehensive riddle of the universe now remains—the problem of substance.'[1] But, even judging by his own reference to the contrary, in regard to the 'seven world-enigmas' of Du Bois-Reymond, this is pure assumption. Nor has he himself ventured as far as his English advocate, seeing that the latest popular edition of his work, published in Stuttgart, is still entitled *Die Welträthsel*. Meanwhile the impression produced upon the mass of English readers in this country is that there is only one real 'riddle' to be solved, and then all is clear to the 'Rationalist' eye.[2]

As regards the booklet of the translator himself, entitled *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, it is confessedly difficult to speak with courteous moderation, seeing that it is distinguished, not merely by vigour of mind and vivacity of style, but by slashing invective and contemptuous personalities which, in their setting of exuberant infallibility and thoroughgoing atheism, make the work unique even in the literature of 'Rationalism.' One cannot be surprised that it should have

[1] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 134 (Cheap Edition).

[2] Thus Schoeler well writes: 'Also nach Haeckel sind die Welträthsel gelöst und es giebt keine Probleme mehr! Difficile est satiram non scribere' (*Probleme*, p. vii).

carried away not a few who only know the 'other side' by this writer's representation of it.[1]

Finally comes another volume, *Die Lebenswunder*, from Professor Haeckel. This the writer—now in his seventy-first year—intimates is his last philosophic work, 'a final reply to interrogators,' and a 'thorough exposition of my own monistic and causative system.' It is put forth as a necessary supplement to the *Riddles*. The supplementariness is decidedly more manifest than the necessity, inasmuch as it is, from beginning to end, nothing more than a reiteration, with amplifications which cannot be pronounced important, of what had previously been published.

Now, even apart from the fiery and furious championing of Mr. M'Cabe, it is inevitable that three such works as these of Professor Haeckel should attract no little attention. Nor is their interest or importance lessened by the fact that it is all, as Sir Oliver Lodge reminds us, 'a surviving voice from the nineteenth century.' Undoubtedly there is good warrant for this estimate:

> 'Professor Haeckel's voice is the voice of one crying in the wilderness, not as a pioneer of an advancing army, but as the despairing shout of a standard-bearer, still bold and unflinching, but abandoned by the retreating ranks of his comrades, as they march to new orders in a fresh direction.'[2]

None the less, such a challenge as his, following upon a long life of persistent effort to the same purpose, is necessarily effective. And when this his latest work is put into its cheaper form, as doubtless it soon will be, there cannot but ensue a confirmatory influence for his previous attitude, especially amongst the many for whom reiteration passes as reasoning.[3]

---

[1] Such notice as this work merits will shortly appear in another form.

[2] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 324.

[3] It is to be feared that their name is legion who have not only never heard of Dr. Adickes's reasoned protest, but would fail to appreciate his most appropriate reminder, in regard to Haeckel's assertions—'Zwar kehrt sie oft wieder, aber eine falsche Behauptung wird durch häufige Wiederholung nicht richtiger' (*Kant contra Haeckel*, p. 11).

Our famous author often exhibits the not unusual combination of great courage with hypersensitiveness. In the Preface to his latest work (p. ix) he refers to the *Nachwort* —as yet untranslated—which is appended to the popular edition of the *Welträthsel.* This is said to embody his replies to 'those heated partisans who continue to attack and calumniate my person.' But all who have read this Appendix for themselves, and have compared therewith the works of Paulsen, Schoeler, Adickes, Dennert, &c., will be able to judge how unfounded, in spite of Mr. M'Cabe's endorsement, is this representation. Even the pamphlet of Dr. Loofs, as English readers can see for themselves, speaks no more plainly than does Haeckel himself in all the three works above mentioned. He claims, indeed, to write both as a man of science and as a philosopher. Now as to the latter, by his own showing,[1] he is open to the candid criticism of every thoughtful reader; whilst as to the former, the more strongly he claims authority to write from the scientific standpoint, the more he must hold himself 'liable to be opposed by other men of science who are able, at any rate in their own judgement, to take a wider view of existence, and to perceive possibilities to which the said narrow and over-definite philosophers were blind.'[2]

His strong claim to sincerity is admirable enough, but counts for nothing here, seeing that all his opponents have an equal right to allege the same. We fully acknowledge his eminence as a biologist and anatomist, and have no quarrel with his facts so long as they are facts. Our objection is to the inferences he draws from them, and the iconoclastic system he builds upon them. Truly one cannot look without sadness, at all events from the Christian standpoint, upon the spectacle of this man of venerable age, filled with the knowledge of nature's wonders, taking his 'solitary walks in the wild regions of the Ligura Apennines, inspired

[1] 'In my opinion, every educated and thoughtful man who strives to form a definite view of life is a philosopher' (*Wonders of Life*, p. 471).

[2] Sir Oliver Lodge, *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 327.

with a feeling of the unity of living nature,' and yet finding only reason to spend his remaining strength in endeavouring to demonstrate that the Fatherhood of God is a delusion, that Christ is merely a child of adultery, man a thing of nought—'of no more value for the universe at large than the smallest bacillus,' Christian faith nothing else than an extreme form of 'anthropistic illusion,' and, generally, 'God, the soul, and immortality' base superstitions exploded for ever by the 'law of substance.' Whence it needs must follow that we are all nothing more than the sports of blind chance, or the puppets of sheer necessity, coming no-whence and going no-whither, with no aim in life beyond the sensations of the moment, and the futile fight with that 'social misery' which, this same writer assures us, 'spreads wider and wider almost in proportion as civilization develops.' Of a truth, the more such a philosophy is sincere, the more is it alike pitiful and repulsive.

Happily, there are no immediate prospects of its becoming paramount, although it may yet do much mischief and cause no little depression. On the whole, the tide of best modern thought seems rather to be setting in the opposite direction. There may certainly be some, as Sir Oliver Lodge suggests, who think 'that Christian faith is undermined and the whole religious edifice upset by the scientific philosophy advocated by Professor Haeckel under the name of Monism.'[1] But there are ample reasons for adding, as he does, 'Do not think it, friend; it is not so.' One can understand only too well how, from the perusal of Mr. M'Cabe's tirades, many a half-informed reader has arisen, simply amazed at the ignorance and hypocrisy of all Christian advocates, and ready to assume, as Butler said for his time, 'that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry, but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious,' only deserving to be set up 'as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule, as it were, by way of reprisals for its having so long interrupted the pleasures of the world.' There is apparently room for a plain and

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 315.

popular statement of the grounds upon which the 'intelligent artisan or other hard-headed reader,' whom our eminent physicist has in view, may decline to be goaded by Haeckel's dogmatisms, or dragooned by his champion's onslaughts, into accepting so poor and paltry an account of all 'things in heaven and earth' as their 'Monism' has to offer.

Now, it were all too easy to point out, in definite quotation, the instances of arrant dogmatism, unwarranted assumption, plain misrepresentation, statements contrary to fact, false logic, damaging acknowledgements, self-contradiction, insult poured upon opponents, &c., which abound in the works before us. That must be left, however, for another occasion. At most we may here deal only summarily with one or two of the main matters for consideration, which must serve as types of the rest.

One cannot repress a smile at the number of foundations upon which Haeckelian monism is said to rest. Now, we are told that all depends upon the conception of substance as the 'all-powerful matter-force reality';[1] now, all turns upon the 'law of substance';[2] then, it is stated that the doctrine of 'archigony' is the absolute essential;[3] on another page, 'the most solid foundation of monistic psychology is the fact that the human mind grows';[4] elsewhere, it is 'mechanical biogeny' which constitutes 'one of the strongest supports of the monistic philosophy';[5] yet again, 'this trinity of substance provides the safest basis for modern monism';[6] and so on. It would doubtless be convenient to regard all these as contributions to total reliability. But there is another suggestion which is more to the point, namely, that as the strength of any chain is that of its weakest link, to every one of these alleged fundamentals applies the writer's acknowledgement in regard to archigony, that it is 'an indispensable thesis in any natural theory of evolution.' So that to disprove one is virtually to settle all. Half a dozen

---

[1] *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, p. 20.
[2] *Wonders of Life*, p. 462.
[3] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 91.
[4] *Wonders of Life*, p. 335.
[5] Ibid., p. 401.
[6] Ibid., p. 465.

principal themes offer themselves at once for such crucial treatment. The conception of 'substance'; the 'law of substance'; the origin of life; the nature of mind in man; the thought of God; the relation between monism and dualism — these all certainly merit candid consideration. But our limits here permit us only to notice three.

1. And, first, the much vaunted 'purely monistic conception of substance.'[1] When an inverted pyramid poises itself upon a point, apart from the miracle of the poising comes the question of the reality and reliability of the point. If this be either mere imagination or confusion, what becomes of the pyramid? Thus, in the present case, when we settle ourselves down thoughtfully to consider this wonderful 'world-substance, the matter-force reality which is the constructive starting-point of monism,'[2] we soon find that it is the confusion which is real, and the 'matter-force' which is imaginary. The principal point in Mr. M'Cabe's chapter upon this theme is that every one who dares to think otherwise than his hero is 'simply throwing dust.' Since, therefore, he himself must be clear, we will take his 'modest' summary. For the Haeckelian monist, then—

> 'Matter and spirit are not two distinct entities or natures, but two forms or two aspects of one single reality, the fundamental substance. This one entity, with the two attributes, is the sole reality that exists, the one nature that presents itself to our contemplation in the infinitely varied panorama of the universe.'[3]

This position, we are further informed, is 'the culmination' of Haeckel's system. We have just learned that it is also the 'constructive starting-point.' Such interchange is, no doubt, highly convenient. But how in any logical system the starting-point and culmination can be identical, we are left to discover for ourselves. Certainly it is the 'starting-point of that network of explanations, theories, and

---

[1] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 76.
[2] *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, p. 27.
[3] Ibid., p. 20.

hypotheses which constitute the monistic philosophy.' That is one fact upon which it is impossible to lay too much emphasis. And the other manifestly is that the 'monistic philosophy' consists largely of 'theories and hypotheses.' Not that these are necessarily unphilosophical, but that in the case of this particular monism there is no room for either theory or hypothesis, if we are to take seriously the sweeping dogmatisms with which both Haeckel himself and his special pleader dismiss everything opposed to their own special conceptions.

That this is no misrepresentation was well shown by Mr. Christie in his trenchant article in the *Contemporary Review*,[1] to which I must refer the thoughtful reader. For the moment we are concerned to inquire more particularly into the origin, nature, and significance of this necessary 'starting-point.' As to the first of these, the plain truth is not long concealed.

'We have thus so far simplified the visible universe as to detect beneath its kaleidoscopic variety the operation of *one form* of force and *one form* of matter *from end to end of the universe.* The next and final step, as far as the unity of the material universe is concerned, is *to bring together* this matter and force themselves. *Dr. Haeckel has done this by saying* that matter and force (*or* spirit) are the two fundamental attributes or principal properties of the all-embracing *divine essence* of the world, the universal substance.'[2]

The italics we have employed will, it is hoped, help to draw attention to the main elements of this truly typical and deliciously modest statement. To ransack the 'universe' —not, be it observed, the kosmos—is to this philosopher a trifle. We note, therefore, with all meekness, that there can be nothing anywhere, under any condition, that he does not know. So that from our permitted 'one form' of force and 'one form' of matter literally everything must be constructed, and, above all, with no *Deus ex machina.* But under the slightest glimpse of the magnitude of such a task we naturally gasp, how? And the answer is easy: 'Dr. Haeckel

[1] For April 1904. [2] *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, p. 26.

has done this by saying'— Precisely. That is exactly what he has done. And no more. 'Monism is for us an indispensable and fundamental conception in science.'[1] Therefore there *can be* but one 'matter-force reality.' Therefore there *is* only this one 'matter-force reality' in all the universe. This is quite typical of monistic logic.

In the next sentence we are informed that 'all phenomena, without exception,' are to be carried back 'to *the mechanism* of the atom,' although 'we are by no means in a position to form any satisfactory conception of the exact nature of these atoms and their relation to the general space-filling ether.' The satisfactoriness is evidently in the assertion. It is not in the proof. Hence we are scarcely surprised to find that whilst the Haeckelian advocate, in accordance with his instructions, alleges that 'matter and force—or spirit—are the true fundamental attributes of substance,' we are told in the *Riddle* that 'the two chief types of substance are ether and mass.'[2] Whence the deduction is plain beyond mistaking. Force and spirit and mass are identical. Truly a scientific conclusion worthy of the 'monistic philosophy.'[3]

Students of Schoeler will call to mind how he commences his acute exposition of the self-contradictions of monism with a section upon 'Der Humbug des Substanzbegriffs.' But, for the present, into the 'essence of substance' we must not enter. Mr. Christie has well shown that, according to Haeckel's monism, the essence of substance is—substance.[4]

It must suffice here to point out how, in the author's own

---

[1] *Confession of Faith*, p. 19. [2] P. 82.

[3] It will interest the thoughtful reader to compare with this the recent statement of Mr. Balfour in his presidential address before the British Association met at Cambridge: 'It used to be thought that mass was an original property of matter. But if the new theories be accepted, these views must be revised. Mass is not only explicable, but explained. So far from being an attribute of matter considered in itself, it is due to the relation between the electrical monads of which matter is composed and the ether in which they are bathed. So far from being unchangeable, it changes, when moving at very high speeds, with every change in its velocity.'—*Reflections suggested by the New Theory of Matter*, p. 10.

[4] *Contemporary Review*, April 1904, p. 498.

indisputable words, monism is not monism at all. For, in the first place, it is necessarily dualism:

'Our conception of monism, or the unity philosophy, is clear and unambiguous. For it an immaterial living spirit is just as unthinkable as a dead spiritless material; *the two* are *inseparably combined* in every atom.'[1]

Be it so. But then, is combination identification? If it be, it is not combination. So that, if the above 'clear and ambiguous' statement be true, 'the two' remain two for ever, and dualism necessarily follows.

Only, unfortunately, even dualism does not suffice for monism. Let us simply quote again:

'The dualist metaphysic has rightly said that the mechanical philosophy does not discover the inner causes of movements. It would seek these in psychic forces. On our monistic principles they are not immaterial forces, but based on the general sensation of substance, which we call *psychoma*, and *add to* energy and matter as *a third attribute of substance*. I am convinced that sensation is, like movement, found in all matter, and this *trinity of substance provides the safest basis for modern monism*. I may formulate it in three propositions: (1) No matter without force and without sensation; (2) no force without matter and without sensation; (3) no sensation without matter and without force. These *three* fundamental attributes are found inseparably united throughout the whole universe in every atom and every molecule.'[2]

Henceforth we know how it is that universe-building is so easy for Haeckelian monism, namely, by contradicting itself into trinitism. Further comment becomes here unnecessary.

2. When we come to consider the question of the origin of life, and its significance, the quality of the science so well accords with that of the preceding pseudo-philosophy that it were scarcely necessary to notice it, save for one feature of the case which calls forth the lofty scorn of Haeckel and the pointed sneers of his pupil. The latter, in particular, cannot resist the opportunity to reiterate his favourite metaphor of 'dust-throwing' in regard to those who differ from him, and

[1] *Confession of Faith*, p. 58. [2] *Wonders of Life*, pp. 464–5.

adds a personal note with a view to accentuate the folly of one of them. All and sundry are charged with neglecting to perceive the difference between 'saprobiosis'—to adopt Haeckel's own terms—and 'archigony.' The former—'the formation of lower organisms out of the putrid and decomposing organic elements of higher organisms'—is said to have 'absolutely nothing in common with archigony,'[1] which '*only* assumes that the chemical process of plasmodomism developed of itself at the beginning of organic life.'[2] Here, again, there are two matters for consideration: (1) The significance of the acknowledged disproof—so far as present science is concerned—of not only saprobiosis, but abiogenesis, which is a decidedly wider term; and (2) the quality and quantity of the assumptions deftly wrapped up in the meek word 'only.'

Now, as to the former of these, at one time[3] we are sharply informed that science is grounded only upon experience and inference, so that what is beyond these is not science. Then 'experience' is explained as meaning observation and experiment. Then, forsooth, we are peremptorily summoned in the name of science to accept without demur an 'inference' which is not only, by confession, a 'temporary hypothesis'[4] but is flatly contradicted by all observation and experiment, thus far possible or actual. In other words, our scientific conceptions of what has happened in the past are to be based unhesitatingly upon the exact contrary of all that is known to happen now. Thus Haeckel on one page acknowledges that 'to reject abiogenesis is to admit a miracle,'[5] and elsewhere insists upon his right to assume, as a fundamental support of his monism, the 'provisional reply' for which no scientific evidence whatever is forthcoming. As to the failure of 'intelligent experiments in regard to archigony, their negative result does not in the slightest degree affect our question.'[5] Nothing whatever can be adduced in

---

[1] *Wonders of Life*, pp. 363–6.
[2] Ibid., p. 357.
[3] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 6.
[4] *Wonders of Life*, p. 368.
[5] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 91.

proof—the 'various modern theories' mentioned below are very far indeed from proof—that archigony did take place, but that does not matter in the least. It might have done, and that is enough. It is enough, truly, to exhibit the character of monistic science, no less than that of its philosophy. In this connexion Sir Oliver Lodge has well said that

'A reader of Haeckel might easily assume that it was scientifically established that life could spontaneously originate from dead matter, without animation from anything outside itself; and, moreover, that the atoms of matter possessed, in themselves and their forces, the elements not only of vitality, but of the further developments of consciousness and will. My contention throughout is not that Professor Haeckel's statements are necessarily untrue, but that they are of the nature of philosophic speculation or brilliant guesswork.'[1]

It is simply untrue that 'Haeckel's critics' have argued from the present failure of all attempts to demonstrate abiogenesis that it never did take place in nature's laboratory in the past, or never will be accomplished in human laboratories in the future. But of two things we are quite sure. First, that—to quote Sir Oliver again—'the origin of life certainly has no place in the science of to-day.' And, secondly, that if it should take place in the chemist's laboratory at any time in the twentieth century, it will neither be by the 'fortuitous concourse of atoms,' nor by 'necessity,' but as the result of efforts involving the utmost mental guidance that a thinking man of science can put into them. The inference from which latter, certainly draws itself.

The special interest of the present position is this: Whereas monism, especially as represented by Mr. M'Cabe, is at a loss, even with his exuberant vocabulary, to find words of contempt sufficiently contemptuous for theologians who 'build on gaps'—and this particular question is ever fixed upon as exhibiting most luridly the folly of transcendentalism—it turns out, after all, that it is the monist, not the

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 320.

theist, who is building on the 'gap.' Besides which, the theist has at least this advantage, that he does not contradict himself as flatly as the monist does. Witness these words of our Professor himself:

> 'These creations of the *phronema* with which we fill the gaps in our knowledge are called *hypotheses* when they are in harmony with the empirically established facts, and *myths* when they contradict the facts.' [1]

Seeing, then, that all known facts are in contradiction with the abiogenetic gap, we are given to understand henceforth, upon the very best testimony, that monism rests absolutely upon a myth.

It is scarcely necessary to add to this. If instances were required to show how here, as in the case of the initial 'matter-force reality'—and one might add, by way of fitting analogy, in the well-known hat trick of every conjurer—just that is deftly slipped into a premiss which is required to come out in the conclusion, they would be ready to hand in any quantity. Thus we are informed that an 'organism' designates 'an individual living thing, the material substance of which is plasm or *living* substance—a nitrogenous carbon-compound in a semi-fluid condition.' So, again, that 'chromacea and bacteria accomplish their peculiar *vital* function solely by means of their chemical constitution or their invisible molecular structure.' And yet once more, in regard to the synthetic faculty of carbon-assimilation possessed by chlorophyll, that 'this most important process of vegetal *life* is a purely chemical process, and that there is no question of a specific vital force in connexion with it';[2] in other words, there is nothing vital in life. In each of these cases the reader will perceive that the very thing to be demonstrated is quietly assumed in assertion. Similarly, a little later, we are informed that protoplasm—or 'plasm,' as Haeckel prefers to call it—is 'the material basis of all vital phenomena, and that this *living* matter owes its properties to the chemical properties of the albumin.'

---

[1] *Wonders of Life*, p. 90.

[2] Ibid., pp. 37, 42, 357.

Having thus identified the vital with the chemical, it only remains, of course, to show how this peculiar chemical combination arose, or, what is the same thing to monism, might have arisen. The alleged process merits appreciation in all its details, but here we can only summarize. All organisms, according to Pflüger, whose theory Haeckel adopts, are built out of the living albumin of the plasm, by reason of its 'extraordinary instability.' And 'the real cause of this rapid decomposibility is found in the presence of cyanogen'—CN—whence 'we may infer that the *living* albumin always contains the cyanogen-radical because its *decomposition* products do.' So that 'it is cyanogen which gives its characteristic *vital* properties to the plasm.'[1] All those who are acquainted with the effects of cyanide of potassium upon the animal organism will, it is hoped, appreciate the physiology as well as the logic (indicated by the italics) of this suggestion. But having arrived at the conclusion that 'cyanic acid'—HCNO—is 'a semi-living molecule' (!), it is an easy matter to bridge the 'gap' between wholly living plasm on the one side and wholly not-living nitro-carbonates on the other, by a 'temporary hypothesis,' which is the 'indispensable condition of monism.' And of all this, note that we may be quite sure, because the 'conditions of chemical activity millions of years ago were totally different from those with which we are now acquainted';[2] although, at the same time, all the preceding theory is based upon what we do now know! Thus the monistic philosophy of life, we see once more, rests upon a 'myth' of Haeckel's own defining.

Before altogether leaving this section of the subject, it may be worth while to present the dilemma which, herein, awaits monistic solution. The author of the *Riddle* says (p. 67): 'By death we understand simply the definite *cessation* of the vital activity of the individual organism.' Now, if this activity be, as alleged, purely chemical or mechanical, and if, as is thus stated, it ceases at death, what becomes of the much vaunted 'law of substance,' half of which is the

[1] *Wonders of Life*, p. 360.

[2] Ibid., p. 362.

absolute indestructibility of energy? On the other hand, if the 'law of substance' holds good, and the vital (i.e. chemical) energy does not disappear, upon what grounds is immortality ruled out as a 'baseless superstition' or an 'irrational dogma'? In either case Haeckelian monism goes by the board.

3. But it is not until we come to the thought of God that the dogmatism of the Professor at Jena reaches its climax, and the special pleading of his English champion its consummation of audacity and contumely. The chapter in the latter's brochure upon what he is pleased to call 'the title and prerogatives of the dying God,' deserves indeed a fuller exposure than can be given here, if only for the brow-beating impertinence which accuses Lord Kelvin, amongst others, of ignorance or hypocrisy, and which will probably pass with many readers for truth. Waiving that, however, for the present, it will be instructive first to summarize Haeckel's own papal pronouncements upon this theme, and then note the supplementary exposition of his English representative.

Students of the literature of theism—or even of the 'Selections' therefrom so conveniently published[1] by Drs. Caldecott and Mackintosh—will know how to estimate the bald assertions that 'Since the time of Kant and Laplace there has been no question of the conscious action of a Creator in any part of astronomy'; 'no evidence of God's existence is to be found'; 'the unprejudiced study of natural phenomena reveals the futility of the theistic idea as an untenable myth,' &c. But the climax of gross misrepresentation—revealing only too clearly the state of the writer's mind—comes when 'homotheism, the anthropomorphic representation of God,' is attributed wholesale to Christianity, and from the words of Christ in John iv. 24 the inference is drawn that 'We thus arrive at the paradoxical conception of God as a *gaseous vertebrate*.'[2]

As it would appear impossible to add to the plain—and coarse—conclusiveness of such pronunciations, the author of *Haeckel's Critics Answered* addresses himself to the task of

[1] T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh. [2] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 102.

justifying them in the name of modern science.[1] His chapter hereupon is an interesting 'lesson in modesty'—to quote his own phrase. All variations from his decisions are but 'quibbles,' 'useless talk,' 'simply audacious assertions,' mere 'verbiage and sophistry'; whilst every Christian advocate is just 'trying to bully us,' or producing 'surging floods of rhetoric.' Upon this exhibition, however, we need not dwell, because 'we are approaching the psychological moment in the great drama of the conflict of science and religion,' and the writer has at hand 'a dramatic simplification of the controversy.' Let us, therefore, give heed to this 'Daniel come to judgement.' It is a definite gain, certainly, to have the 'fortuitous concourse of atoms' dismissed at once and for ever from the programme of evolutionary possibilities. Monism, it seems, is ashamed of such a suggestion. There is, we are told with a lofty flourish of disdain, no such alternative as Lord Kelvin publicly asserted a short time ago. That was only his ignorance. One might suggest that, possibly, he knows as much of 'the universe from end to end' as Mr. M'Cabe, but we will not press it. Nor is it necessary here to discuss Haeckel's interpretation of the word 'chance.' We have the 'dramatic simplification' to our relief. And here it is:

'Haeckel and his colleagues hold that the direction which the evolutionary agencies take is not fortuitous; that they never could take but the one direction which they have actually taken.

'The theist says that the ultimate object must have been foreseen, and the forces must have been guided, or they would never have worked steadily in this definite direction. The monist says that *these forces no more needed guiding than a tramcar does*: there was only one direction possible for them.'[2]

And this is the final finding of an ex-professor of philosophy, after all the blinding flashes of rhetorical denunciation which have issued from his preceding pages! Verily—to shift the metaphor—'*Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus.*' It is true that, with the bravery of a Don Quixote, he himself

[1] *Haeckel's Critics Answered*, pp. 68–80.

[2] Ibid., p. 73.

says, 'The matter must be reasoned out.' But is there anything to reason out?

'No more needed guiding than a tramcar does.'—Surely if some humble-minded Christian stumbled upon this booklet and trembled when he read of the 'dramatic simplification' which was going at a stroke to annihilate his faith for ever, he must have heaved a sigh of immense relief when he read these words. For, as every one in these days rides in 'trams,' it must at once have occurred to him to call to mind the last tramcar he met with which needed no guidance. And, as fact is not seldom stranger than fiction and truer than argument, I will present his recollection by simply quoting verbatim from a newspaper report, published during October last:

'Millbrook, a village near Stalybridge, was yesterday the scene of an alarming tramcar accident, a child being killed, and several passengers in the vehicle more or less severely injured. Near the top of the hill the car *got out of control* and dashed down the hill at a great pace. Nearing the bottom it *jumped the metals*, and, swerving to the right, dashed into the last of a block of three cottages, knocking out the end and the whole front. The passengers, bruised and shaken, were got out, and then under the ruins was found the body of a child named *Thomas M'Cabe*, who was playing on the pathway and unable to escape *as the car came crashing on*.'

To comment upon this, beyond the few italics, would be to spoil it. So that if the above deliberate avowal truly represents the loudly vaunted doctrine of 'necessity,' which is to make a 'dramatic' nemesis of faith, the 'monistic mechanical process' which bases itself upon such a 'starting-point' is even more self-stultifying than we thought. Well might Professor Huxley say, 'Fact I know, and law I know, but what is this necessity but an empty shadow of my own mind's throwing?'[1]

Finally, by way of corroboration, we are told that—

'The man of science has never discovered an erratic force yet. Force always acts uniformly, always takes *the same* direction. Force,

[1] Ward's *Naturalism and Agnosticism*, vol. ii. p. 217.

as far as our experience goes, acts necessarily, inevitably, infallibly. There could be no science if it did not.'

Who says there could? Certainly not the Christian philosopher. Who pleads for 'erratic forces'? Assuredly not the theist. His theism is rather the very rock of his refuge from 'erratic' forces. But how an intelligent man can print the statement that 'force always takes *the same direction*,' as a sufficient account of the evolution of this world—to say nothing of the 'universe from end to end'—so utterly passes ordinary comprehension that one becomes dumb with an astonishment trying to be courteous. 'The same direction'— But is not the question of questions, *which* direction? And is 'the same' any rational answer to it?

Here, however, we must for the present forbear. If we were to examine carefully the magniloquently belauded 'universal sovereignty of nature's supreme law, the law of substance,' as Haeckel propounds and employs it, we should only find ourselves landed in other similar mazes and contradictions; whilst as to his professed explanation of consciousness and human thought, he is not only flatly contradicted by the very manual of psychology recommended in his pages, but is obliged to bolster up his positions by assertions which he himself acknowledges rest upon final and utter ignorance.[1] Students of philosophy will surely need no one to comment for them upon his identification of vibration with sensation,[2] or his unblushing avowal that modern anatomy and physiology 'have established the monistic view that psychology is a special branch of cerebral physiology, and that therefore the soul of man is a physiological function of the *phronema*.'[3] On a par with this is the assertion that 'A definite small region of the cortex (the Broca fissure), in conjunction with other parts of the

[1] *Riddle of the Universe*, p. 134; *Confession of Faith*, p. 19.

[2] The student who has access to Adickes's *Kant contra Haeckel* will do well to note his section upon this matter, pp. 30–1. Being himself a 'Monist and Pantheist,' his witness here is all the more valuable: 'Bewegte Materie bleibt in alle Ewigkeit und überall bewegte Materie.'

[3] *Wonders of Life*, p. 478.

phronema and the larynx, *produces* articulate speech,'[1] as also that '*sensation perceives* the different qualities of stimuli.'[2] All this is, surely, best summed up in one of his own sentences: 'In this way he came to frame the false theory of knowledge which is honoured with the title of' Monism, 'while, as a matter of fact, it is only a new form of dogmatism.'[3]

If, in conclusion, the question be asked what attitude should be taken by Christian philosophy in face of the 'Rationalism' which thus irrationally combines unphilosophical philosophy with unscientific science, only a general answer can, naturally, here be given. The difficulty is not, as a rule, with the truly educated. Philosophers and psychologists, in spite of all Haeckel's jibes, are well able to take care of themselves, both in this country and on the Continent; whilst as to men of science, they too, as a whole, are more truly represented by Captain F. W. Hutton, F.R.S., when he says:

'Evolution is evidently due to the action of the mind. There are some who still maintain an opposite view, but I think their numbers are fast diminishing'[4]—

than when Haeckel, with accustomed modesty, asserts that 'all men of science' who are informed, and acute, and have any moral strength,[5] share his monistic convictions. Christian theology, as such, may find less categorical confirmation from modern men of science, by reason of a growing sense of its distinctiveness in sphere and function. But in the same degree its way is clearing, so that the bitter opposition of deists and secularists will not long be able to pass as scientific in its antagonism.

To quote once more the manual of psychology above referred to:[6]

'Will and thought are not explicable by such categories as causality, substance, resemblance, or correspondence. Hence truth and freedom are ultimately topics for the metaphysician.'

---

[1] *Wonders of Life*, p. 479. [2] Ibid., p. 308. [3] Ibid., p. 452.
[4] *Lesson of Evolution* (Duckworth), p. 21.
[5] *Confession of Faith*, p. 60.
[6] By Professor C. F. Stout (University Tutorial Press), p. 634.

Haeckel's fine scorn for metaphysics no more avails to disprove this judgement, than the spray thrown up by some salt wave dashing on a rock is likely to put out the sun.

The real concern of Christian philosophy must be for the younger, more-educated-than-formerly, but as yet only half-educated sections of the community, who know enough to appreciate plausibilities, and to feel the force of reiteration, but not enough to perceive the contradictions which swarm between the lines, or take warning against the snares of mere repetition.

'Here is the patience and faith of the saints'—such an ancient ideal of duty, in a modern sense and application, is the only method for the maintenance of Christian truth amidst the ever-thickening conflict of opinions and the hurricanes of wild words which characterize our times. Unfitting as it may be in ordinary Christian work to meddle with complex and difficult themes, it must be none the less plainly understood that if, in face of the ceaseless outpourings of the modern press, those whom Christianity should most reach and guide and bless are to be saved from the devastating blight of disbelief, some means wiser and more potent than the policy of orthodox silence will assuredly have to be adopted. The assumptions which may be legitimately made in the pulpit must be fairly justified elsewhere. Preaching, to be valid and effective, must increasingly be clarified and supported by teaching. And the teaching will have to face unflinchingly the pressing problems of modern thought, rather than repeat ancient questions and answers which have lost their interest for this generation.

Happily, signs are not wanting that such development of mind as well as heart in Christendom is coming to pass. Yet there is much more need to accelerate its pace than is generally acknowledged. For whilst platform oratory, cheap issues, and clever journalism, in the interests of 'Rationalism,' may easily move myriads in directions contrary to Christian faith, not only is the resulting unsettlement often

as real as insidious, but the winning back, by appeal to reasoned truth, of those who have been troubled or perverted, is often a painfully difficult task. The sentence which Dr. Adickes, at the outset of his trenchant exposure of Haeckel's fallacies, quotes from that would-be philosopher against himself—'Unfortunately, consecutive thought is a rare phenomenon in nature'—is no doubt applicable all round. But it is especially true in regard to the vast numbers of ordinary men and women in our crowded cities, who are most open to the force of 'destructive criticism,' and least able to construct a positive and valid faith for themselves.

For all such it should be instructive, as to Christian teachers it is undoubtedly stimulating, to find a physicist of the eminence of Sir Oliver Lodge daring to affirm, in the fiercest light of modern discussion, that 'the only rational creed for a man of science, undeterred by any accusation of dualism,'[1] is the very antithesis of that 'Confession of faith' which the German professor and his English champion are seeking, under the guise of a cheap and easy monism, to force upon the modern mind.

FRANK BALLARD.

---

[1] *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1905, p. 331.

HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME: A SIDELIGHT ON THE HISTORY OF THE PAPACY.

HIPPOLYTUS: *κατὰ πασῶν αἱρέσεων ἔλεγχος*. Edited, under title *Philosophoumena Origenis*, by Miller. (Parker. 1851.) (English Translation in Clark's 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library.')

BUNSEN: *Hippolytus and his Age.* (Longman. 1852.)

DÖLLINGER: *Hippolytus und Kallistus*, 1853. (English Translation by Plummer. T. & T. Clark. 1876.)

WORDSWORTH: *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome.* (Rivingtons. 1853.)

LIGHTFOOT: *Apostolic Fathers.* Part I. Vol. ii. (Macmillan. 1890.)

SALMON: Article, 'Hippolytus Romanus,' *Dict. Christ. Biography.*

A SAINT and martyr of the Roman Church, an ecclesiastical writer of high repute, the real personality of Hippolytus and the actual history of his life are involved in deep obscurity, and present a problem of which no entirely satisfactory solution has ever yet been reached. The difficulty of this problem has been increased rather than diminished by the new sources of information which became accessible to students in the middle of the last century, when the Greek MS. of a work on heresies, brought back from Mount Athos in 1842 by Mynoide Minas, and deposited in the Imperial Library at Paris, was published at Oxford by Miller, nine years later, as the *Philosophoumena* of Origen. Study of the document itself, however, puts the conjectured authorship of Origen entirely out of court; and, although other names have been suggested, leaves it

practically certain that the writer was none other than Hippolytus himself.[1]

The author of this most interesting anonymous work represents himself as a bishop whose sphere of activity, so far as indicated, was in Rome, where for some years he apparently headed an opposition party, which must have been a thorn in the flesh to Zephyrinus and Callistus, who successively occupied the Roman Chair during the greater portion of the first two decades of the third century. What, then, was the exact position held by Hippolytus, a bishop *in* Rome, yet not *of* Rome, so far as any extant lists, whether Eastern or Western, bear witness?

The uncertainty which we feel in any attempt to answer this question is not by any means a modern growth, but manifests itself in the very earliest records.[2] In the Liberian Catalogue of the Popes, ascribed to the year 354, he is spoken of as a 'presbyter';[3] Eusebius, the historian,[4] refers to him as a bishop, but does not name his see; so also Jerome, who remarks that he was 'bishop of some church (the name of the city I have not been able to learn).'[5] Tradition has handed it down that he was Bishop of Portus; but it is, to say the least of it, strange that, in the case of so conspicuous a man as Hippolytus, the Roman bishops, Damasus (366–84) and Gelasius (492–6), should have been ignorant of the fact. The former of these[6] speaks of him

---

[1] The first to point this out was Professor J. L. Jacobi of Berlin, in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* for October 1851; and his general line of argument has been to a large extent followed by many later writers. Cf. Döllinger, *Hippolytus and Callistus*, chap. i. (hereafter quoted as 'Döllinger'); Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church*, p. 389; Wordsworth, *St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome*, chap. iv. (quoted as 'Wordsworth'); Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, part i. vol. ii. pp. 387 seq. ('Lightfoot'); Bunsen, *Hippolytus and his Age*, vol. i. pp. 14–17 ('Bunsen'); Macklintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia*, art. 'Hippolytus.'

[2] A most useful and convenient list of references to Hippolytus in the early writers may be found in Lightfoot, pp. 318–65.

[3] Duchesne, *Liber Pontificialis*, p. 4.

[4] *H. E.* vi. 20.

[5] *De Vir. Ill.* 61.

[6] Quoted by Lightfoot, p. 328.

simply as a presbyter, while the latter makes him bishop of the metropolis of the Arabians, i.e. Bostra.

The statue of 'St. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus,' which was disinterred in a cemetery near Rome in 1551, and is now in the Vatican collection, may be regarded as affording some tolerably definite evidence in favour of the Portus episcopate. It should, however, be borne in mind that, though of great antiquity, and thus, if nothing more, valuable evidence to the early date of the accepted tradition, the statue itself, or the original inscription thereon, may have been chiselled later than 405, in which year the Spanish poet, Prudentius, collected and no doubt made public his various poems, among which is one of considerable length[1] describing the martyrdom of a Hippolytus, who is called a presbyter, and said to have been involved in the Novatian schism. The persecutor is described as extending 'his rage to the coast of the Tyrrhene Sea and the regions about sea-swept Portus,' of the church in which place the hero was apparently the head, presumably bishop, though not so called. But Prudentius is, on the face of it, not entirely trustworthy. Hippolytus must have been dead before the middle of the third century, and cannot very well have fallen into Novatianism; though of course, as Wordsworth thinks, the poet may have confused this later schism with that which occurred during the pontificate of Callistus a generation earlier. Perhaps our Hippolytus has been confused with another of the same name: this is the accepted tradition of the Roman Church.[2]

The earliest mention of Hippolytus as Bishop of Portus appears in Constantinople some years before the middle of the seventh century in the *Chronicon Paschale*, which reaches down to 628, and may not improbably be dated somewhere

---

[1] *Peristephanon*, xi.; Lightfoot, pp. 332–8; and Plummer, the English translator of Döllinger, pp. 345–51, quote this hymn in full. Cf. especially lines 19–23, 39–40, 46–7, 80. See also Wordsworth, pp. 108–12; Döllinger, pp. 51 seq.; Lightfoot, p. 432.

[2] Cf. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity*, vol. i. p. 55 n.; Salmon, art. 'Hippolytus Romanus,' *Dict. Christ. Biog.*

about that year. Anastasius, Apocrisiarius or Ambassador of the Roman See at the Byzantine Court, also speaks of Hippolytus as Bishop of Portus, having found the author so styled in the spurious work of Hippolytus against Beron, a portion of which he copied,[1] and Döllinger is of opinion that it was from him that the chronicler got his information. But however this may be, and to all intents and purposes Anastasius and the compiler of the *Chronicle* form but a single source of information, we may here trace the influence of the so-called *Acts of Chryse*, in which is to be found the account of the martyrdom of Hippolytus which was current in the East, and which, it may be said, differs *in toto* from that of Prudentius. The martyr, we are informed, was drowned in a ditch or tank at the wall of Portus; he is, however, only spoken of as a presbyter, and, beyond the fact that it was the scene of his death, no closer connexion with Portus is suggested. The author of the *Chronicle* may have had this story running in his head, and thus have come to describe Hippolytus as Bishop of Portus.[2] As such he has passed into Church tradition, a concrete embodiment of which may be seen in the Torre di S. Ippolito, still standing in Porto at the present day.

Though slight and far from complete, this sketch of the character of the early evidence with regard to the position held by Hippolytus will have sufficed to indicate how contradictory and uncertain it is, and how much room for speculation and subjective opinion its interpretation affords. It is now time to pass on to the much later date at which the traditional view was first seriously questioned, and a discussion opened the last word of which has not yet been spoken.

In 1658 Le Moyne published at Leyden his *Varia Sacra*, in which he controverted the received tradition as to the Portus episcopate of Hippolytus, whom, relying upon the

[1] On the question of the authenticity of this very doubtful work consult Döllinger, pp. 295 seq.

[2] See Salmon, arts. 'Hippolytus Romanus' and 'Chryse,' *Dict. Christ. Biog.*

notices of certain early writers, he transferred to Arabia, making him Bishop of the Portus Romanorum at the mouth of the Red Sea, said to be the present Aden,[1] which place, he thought, might easily have been confused with the Portus Urbis Romae, near the mouth of the Tiber; thus accounting for the rise of the tradition which had been accepted without question for so many centuries. The view of Le Moyne was adopted by Dr. William Cave (1637–1713), an English patristic scholar of considerable erudition, who expressed himself as being free from doubt on two points only, viz. that Hippolytus was a bishop in Arabia, and was himself a native of that country.[2] Cave's contemporary, Du Pin, Doctor of the Sorbonne and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris, comes to the same conclusion;[3] and some eighty years later, two years after Ruggieri's work had been given to the world, Hippolytus was again transferred to Arabia by Saccarelli,[4] a Roman ecclesiastical historian of considerable repute.

Le Moyne, however, did not long remain unanswered. Ruggieri, an Italian savant, commissioned by Cardinal Ottobuoni of Portus, undertook the task of investigating all accessible archives bearing upon the question of Hippolytus and the see of Portus. In 1740 his work was ready for the press, but when eighty pages had been printed Ottobuoni died, the work came to an end, and the edition was dispersed. A copy, however, came into the hands of Abbate Ruschi, who published the dissertation in its complete form in 1771. This work, says Bishop Wordsworth,[5]

---

[1] I have endeavoured to find evidence of the existence of this colony by reference to the superb *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*, edited for the Oxford Press by R. L. Poole, which may be regarded as speaking the final word on questions of historical geography, so far as our present knowledge goes. No Portus Romanus or Portus Romanorum is shown at the spot named. This adds somewhat to the improbability of the view advanced by Le Moyne.

[2] Cf. Bunsen, vol. i. pp. 200 seq.

[3] *Biblotheca Patrum* (Eng. Trans. 1696), vol. i. p. 87 n.

[4] Cf. Döllinger, pp. 294–5.

[5] Cf. pp. 4–10. The italics are mine.

'has set the question at rest, refuting Le Moyne, and established *beyond the possibility of doubt* that Hippolytus was Bishop of Portus, and one of the suburbicarian bishops of the Roman Church, whence he is called "a Roman Bishop," "Bishop of the City," and even "Bishop of Rome," for the ancient Roman province was sometimes called Rome.'

The question at issue is not, however, to be settled in so summary a fashion, even with the aid of the writings of Hippolytus himself which are now available, but which were inaccessible to both Le Moyne and Ruggieri. These writings we must pass on to consider, in so far as they have any bearing upon the problem with which we are engaged.

Into the general character of the *Refutation of all Heresies* it is somewhat foreign to our present purpose to enter. There are ten books in all, of which the second and third are missing. It is with the ninth book alone that we are more particularly concerned. In this book, which contains much interesting autobiographical matter, a most unpleasing picture of the state of affairs in the Church of Rome in the early third century is presented. The characters of the two bishops, Zephyrinus and Callistus, are painted in the harshest colours, the former being represented as a fool of indifferent morals, and the latter as a thorough-paced knave.

The story cannot be told here, the limits of our present inquiry only permitting us, apart from all discussion of details, to refer to it in so far as it throws any light upon the actual position held by Hippolytus; though, as will be apparent in the sequel, the light in question is not sufficiently clear to dispel the obscurity in which the whole question is involved. Hippolytus's opposition to Callistus — and Zephyrinus may be set aside as being dominated by the influence and little more than the mouthpiece of his archdeacon and successor—was upon two counts, doctrine and discipline. The tone in which it was expressed displays such manifest personal resentment and fanatic passion as to make it quite impossible for the reader who simply

wishes to get at the truth, to accept, without careful consideration and some criticism, the narrative just as it stands. It has too much of the character of a speech of the counsel for the prosecution to afford altogether unimpeachable historical evidence. The language used gives a strong impression that Hippolytus was the rival of the man whom he so vehemently denounces. He writes as one who was himself taking an active part in the life of the Church at Rome, giving not the slightest hint that he had a sphere of duty which lay elsewhere. He speaks of Callistus as being in fear of him, and appears to regard him rather as the leader of a school, morally lax and of doubtful orthodoxy, than as the legitimate Bishop of Rome.

Hippolytus's statement of the case does not, however, ring quite true. The fact that, on the return of Callistus from penal servitude in Sardinia, Bishop Victor, the predecessor of Zephyrinus, regarded the escaped convict as a personage of sufficient importance to be dangerous, and therefore bribed him to reside away from Rome, appears, to say the least of it, strange in view of the revelations with regard to the criminality of his past, made, with some zest, by Hippolytus himself. The whole tone of the latter's polemic renders it necessary to accept the presentment of the case given therein only with extreme caution, and to allow for a large element of—we may charitably hope almost unconscious—exaggeration and even distortion of the facts; yet, on the other hand, it could hardly have been written, or even imagined, unless Callistus's past had been an extremely discreditable one, and out of all keeping with the sacred office which he held.

In the year following the publication of the *Philosophoumena* appeared Bunsen's work, to which reference has already been made. This writer maintains that Hippolytus was Bishop of Portus, and attempts to find an explanation of the passages in which he is spoken of as a presbyter by supposing that the bishop of the suburban see of Portus was a member of the presbytery of the metropolis. 'They have bishops now as members of the presbytery of the city

of Rome, with the body of presbyters and deacons, of which they form the governing clerical board of the Church of Rome. The relation of these suburban bishops to the Bishop of Rome must, in a certain degree, have been analogous to that which, in later times, existed between suffragan bishops and metropolitan.'[1]

With this solution of the difficulty, Wordsworth, in his work on the same subject, as we have already seen, is in general agreement; so also is Dean Milman in his famous work on the *History of Latin Christianity*.

Of this view Professor Schaff[2] remarks that it is possible, but cannot be proved; Bishop Lightfoot,[3] on the other hand, that this suburbicarian theory is an anachronism; and, indeed, though the metropolitan office was already beginning to take shape,[4] it is improbable, almost to the point of impossibility, that so high a degree of organization had been attained by the churches of Rome and the surrounding neighbourhood in the opening years of the third century. Plausible as it may appear at the first glance, this view of Bunsen and others cannot command unquestioning assent. If, on the other hand, the 'suburbicarian' idea be dropped and we are content to regard Hippolytus merely as Bishop of Portus, the difficulty of the 'presbyter' references still remains; while the ignorance of Jerome as to the see of Hippolytus, and still more of the Bishops Damasus and Gelasius, in the case of an ecclesiastic so eminent, and so closely connected with their own see as he evidently was, is not easily to be accounted for. Lightfoot's suggestion[5] that the term 'presbyter' is used simply as a title of respect, apart from any reference to office, instancing as a parallel case that of the well-known 'Venerable' Bede, is interesting and worthy of consideration. That the term 'presbyter' was

---

[1] Bunsen, vol. i. p. 207. But see the whole passage, pp. 200–10.

[2] *History of the Christian Church*, vol. ii. p. 772.

[3] P. 430.

[4] Cf. Gieseler, *Compendium of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. i. pp. 261–3 (Eng. Trans.).

[5] P. 436; cf. Wordsworth, p. 108.

sometimes so used is quite clear, for proof of which we need not go beyond the writings of Hippolytus, who himself applies it to his master, Irenaeus, unquestionably a bishop. This may possibly be the correct explanation of the entry in the Liberian Catalogue of 354, though, when the context[1] is considered, an improbable one. The terms 'bishop' and 'presbyter,' applied in the same breath to Pontianus and Hippolytus respectively, and thus brought into sharp contrast, compel the reader to interpret them as intended to make a real distinction between the official positions held by the two men. The office of the former unquestionably is indicated when he is described as a bishop, and only extreme anxiety to find a solution of an apparently insoluble difficulty could lead to any other construction being put upon the straightforward description of the latter as a presbyter.

In the same year as Bishop Wordsworth's work on this subject saw the light, two years after the publication of the *Philosophoumena*, Dr. J. J. I. von Döllinger, famous as a German theologian of the first rank and a pronounced opponent of the Infallibilist movement, issued from the press his *Hippolytus und Kallistus*,[2] in which he attempted, with great learning, to find a solution of the difficulties of the case by supposing that Hippolytus was a schismatic bishop of Rome, an anti-pope in fact, of whom the later tradition of the Church has preserved no record as such. If this were the case, the language of Hippolytus would be explained.

Callistus is painted by his opponent in very dark colours as a worldly and venal intriguer; as a favourer of the Patripassian heresy associated, broadly speaking, with the names of Noetus, Sabellius, and their followers; as loose in his administration, and failing to maintain the discipline of the Church. Without going into detail, it may be said

---

[1] The sentence runs as follows: 'Eo tempore Pontianus episcopus et Yppolitus presbyter exules sunt in Sardinia' (Duchesne, vol. i. p. 4).

[2] An English translation by Plummer appeared in 1876.

that the main counts of Hippolytus's indictment were in respect of the power to forgive sins claimed by Callistus; his reception of excommunicates—apparently in this case those whom Hippolytus himself, acting as a bishop, had excluded from the communion of the Church; his assertion that bishops were not to be degraded even though guilty of mortal sin, this latter being a somewhat indefinite expression, as to the application of which some difference of opinion may well have existed; and certain questions of marriage and rebaptism.

To these charges Döllinger devotes considerable attention. Though his statement of the case can hardly be regarded as other than an *ex parte* one, yet, when all due allowance has been made on this account, enough remains to convince the reader that Hippolytus has been guilty of considerable exaggeration, and not a little misrepresentation, perhaps the unintentional outcome of party spirit and religious differences. Callistus, his humble origin notwithstanding, may be regarded as a type of the society prelate, whose view of the Church and his own position was somewhat worldly, while as an ecclesiastical statesman his main concern was for smooth working, and the satisfaction of as many parties as possible; unwilling, therefore, to draw the cords of discipline too tightly lest the outward harmony and prestige of the Church should suffer thereby. Hippolytus was the very opposite of this: a stern fanatic, a man of deep convictions, ascetic and somewhat narrow in his views. Between two such men, each holding a high position in the Church at Rome, collision was inevitable.

That such collision actually took place we know; but, unfortunately, we have only the account which Hippolytus has given, in which of course impartiality cannot reasonably be looked for. His language is that of a bishop,[1] of one who claims to be of the succession from the apostles. He brands Callistus as the sectarian leader of a 'school,' loose alike in doctrine and morals—a school which had been

[1] *Philos.* 'Introduction' (Ante-Nicene Library, vol. vi. p. 28).

crowded by those whom the writer had himself ejected from the Church.[1]

It has been argued that Hippolytus never ascribes the title of Bishop to Callistus, and speaks of him only as having seemed to attain that dignity; but whether this is intentional or not is a somewhat doubtful point, and the precise meaning of the passage from which this inference is drawn[2] is not altogether clear, at all events not sufficiently so to warrant our drawing any positive conclusion therefrom. But, on a review of the whole case as stated by Hippolytus, it must, I think, be admitted that the language used by him would be explained, and perhaps most readily explained, on the supposition that he was the schismatic anti-bishop of Döllinger's theory.

This solution, plausible and attractive as it may appear, leaves us, however, with the great difficulty of the silence of the ecclesiastical historians, and the fact that, until the discovery, in the middle of the last century, of a polemical pamphlet, written by one of the parties concerned, students of Church history were in complete ignorance of such a schism ever having taken place. Still harder is it to understand how the Roman Church should have cherished the memory of the great schismatic, who in his lifetime was the strenuous opponent and trenchant, possibly libellous, critic of more than one occupant of the throne of St. Peter, as that of a saint and martyr.

The late Bishop Lightfoot,[3] although he rejects the Portus episcopate, is of opinion that the evidence for some connexion of Hippolytus with that town is better and earlier. The view which he adopts is that Hippolytus was a bishop *in partibus* whose sphere of activity was among the cosmopolitan seafaring population of Portus, though Portus was not his see; that he was, in fact, a sort of episcopal freelance, a missionary bishop without a see. Thus would be explained the remark of Photius,[4] a ninth-

[1] *Philos.* 'Introduction' (Ante-Nicene Library, vol. vi. p. 343).

[2] Ante-Nic. Lib. vol. vi. p. 342; cf. Salmon, *Infallibility*, p. 393.

[3] Pp. 432 seq.

[4] *Myriobiblion* (ed. Hoeschelius et Schottus), pp. 35–6.

century patriarch of Constantinople and ecclesiastical writer, that the author of the *Labyrinth* was supposed to have been a presbyter of Rome and a bishop of the nations. Photius himself ascribed the authorship of this work to Caius, but it almost certainly belongs to Hippolytus.

This explanation of the case is, however, little more satisfactory than that which makes Hippolytus Bishop of Portus, besides being open to the objection that evidence for the existence of these independent episcopates in the early third century is entirely lacking; nor does it harmonize with the fact that the sphere of Hippolytus's activity, so far as we know anything about it, was at Rome; no hint being given that he had any interest or duty connecting him with Portus.

Much more satisfactory is the solution suggested by the late Dr. George Salmon.[1] The fact that in Victor we have a bishop with a Latin name, and who wrote in the same tongue, succeeding to a line of bishops whose names generally suggest a Greek origin, is regarded by him as an indication that the autocratic character of this episcopate may perhaps be accounted for on the supposition that the Church at Rome was no longer that of a foreign colony in the metropolis, but consisted mainly of native Romans, ruled by a bishop of their own imperial race.[2] The community of Greek-speaking Christians was still, however, in all probability of considerable size. The inference drawn by Salmon is that these two communities existed side by side, for the most part independent of each other, and each with its own bishop; Hippolytus being bishop of the Greeks, and thus bishop *in* Rome, though not Bishop *of* Rome. But once again evidence is lacking, for history knows nothing of two independent and legitimate bishops in Rome.

A modification of this view may, however, be possible,

---

[1] In his article 'Hippolytus' (*Dict. Chris. Biog.*), to which reference has already been made.

[2] See *Infallibility*, p. 383. Victor does not appear to have been born at Rome, and it is doubtful whether he was of Roman blood. He may, however, have been a Latin-bred African.

and perhaps a little less difficult to explain, and not entirely unsupported by early testimony; though it must be frankly stated that it is largely a matter of conjecture in view of the admitted difficulties of the case, quite satisfactory evidence still being a *desideratum*.

Without assuming that there were, side by side, in Rome two independent bishops, each at the head of his own organized Christian community, an arrangement of which we might fairly expect to find some historical record if it had ever actually existed, it is far easier to suppose that, if there were two bishops actively engaged in Rome, one of them was in a subordinate position as coadjutor or assistant bishop to the titular of the see.

That such an arrangement was not an entirely unheard-of thing, even at this early date, there is happily some evidence forthcoming. Eusebius,[1] the historian, informs us that, when Narcissus of Jerusalem had grown too infirm, by reason of age, for the efficient discharge of his duties, a coadjutor was appointed to share with him the administration of the see. Narcissus sat as bishop during the early years of the third century, the very period now under review, and it is not at all difficult to suppose that the Bishop of Rome required and received such episcopal assistance as was accorded to his contemporary at Jerusalem; though, in all probability, such an arrangement was decidedly exceptional.

It will of course be at once evident, that had Hippolytus been placed by Victor in a position of this sort, perhaps with special reference to work among the Greek-speaking Christians—and Hippolytus, it will be remembered, was a Greek writer—it would not be difficult to explain the situation which afterwards arose. Hippolytus, coadjutor of Victor, might not unnaturally expect that his position as assistant bishop gave him a strong claim to succeed to the diocesan office when the see should have fallen vacant. But this expectation was not realized; and on the death of Victor, in 202, the coadjutor was passed over in favour of Zephyr-

[1] *H. E.* vi. 11.

inus; and again, seventeen years later, when Callistus mounted the chair of St. Peter, he still remaining in the subordinate yet sufficiently important position which he had previously held, as second only to the Bishop of Rome.

Under such circumstances as these, his disappointment, and the sense of having been unjustly passed over, would almost inevitably, human nature being what it is, lead Hippolytus to put the worst possible construction upon the actions and policy of his successful rivals; while his convictions, narrow, ascetic, and pronounced, would have caused him in any case, all personal considerations apart, to regard their conduct both as administrators and spiritual guides with the extremest displeasure.

Allowing that both Zephyrinus and Callistus were, in many respects, unworthy of the great position which they held, and, whatever the personal feelings of Hippolytus might have been, his ninth book could hardly have been written unless they were so—this, coupled with the fact that he felt their elevation to be a personal wrong sustained by himself, and a grave slight, would go far to explain his somewhat extravagant language.

Callistus, for whom he had been passed over a second time, and therefore the special object of his wrathful denunciations, appeared to Hippolytus, who was keen to note the evident shortcomings of the occupant of that high place to which he doubtless considered that he had had the prior claim, as no better than the leader of a school composed of the more lax and worldly members of the Roman Church; while he himself, though not exactly Bishop *of* Rome—and he never calls himself such—was at all events a true bishop *in* Rome; and as such he excommunicated certain members of the Church whose conduct appeared to him to warrant such extreme measures, without regard to his diocesan's opinion in the matter—an opinion which was evidently not in accord with his own.

At the same time, while thus really a bishop, Hippolytus, we may venture to think, might yet have been a member of

the Roman presbytery. A position analogous to the one which it is here suggested may have been held by him, can be found in that of the suffragan and assistant bishops of the Anglican Church to-day. Some of these, although they have received consecration as bishops and enjoy the spiritual prerogatives of such, nevertheless hold presbyterial office also, and are members of cathedral chapters and the Lower House of Convocation as dean, canon, or archdeacon.

On some such assumption as the foregoing may be most readily explained the circumstance that by various early writers Hippolytus is spoken of both as presbyter and bishop, and sometimes even as Bishop of Rome. For, according to the view here advanced, he was both presbyter and bishop in Rome, and, as the latter, might easily have been supposed by a writer distant from him in place or time to have been titular of the Holy See.

That this suggestion is open to objection may be at once admitted; but, owing to the unsatisfactory and conflicting character of the evidence available, no solution of the historical difficulties involved can be quite satisfactory; and, pending fuller and more definite information, the inquirer can but seek the line of least resistance. If all the difficulties involved cannot be met, he can but see to it that those which must remain be the fewest and least insuperable possible. To the present writer it appears that the hypothesis of coadjutorship will best meet the facts of the case, while, on the whole, least open to serious objection.

The absence of any historical record of this arrangement is not altogether inexplicable. The appointment of an assistant bishop, supposing such to have actually taken place, was in all probability a very exceptional expedient; the need, as Dr. Salmon's remarks suggest, for such an appointment having only very recently revealed itself, so far as Rome was concerned, by reason of the development of the Latin-speaking Christian community in that city side by side with the older one speaking Greek. The experiment having turned out so disastrously, one can understand that with Hippolytus the appointment would be allowed to lapse;

nor would any succeeding bishop be in haste again to have recourse to an expedient which painful experience had shown to be fraught with possibilities of serious disturbance to the peace of the Church. Being thus almost immediately discarded as impracticable, treated as a mere unpleasant incident, the chance of the recurrence of which must be guarded against, it is not difficult to suppose that, in course of time, the fact that there had ever been an episcopal assistant to the Bishop of Rome was entirely forgotten, and thus passed out of history altogether.

At all events, the silence of history can be more readily understood on the supposition that Hippolytus was a mere assistant to the diocesan, than if we suppose him to have been an independent co-bishop, or, still more, an avowed anti-Bishop of Rome.

But whatever the actual facts may have been, and whatever be the interpretation that we put upon them, one point emerges with perfect clearness; and that is, the great difficulty which the whole incident of Hippolytus presents to the papalist historian.

On the improbable assumption that the tradition of the Church has preserved the truth, and that the antagonist of Callistus was Bishop of Portus and a suffragan of the Bishop of Rome, it is evident on the face of it that the authority of the latter was far from being unquestioned at that period; since even his suffragans, to say nothing of more distant prelates, could venture to criticize him so freely, and in such terms of apparent equality.[1]

On the anti-Pope theory of Döllinger comment is surely needless. The picture which is thereby suggested of two rival pontiffs assailing and anathematizing one another is an anticipation of some of the darkest scenes from the darkest days of later papal history. That such a state of things was even possible is fatal to the assumption of spiritual supremacy afterwards made by a long succession of sovereign popes. The papal office was not sacrosanct in the third century, nor

[1] Cf. Mullinger, art. 'Popedom,' *Ency. Brit.* (ninth ed.).

was its holder beyond the reach of denunciation and invective on the part even of members of his own Church, who dwelled under the shadow of his reputed throne; while the conduct and character of the successor of St. Peter, even when all allowances are made, must have been such that it is impossible, without impiety, to regard him as the Vicar of Jesus Christ. It is also worthy of note that, if in this sense he were the rival of two Roman bishops, Hippolytus no more claims for himself than he allows to them a papal position, and that despite his claim to be of the succession from the apostles.

Assuming that either Dr. Salmon's reading of the evidence, or my own modification thereof, be correct, Hippolytus, as independent missionary bishop of the Greeks in Rome, or as assistant to the diocesan, shows an absence not merely of awe but of common respect in speaking of the latter, which would have been impossible had he been generally recognized as the successor of the Prince of the apostles, Father of princes and kings, and earthly Governor of the world; and, as such, endowed with the amplest prerogatives of spiritual autocracy by the direct commission of the King of kings. The same remark holds true of Hippolytus's contemporary, Tertullian,[1] whose language displays a similar sense of independence and equality in speaking of the Bishop of Rome, whose actions are treated as not at all above the freest and most severe criticism; and Tertullian was not even a bishop.

The most significant point of the whole affair is, however, the deep obscurity in which it is enwrapped. Neither in the East, nor in the West, neither in or out of Rome, is there any unimpeachable evidence bearing upon it. Fierce is the light that beats upon a throne, and fiercest surely that which beats upon the most august of all thrones. Had the Roman bishops of the third century been recognized by Christendom as occupying the almost superhuman position which their successors have claimed, through them, as their inheritance

[1] See especially *De Pud.* (Ante-Nicene Library, vol. xviii. p. 57).

from the Prince of the apostles, around whose shoulders the Lord Himself had flung the imperial mantle of a Pope, this silence would have been a sheer impossibility. That the Viceroyalty of the Eternal had been a matter of conflicting claims and divided votes; that a daring suffragan or assistant had ventured to assail with frantic and abusive passion him who on earth stood in the place of God and wielded the dread power of the keys—this had been to that simple and credulous age an awful and unheard-of thing, which must have resounded throughout the whole of Christendom and left many a shuddering trace upon the blotted page of history.

But this was evidently not the case; for the almost unbroken silence which prevails suggests that the whole business was treated as a matter of minor interest, a purely local affair, with which Christendom in general had no concern. Hence it has been allowed to pass into that oblivion in which the memory of many a similar local and temporary dispute has, happily, been for ever hidden away from the prurient curiosity of the aftertimes.

The conclusion, therefore, to which we are inevitably led is, that in the early third century the Roman See was but one of many; of pre-eminent importance, doubtless, but not essentially different from the rest. It had its troubles and disputes; but then so had other sees, and no particular importance attached to them; nor did any chronicler make a special note of them. Its bishop was, at most, but *primus inter pares*, and it is by no means certain that he was always even that. The papal monarchy was still in the far distance.

W. ERNEST BEET.

IMMORTALITY AND REVELATION.

A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. By R. H. CHARLES, D.D. (A. & C. Black. 1899.)

Eternalism: A Theory of Infinite Justice. By ORLANDO J. SMITH. (Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. 1902.)

The Other Room. By LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D. (Outlook Co. 1903.)

Ostern und Pfingsten. Von E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ. (Leipzig. 1903.)

The Theology of the Old Testament. By the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D. (T. & T. Clark. 1904.)

ONE of the most frequent creations of ancient religious art is that of a youthful winged genius standing with perplexed and anxious mien as he gazes at a human corpse stretched prostrate at his feet. His head and right hand lean upon an inverted and extinguished torch, while from his left hand hangs a garland of flowers surmounted by a fluttering butterfly. It is a pathetic and suggestive figure, embodying as it does the attitude of the ancient mind to the terrible enigma of death. All its boasted wealth of knowledge stood baffled and frustrate at the grave's edge: it was but a dead and inverted flame. What was left save to summon the bright and gracious fancies of the poetic imagination to dispel, if it were possible, the dark forebodings, the haunting shadows created by a contemplation of man's inevitable end? It was reserved for Christianity to pierce with the light of its Easter message the darkness of the grave, to confirm the deepest instincts of the soul, and to lift into the sphere of spiritual certitude the vaticinations of reason and of conscience. But, ere this revelation could

appeal with power to the hearts of men, it must be preceded by a moral groundwork, by a discipline of faith amid the moral anomalies of the world—a faith which rises at times into sheer agony that wrests, as it were, from God the needed answer. The sense of the moral worth of man, of God's abiding relationship to the trustful soul, of the contradiction between the ideal and the real in human life, must be developed, purified, and strengthened—shaped, so to say—into a premiss from which the great and otherwise incredible conclusion of immortality might flow.

It is the purpose of this article to show how the divine purpose as to man's destiny gradually made itself known, until at last it found its crown and climax in the gospel of the Incarnation and the Resurrection. One difficulty meets us at the outset. The modern religious consciousness, regarding the belief in a future life as an essential element in religion, is perplexed to find that, as a matter of fact, though Israel held a pure monotheistic faith as early as the eighth century B.C., it was several centuries later ere immortality found explicit recognition. The only answer is that given by the late Professor Davidson: 'Revelation took men as it found them, setting before them at all times and in each successive age what was needful that they might walk before God in holiness and righteousness, and as it taught them thus, penetrating and transforming other modes of thinking on many non-essential matters which they cherished. If, therefore, we find explicit teaching on this question of immortality postponed, we may infer that it was not unnatural that it should be so; that there was something in the ways of thinking on the part of the people which for a time at least supplied the place of it, or, at all events, made it not a necessity to a true life with God and a walk before Him in righteousness.'[1] This is another way of saying that revelation is not an external and mechanical thing; rather is it to be viewed as psychologically mediated, wrought into the human spirit and conditioned by historical

[1] *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 405.

environment. If revelation is thus a gradual process in which man is led step by step from a lower to a higher spiritual level, we need not be surprised to discover at the beginning of the process a simplicity and meagreness at first sight incompatible with the idea of a divine economy. The great lesson of history is that it is only through a *religious experience* that a really effective belief in immortality can come to the birth. Plato, of all men who stand outside the pale of revelation, is the grandest prophet of our belief, yet his reasoning has failed to make it a living faith for humanity. At most he has built but a splendid Peradventure; it was the religion of the Jew that turned the surmise into an assured conviction.

The presuppositions of faith in immortality are the doctrines of God and of man. Now in the Old Testament religion, from its earliest to its latest form, God is never thought of in a non-personal way. Everywhere and always He is a free personal Will, now recognizing the creature to be good, and, again, repenting Him that He had made man; entering into covenant bonds with His servants, and swearing by Himself as the ultimate and objective ground of right. He is *Elohim*, lifted above all creaturely weakness; He is *El-Elyon*, higher than all the gods of the heathen; He is, above all, *Jahve*, the covenant God, who as a moral personality is capable of setting ends to Himself, and unchangeably true to His own nature. He can be jealous, angry, merciful, loving—phrases which express in terms of the soul's experience the fullness of His personal life. God is spiritual, though His spirituality, as Schultz remarks, is conceived of not in a metaphysical but in an anthropological and popular sense. Men spoke as materialists because they had not as yet learned to distinguish clearly between matter and spirit; but the very metaphors they used proved that they held to a belief in God outside nature, and freely ruling over it. But to such a belief the finite could not be the absolute limit of existence. There was another world lying beyond this temporal and transitory one; and of that world God was the centre.

Corresponding to this lofty doctrine of God is the Old Testament idea of man. A very early tradition as recorded by the Jahvist writer in the Book of Genesis is not without a hint of man's dignity and worth: 'The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.'[1] Man is endued with life from God like other animals. Yet even here a distinction emerges; of no other animal is it said that God breathed directly into it the breath of life. The writer is conscious that a unique order of being comes on the stage of history with the origin of man. Still, man is 'flesh,' God is 'spirit';[2] and this antithesis points the way to a line of thought running throughout the whole of the Old Testament. Man is of the earth;[3] his life is but a 'wind';[4] and if God should gather the 'spirit and breath' of man to Himself, 'all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again into the dust.'[5] But when we turn to a later revelation we note a distinct advance on this idea. The priestly writer enunciates a truth which has marked an epoch in the spiritual history of humanity when he records the divine origin of man: 'And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, . . . and God created man in His own image; in the image of God created He him.'[6] Three ideas may be fairly deduced from this great oracle. (1) The creation of man has a significance for the Creator far greater than that afforded by the rest of nature. It marks a stage in the creative purpose grander than any up to that point reached. God, as it were, takes counsel with Himself; that which results from such a majestic introspection must be worthy of it. (2) There is an inner link of connexion forged between the creature and the Creator. Man is in God's image, that is, he is a free, self-conscious personality, and therefore able to hold communion with the God in whose image he is made. (3) Because self-conscious and free he stands in a category by himself, joined indeed on one side of his being to the lower

---

[1] Gen. ii. 7. [2] Gen. vi. 3. [3] Ps. x. 18.
[4] Job vii. 7. [5] Job xxxiv. 14, 15. [6] Gen. i. 27.

animals, but on the other rooted in God, and so lord of all creation. Hence it is that we find man the object of God's special care and visitation. He is made a little lower than God, and crowned with glory and honour;[1] all things are put under his feet. The 8th Psalm, which Delitzsch calls 'a lyric echo of the Mosaic account of creation,' contrasts man as he stands in nature and man as he is related to God: from the former point of view it is a matter for wonder that God should visit him; from the latter, the wonder passes into praise as the Psalmist contemplates him as God's visible representative on earth. Out of a sense of this kinship to God and of capacity for communion with Him spring those expressions of yearning for God's face and favour familiar to us in the writings of Israel's poets. But this very desire for God contains within itself an implicit prophecy of immortality.

These, then, are the presuppositions of our belief: God, a free, spiritual personality; man in God's image; man's goal, the perfect realization of that image through fellowship with his Maker. The germs of all that afterwards came to the blossom in Israel's later history may here be found.

The Exile marked the most significant turning-point in the history of Israel. 'In a religious sense it was,' says Dr. A. B. Davidson, 'the greatest step towards Christianity taken since the Exodus.'[2]

We have, then, to ask: How did it fare with the doctrine of a future life in the pre-exilic period?

As in all primitive civilizations, the state and not the individual was at first regarded as the moral unit. The single personality was thrown into the background, and the idea of the collective people filled the entire horizon; man was to realize himself in and through the state, and has no independent footing over against it. Does he ask any question as to the future? No explicit answer is vouchsafed. Enough to know that God will not deceive man's trust and that the venture of faith will be justified. Meantime a

[1] Ps. viii. 5, 6. [2] *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 408.

positive foundation for the belief in immortality is laid by the publication of a moral law with its temporal rewards and punishments. This means: man has spiritual worth; he is not governed like a thing; he is a person able consciously to realize a moral end. Within him lies a capacity for appropriating the moral ideal as the law of his life; and that capacity is widened and deepened, strengthened and disciplined, by a holy God who enters into abiding relationship with him. To such a being eternal life eventually would not seem an incredible thing. It becomes a matter possible to belief in the light of the divine education of man.

Did, then, the Mosaic and after ages refuse to believe in existence after death? By no means. Ancient Israel shared the belief of her Semitic kindred in a shadowy, joyless, gloomy subsistence in Sheol—a subsistence which is, however, the negation of all true life. The fate of all the inhabitants of Sheol—'the congregation of the dead'—is pitiable in the extreme. They know nothing of what transpires on earth;[1] even earth's great ones are robbed of their glory.[2] Darkness reigns supreme in the under world;[3] in it God is forgotten,[4] for no evidence of His presence is seen;[5] nor can any signs of government be observed.[6] There is nothing in Sheol to make it tolerable.[7] Once within its gloomy portals return from it is impossible,[8] and no one is exempt from its sway.[9] The dead are forgotten, nor have they any interest in the living. They are without feeling, and their existence is a pale and spectral shadow of life on earth. Once only do we read of a thrill of emotion passing through them as they are stirred up to meet the shade of the proud King of Babylon with the taunt: 'Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us?'[10] There is no difference of destiny in Sheol. All alike are at rest; the prisoners are at ease together, and the servant is free from the master.[11] The theocracy is an earthly

[1] Job xiv. 21. [2] Isa. xiv. 9, 10. [3] Job x. 22.
[4] Ps. vi. 5. [5] Ps. lxxxviii. 12. [6] Job x. 22.
[7] Eccles. ix. 10. [8] Job viii. 9. [9] Job xxx. 23.
[10] Isa. xiv. 10. [11] Job iii. 18.

one, and its punishments and rewards are realized here. 'Death is itself a final judgement, for it removes man from the sphere where Jehovah's grace and judgement are known.'[1] The most striking and, to the Western mind, paradoxical element in this belief is that, though from the age of Prophets onwards God was conceived as the sole Ruler and Judge of the world, yet till after the Exile His rule was supposed to stop short of Sheol. Within its gloomy borders neither the justice nor the mercy of God was displayed. 'When a man died he was removed from the moral jurisdiction of Jehovah, and his relations with Jehovah ceased.'[2] The power and presence of God at a later time are conceived to make themselves known in such way in Sheol,[3] but this conception was powerless to transform or elevate the idea of death. That idea was not given by revelation; rather is it a *Volksglaube*, a popular heathen belief created by the mythical imagination working on the external aspect of the dead. Death paralyses man's energies, deprives him of all feeling, thought, emotion, yet leaves for a time his external form and shape. Sheol is simply the externalizing or personifying of this thought, and the transference of it as thus personified to a world beyond the grave. Now it was the function of revelation to transform this idea in conformity to the demand of faith in the living God. The theology was bound to penetrate and elevate the eschatology. The soul that knows God and craves for fellowship with Him must fight its way to a standpoint from which death shall be seen to be abolished, or at most only a temporary halting-place on the soul's journey to a fuller communion. Sheol must not be allowed to swallow up permanently all the hopes and aspirations of the pious mind. Hence occasionally, as in the 16th and 73rd Psalms, we find the higher minds

[1] W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 64.

[2] R. H. Charles, *A Critical History*, p. 36.

[3] Ps. cxxxix. 7, 8. The popular idea of Sheol was vague and indeterminate, and involved contradictory elements. It was this that misled Mr. Gladstone in appealing to the story of the Witch of Endor as a proof of an early belief in immortality.

in Israel resting in a personal and subjective solution to the vexing problems of life in their feeling of fellowship with God—a feeling which at times ignored the fact of death, but could not indicate any way by which its sharpness could be overcome.

As has been said, the Exile marked a most important stage in the development of Israelitish religion. It is a law that outward changes, catastrophes in the individual or national life, appeal profoundly to the moral nature, and stir its faculties to their most strenuous exercise. Such a crisis came to Israel in the Exile. It was her death; no longer is she to play a part among the nations of the world, or pursue the ambitions of a secular state. Yet the death of the body was but the emancipation of the spirit. Only through the disillusionment of its national hopes, the utter failure of its theocratic dreams, could Israel be thrown back upon herself, to search her own soul and read there the prophecy of a grander destiny than any that had ever seemed possible in the days of her greatest prosperity. In a word, the death of the nation was the birth of the individual. We may date from the Exile the rise of that thought which henceforth is to grow more and more significant, until it becomes the burden of the New Testament, namely, that the soul, apart from its environment in the family or the nation, has an independent footing before God, and must work out the problem of its being in His presence. In the prophets of the pre-exilic period there is no trace of a gospel for the individual. It is of the nation they speak. Israel is conceived of as a person, possessed of a common life, responsible for its deeds, capable of receiving and reciprocating the love of Jehovah. 'When Israel was a child,' writes Hosea, 'then I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt.'[1] When the same prophet foretells that 'After two days will He revive us; on the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live before Him,'[2] he describes figuratively the revival of Israel from the troubles in which she has been

[1] Hos. xi. 1. [2] Hos. vi. 2.

submerged. It is of the whole people he is speaking. And when again he utters words which are to receive splendid application at the hands of St. Paul, 'I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O grave, where is thy destruction?'[1] he is not proclaiming the hope of a personal resurrection, but the belief that Israel as a nation will live in spite even of death itself. 'Though all the plagues which fill the dark city of Sheol were let loose upon Israel as a nation, they would be incapable of destroying Jehovah's son.'[2] Now such teaching as this, while it does not imply a belief in the future of the individual, at least paves the way for such a belief. Along with the thought of a national resurrection was the growing sense of individualism in religion, so that, as Kuenen remarks, 'the same arguments that pleaded for the perpetual existence of Israel, pleaded also for the endless life of a single human being.'[3] In some way or other—so the inference would run—God would open up for the righteous man a way through the gloom of Sheol to the upper world of light and glory.

This bold thought finds expression in a passage which 'may be referred most plausibly to the early post-exilic period.'[4] It may be literally translated thus: 'Dead men do not live; shades do not rise: wherefore Thou visitest them and destroyest them, and perishest all memory of them. Thy dead shall live! My dead bodies shall arise! Awake and sing, ye dwellers in the dust: for a dew of lights is thy dew, and the land bringeth forth her dead.'[5] The prophet represents first the reality of a sad experience—'dead men do not live'—that is, there is no return from Sheol. The nation restored from the Exile is personified;

---

[1] Hos. xiii. 14.

[2] Cheyne, 'Hosea,' *Cambridge Bible*, p. 124. Compare also the Versions of the Valley of Dry Bones, Ezek. xxxvii. 1–12.

[3] *Religion of Israel* (Eng. Trans.), vol iii. p. 30.

[4] Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 210.

[5] Isa. xxvi. 14, 19.

looks upon her land ravaged by her enemies; sees the meagreness of her repopulated territory; and calls to mind the multitudinous graves in Babylon and at home. In the moment of her despair is born her grandest hope. These graves will not retain their dead for ever. The thought of Jehovah's power and the realization of her own need conspire to create the hope of a resurrection of her individual members. Speaking *to* herself she says, 'Thy dead shall live!' Speaking *of* herself she cries, 'My dead bodies shall arise!' Here there is a clear intimation of a resurrection of the individual. 'A restoration of the state or community was not enough; the heart of Israel wanted back in their numbers her dead sons and daughters.'[1]

It has been argued that the hope of a resurrection to eternal life arose in Judaism through various foreign influences. Egypt, Babylon, Persia—each in turn has been considered the ruling factor in the formation of Israel's later hope. Professor Cheyne in particular has pleaded for a special influence on the development of our doctrine by the teaching of Zasathastra, the founder of the reformed Mazdean faith.[2] But all that Dr. Cheyne seems to have made credible is simply this: The Persian ideas floating in the air may have pointed the Jew to the latent possibilities of his own religion; but beyond this it is hard to see what they could have done for Judaism which Judaism could not have done for itself. The presuppositions of the hope of resurrection and immortality were by this time commonplaces of Jewish faith. All that was needed was some outer change in the national and individual fortune, some providential discipline, in order to mature the germs lying hidden in past revelations. And such a discipline, as has been seen, was the Exile. The hope of immortality, while it may have been strengthened and confirmed by the faith of foreign peoples, is in no essential particular the fruit of external influence. It sprang by necessity out of a preceding de-

[1] G. A. Smith, *Book of Isaiah*, vol. i. p. 150.
[2] *Bampton Lectures for* 1889, pp. 381–425.

velopment of thought and discipline of spirit which, ripened by the outward providential ordering of history, came at length to full fruition. If, then, the conditions which create the faith are already deeply laid in the hearts of the Hebrew religion, what need is there to invoke the forces of an alien creed?[1]

So far the great hope is confined to the people of Israel. Of all others the prophet could only say, 'Dead men do not live.' It remained for another to show how the intuition of another life arose within the heart of one who was no child of Abraham, and thus became the possession of universal man. The Book of Job represents a man in the hands of bitter grief. A believer in the old doctrine that lot and character are always harmonized in this world, he has found a perplexing contradiction to it in his own experience. He is conscious of his own integrity, yet he has been visited by many and sore misfortunes. There is no injustice in his hands, and his prayer is pure;[2] yet God is his giant foe, running upon him, taking him by the neck, and breaking him in pieces.[3] To whom can he appeal in the agony of his soul? Only to God, but to Him now no longer as an enemy, rather as the Witness of His servant's wrongs.[4] This truer thought of God abides with Job to comfort him. Stung by the taunts of Bildad, and knowing how undeserved they are, he longs for some permanent memorial of his innocence, a graving on the rock with a pen of iron and lead.[5] But such a thought satisfies him only for a moment: the vision of a more glorious vindication flashes on his soul, and breaks into speech: 'But I know that my Redeemer liveth, and in after-time, as an afterman, will stand upon the earth. And after my skin which is destroyed—this here, even without my flesh, shall I see God; whom *I* shall see and my own eyes behold, and not another's; and my reins faint within me.'[6] This is a very difficult passage, but it is clear that Job expects God

---

[1] Compare Charles, *A Critical History*, pp. 134–7.
[2] Job xvi. 17. [3] Job xvi. 14, 12. [4] Job xvi. 19. [5] Job xix. 24.
[6] Job xix. 25–7 (Dr. Davidson's Trans.)

to intervene in his behalf after death. He hopes that when his body lies in the grave he will witness God's vindication of his integrity, and see Him by the eye of the spirit. 'The importance of the spiritual advance here made cannot be exaggerated. This new view of the next life springs from a spiritual root, and owes nothing to any animistic doctrines of the soul then existing. We have here a new doctrine of the soul. The soul is no longer cut off from all communion with God on death, and shorn of all its powers, even of existence, as Job and his contemporaries had been taught to conceive it, but is regarded as still capable of the highest spiritual activities, though without the body.'[1]

Now, what is the mark of revelation here? Not indeed the rise of the great Hope, but the way in which it arose. The Hope itself was not unknown outside the chosen sphere of God's direct communications; but there it was bound up with a mythological system as in Babylonia, Persia, and Egypt, and therefore liable to the fate that overtakes the myth; or it was a speculation as in Greece, and therefore exposed to the ever-varying fortunes of speculative thought. In the Old Testament, however, the idea arises amid the complexities of moral experience, and is rooted, on the one hand, in a grander conception of God than was possible to ethnic faith, and, on the other, in a corresponding conception of man. God is Redeemer, the Vindicator of the right; man is the redeemed, whose being is too dear to God to perish in the grave. As Redeemer, God needs another world than this in order to make manifest His Redeemer-hood; and that means man's survival of bodily death. The faith thus born must live, and become the abiding possession of humanity. But an idea involving so much that seemed subversive of older beliefs could not meet with general acceptance without arousing controversy. And so in the Book of Ecclesiastes we have the sceptic's doubts set forth. The prevailing tone of the work is negative and, in a sense, pessimistic. The age in which the author lived was one of

[1] Charles, *A Critical History*, p. 71.

disappointment and disillusionment; and generalizing from his own experience he rings the changes on the depressing thought: 'Vanity of vanities; all is vanity.' Yet the author being a Jew could not wholly give himself up to blank atheism. He doubts indeed, looking at the matter from an external point of view, whether there is any difference between the man and the brute.[1] Still, there is a sense of man's relation to God expressed in the words: 'And the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return unto God who gave it.' There are allusions to judgement and retribution;[2] but it is not clear whether they are to be referred to a future life, or to the action of an earthly Providence. Probably a later writer added the closing verses of the book, in order to point to its true message and to preserve its teaching from abuse. Life is a painful enigma; we cannot understand it. Our duty, then, is to submit to the laws of God, and hope for a day when He will clear up the contradictions of His government, and will award praise and punishment in accordance with the demands of justice. Such is the last word of the Old Testament; let us now turn to the teaching of the New.

The Incarnation is the decisive point in the religious history of mankind. Before Christ came, the hope of a future life with Gentile thinkers was a speculation held in the face of manifold opposition as probable; while in the Old Testament, as we have seen, it was the splendid dream of noble souls that could not bear to lose their hold on God. In the teaching and person of our Lord the speculation is changed into a spiritual certainty, and the dream passes into reality. He puts His imprimatur on the deepest instincts of the race, and closes with fulfilment the prophecies of the past. In His gospel, 'life and immortality are brought to light.'

1. Our Lord distinguishes between existence and life. An unreceptive, unresponsive soul may be said to exist; but

[1] Eccles. iii. 21. [2] Eccles. iii. 17, xi. 9, xii. 14.

it does not *live* until it has been touched to spiritual sensibility. A synonym for mere existence is 'death.'[1] This existence is predicated of all men: Lives, though devoid of life in Christ's sense, still exist in the other world. The only life worth speaking of is a life which is 'rich toward God.'[2] Thus immortality in the full sense of the word belongs to spiritual character.

2. In His argument with the Sadducees, Jesus grounds belief in resurrection and immortality, on the one hand, on a true conception of God's power, and, on the other, on a veritable revelation given to the fathers.[3] The Sadducees could conceive only of one form or way of life, namely, a life conditioned by sex and connected with earthly appetites and senses: Jesus points out that God can provide a new form of life for the soul, analogous to the state of the angels in heaven. This teaching is very significant, as it not only refutes the notion of the Sadducees, but also repudiates the crass materialism of Pharisaic thoughts about the resurrection-body. The argument from God's revelation of Himself as the 'God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob' is not one from the tense expressed in the English version ('I am'), but from the spiritual relation involved. 'If God thus solemnly declared His relation to those patriarchs in order to signify to Moses what He *is*, and not merely what He *was*, He must have meant this relation as one not merely belonging to the past, but as still continuing. If He declared His communion with the patriarchs as still continuing, they must, in spite of their dying, have entered upon a state of existence corresponding to fellowship with God.'[4] This state, though one of blessedness, is not yet the full resurrection and heavenly life, but contains within itself the conditions which necessitate that life.

3. Our Lord teaches that the resurrection is universal. This thought appears only in an incidental manner, and on this account it has been denied a place in His doctrine of the

---

[1] Luke ix. 60. [2] Luke xii. 21. [3] Mark xii. 18–27.
[4] Wendt, *Teaching of Jesus* (Eng. Trans.), vol. i. p. 222.

future. Now it is true that our Lord, thinking chiefly of the resurrection to blessedness, connects it with the life which He bestows on the believing soul: 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth on Me, though he die, yet shall he live.'[1] He strengthens the hope of the resurrection by the thought of union with Himself. As He descends into the grave, emerges from it, and passes into the heaven of heavens, so His people in organic union with Him, though for a time under the power of death, must yet prove victors over it. Yet nowhere does He deny a resurrection to the wicked. In His symbolic account of the final judgement all nations are represented as gathered before Him, a vast and promiscuous assembly, while He as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats.[2]

4. As to the nature of the future life, our Lord's teaching is for the most part symbolic. The blessedness of the heavenly life is described as a royal enthronement,[3] as a rejoicing like that of a bridal feast,[4] as a state of authority and dignity,[5] as a royal banquet in the kingdom of God.[6] These terms are of course to be interpreted spiritually. They were the traditional forms in which the popular Messianic hope clothed itself, and expressed the sensuous imaginings of the great bulk of the Jewish people in the first century of our era. But Christ takes them, rids them of their earthly and external character, fills them with new spiritual significance, and makes them the vehicle of His higher and heavenlier thought. The future life is not one ruled by sensuous satisfaction, nor is it concerned with the realization of earthly dreams of greatness; it consists in expansion of soul, in the joy of unbroken fellowship with God and His redeemed humanity, and in the grander possibilities of service.

5. The supreme revelation of a future life is given in the fact that Christ actually rose from the grave. The resurrection of Christ gives rise to questions critical, historical,

---

[1] John xi. 25. [2] Matt. xxv. 32. [3] Matt. xix. 28.
[4] Matt. xxv. 10. [5] Luke xix. 17. [6] Luke xxii. 30.

and philosophical that do not here call for discussion. Suffice it to say that, on a spiritualistic interpretation of the universe, the rising from the dead of the only sinless personality our world has ever known becomes credible and rational, agrees with the highest idea of God, and of the ultimate realities of experience. We have indeed been recently told, in consequence of the new evidence afforded by the investigations of the Psychical Research Society and kindred bodies, 'all reasonable men a century hence will believe the resurrection of Christ, whereas, in default of the new evidence, no reasonable man, a century hence, would have believed it.'[1] This argues a strange misconception of the place which the resurrection history holds in the Christian faith. We may indeed find sufficient historical evidence to assure us that on the first Easter morning the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea was found open and empty; but that is the utmost scientific proof can do. Only faith can explain the empty tomb—faith that rests, not on external facts but on a personal experience of Him who claimed to be Lord of life and death. Those who believe that in some real sense Christ conquered death and reawoke to life and glory, do so, not primarily because of any alleged external evidence for it, but because they believe that such a destiny would be only congruous with His earthly career and the work He has achieved and is achieving in humanity. In this high region psychic research looks like an impertinence and an irrelevance.

A word or two in conclusion as to the light thrown by Christ's resurrection on the life beyond.

First, it gives us an instance of a life that has permanently survived the shock of death. The reign of death over humanity has been broken. In the Risen One we see that the physical order is not supreme, that the spiritual can make the material subserve its higher ends. Secondly, our Lord's resurrection is not an isolated event, unconnected

[1] Myers, *Human Personality and Its Survival of Bodily Death*, vol. ii. p. 288.

with the history of humanity. He is but the first and great example of the operation of a new law. His resurrection carries with it the resurrection of all who are identified with Him. 'He, first and alone, leads the great procession from the prison-house of death, from forgetfulness and nothingness—leads the great triumph of the redeemed of God: the forefathers of the human race, the patriarchs of the Church, saint, and prophet, and witness to the truth; all who were strangers and pilgrims in the land, which, though they knew it not, was their own; all those who, not having the law, were a law unto themselves, the blessed and accepted of Him who is no respecter of persons.'[1]

Finally, in Christ as risen we see revealed a new order of life. Herein His resurrection stands distinguished from all other raisings from the dead recorded in Holy Writ. *They* were but restorations to the conditions of earthly existence; *His* is the abiding revelation of a new mode of being. The appearances of the risen Lord could not have been the creation of the disciples' minds, for they pointed to a unique and unprecedented manner of existence. Whatever was essential to His personality escaped the grasp of death, yet the limitations of the flesh did not pass into the new order. In Him, as risen, God has made disclosure of His final purpose with regard to man. Humanity has been carried through death, changed in the passage, yet retaining all that is essential to its idea; casting off all that clogs its progress and cramps its energies, yet preserving the identity of its life unchanged. As modern science proclaims its discovery that this earth has no permanence, but is hasting to decay and death, it is well to recall the revelation made in Christ of another world into which will be safely gathered out of this dying and deceitful one all that is truly human, 'all that is just, pure, lovely, and of good report.'

S. M'COMB.

---

[1] Church, *Cathedral and University Sermons*, p. 138.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF INTOLERANCE.

Religious Persecution: A Study in Political Psychology. By E. S. P. HAYNES. (Duckworth. 1904.)

History of the Inquisition. Three Vols. By H. C. LEA (Philadelphia). (Sampson, Low, & Co. 1888.)

Persecution and Tolerance. Hulsean Lectures for 1893. By MANDELL CREIGHTON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of London. (Longmans. 1895.)

Tolerance: Two Lectures. By PHILLIPS BROOKS. (Macmillan. 1887.)

Roman Catholic Claims. By CHARLES GORE, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Birmingham. Popular Edition. (Longmans. 1904.)

IN one of his letters to Mary Gladstone, Lord Acton writes: 'The Natural History of Intolerance has yet to be written.' That is so; and it is safe to add, that when it is written it will have to be written by one who possesses Acton's universal and accurate erudition, coupled with his noble fairness of judgement. For not only is intolerance one of the most pervasive of human traits, but it has a history which is vitally bound up with the history of the race, and presents a singular amalgam of that which is noblest in human character and that which is basest.

For practical purposes, intolerance may be described as the disposition which is unwilling to consider the possible validity and rectitude of opinions, sincerely held, but differing from our own. It must be remembered from the first that just as tolerance is distinct from toleration—the disposition from the manifestation of it—so must intolerance be kept distinct from what may be called 'intoleration'—the

expression of intolerance in persecution of various kinds. The disposition of intolerance may be rampant, and yet the power to persecute may be lacking: as indeed is the case to-day, according to the writer of a certain well-known Anglican catechism, who regrets that 'the lukewarmness of the State prevents the wholesome laws of the Church being carried out.' But it is the disposition which is the vital fact for the student of social and religious life, and on that account religious persecution will be only dwelt upon here in so far as it is symptomatic of the disposition of intolerance. How far, if at all, the State is justified in interfering with religious belief and worship, belongs to another field of inquiry altogether; and the toleration, or the converse, which is purely a matter of opportunism or police, likewise must not detain us. So far as it is possible to isolate one trait of character and trace its origin and manifestations, we shall strive to confine ourselves to the spirit of intolerance as manifested by those who not only are professed disciples of Christ, but who persuade themselves that their intolerance — which they call by some more gracious name—is a necessary corollary to their discipleship.

It is a noteworthy fact that, as a matter of experience, while toleration has preceded tolerance, intolerance has preceded 'intoleration.' Toleration is accepted as a practical compromise long before it is endorsed as an ethical principle; and it is thus accepted when and in so far as it is found to be safe to apply it, or impossible to carry out the opposite policy. It is only at a far later period that men become enamoured of the beauty and excellence of the tolerant spirit, and the apostles of tolerance for its own sake cease to be mere voices crying in the wilderness. On the other hand, intolerance has always preceded 'intoleration'; but for centuries apologies for the use of coercion are put forward by the most uncompromising persecutors, as though they were in a degree conscious of the incongruity of the situation. For instance, Dr. Lea quotes the case of one of the minor councils of the ninth century, which had to deal with a heretic whose theories struck at the very root of the

mediatory office of the Church. He was sentenced to be scourged; but at the same time it was expressly stated that this was on account of the infraction of the Benedictine rule prohibiting monks from travelling without commendatory letters from their bishops!

The genesis of the spirit of tolerance is, by a certain class of writers, sought for in a wrong quarter. It was the opinion of Charles James Fox that the only foundation for tolerance was a degree of scepticism; and that same temper pervades Mr. Haynes's book. And it may as well be said here, once and for all, that a distinction must be made between Mr. Haynes as a student of history and ecclesiasticism, and Mr. Haynes as a critic of religion. The former is acute and well informed, caustic and sometimes unfair, but always useful and stimulating. But the latter is strangely ignorant and undiscerning, so far as this book reveals him. He has explored the dust-heaps of Church history, and has set out for us his discoveries; and they are all sound indictments of a depraved Church, but not of Christianity. There is hardly a sentence in the book that suggests an acquaintance with that vital piety which illuminates and transforms the lives of thousands upon thousands of all nations in every age, and for which all the splendour of the mediaeval and modern Church is a worthless substitute. Of the Holy Spirit, working in the heart of the believer, taking of the things of God and interpreting them unto men, he seems to be as ignorant as those who 'knew not that there was a Holy Spirit'; and yet, if the teaching of Christ means anything at all, it is there that we have to seek for the centre of gravity, and not in the ecclesiastical machine. Mr. Haynes has mistaken Erastian ecclesiasticism for Christianity, presumably because it has bulked largest to the gaze. No wonder he is sceptical, contemptuous, pessimistic! He may well look for a day when 'the leader of a new religion gives the modern world a gospel which will satisfy its ethical, philosophical, and emotional needs.' It might have been otherwise had he observed the workings of a spiritual force and life, whether under Catholic or

Protestant forms, whether within the sphere of influence of St. Alban's Holborn, the Manchester Mission, or Exeter Hall.

It is on grounds such as these that the distinction between tolerance and toleration needs to be maintained. Toleration may be considered, as it was by Burke, a part of moral and political prudence: that does not concern us here, for it is bound up with so much that is wholly outside our sphere. But we would affirm that it is only a bastard tolerance which is based on indifference or scepticism; for only he who is swayed by strong convictions can appreciate how dear his opponent's convictions will be to him, and will therefore have no desire to influence those convictions save by argument and reason. This may seem a platitude almost unworthy of mention in this age of liberty; but not only is the inability to recognize this simple fact the historical root of mediaeval persecution, but even to-day it is disputed or ignored by the Papal Curia on the one side, and Orange Lodges on the other. There is no necessary connexion between tolerance and scepticism, between intolerance and conviction. Intolerance is the child of a mésalliance between attachment to truth and scepticism as to its vitality if subjected to free criticism and discussion. Tolerance is begotten of the sense of the inherent power of truth, linked with a reverence for the inherent rights of man.

Seeing, then, that our present inquiry is not into the policy of States and Churches, but rather into the dispositions of Christian disciples, we naturally turn to Scripture for light, and especially to the teaching of our Lord. The *loci classici* on the subject are two:—'John said, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in Thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us." But Jesus said, "Forbid him not: for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in My name, and be able quickly to speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is for us"' (Mark ix. 38–40). 'And when His disciples James and John saw this, they said, "Lord, wilt Thou that we bid fire to come down from

heaven and consume them?" But He turned and rebuked them' (Luke ix. 54, 55). We cannot dwell upon the interesting questions raised by the latter passage—the threefold addition to the text, and the possibility that in this episode we have the historic basis for the Parable of the Tares of the Field. What concerns us at present is the unmistakable bearing of the two passages upon the question of intolerance. Not only is chastisement deprecated in the case of those who are perverse through ignorance, but no quarter is given to the spirit which would frown upon a good work because it came from unauthorized workers. The intolerance of Jesus was reserved for those who were untrue to their own standard; who might have known, and ought to have known, the truth, and did not; who covered up their depravity of heart with a cloak of zealous orthodoxy. For such He has no tolerance, as is shown by Matt. xxiii.; but to him who stumbles and staggers towards the truth He promises that 'he who willeth to do the will of God shall know of the doctrine.'

As soon as we touch the writings of the apostles we are conscious at once of a new factor, which is absent from the Gospels. Jesus taught by virtue of an inherent authority, they by virtue of a delegated stewardship. Now it is 'required in stewards that a man be found faithful'; and as 'stewards of the mysteries of God' they felt their responsibility for safeguarding the truth committed to their keeping, lest the stream should become tainted at the source. But the greater part of the intolerance of the apostles is directed against those whose false doctrine had led, or was bound to lead, to a lowering of moral tone, or which radically and essentially impaired the great redemptive purpose of the Lord. An apparent exception is the anathema of Gal. i.; but we must here remember Amiel's caution against 'confusing the right of the individual to be free with the duty of the institution to be something.' The responsible leaders of the early Church had a true sense that the kernel of the gospel was faith in Jesus Christ as the Saviour of all men, without distinction and without mediation; and that those

who maintained the Judaistic limitations of the gospel, or who were not bound to the Lord Jesus Christ by loving devotion (1 Cor. xvi. 22), placed themselves outside the Christian society, and must be left to Him who was thought to be at hand (Maranatha), to show mercy or to condemn.

When we go further and view intolerance on the field of history, we find, as a rule, in the early Church little more than a genuine and devout passion to safeguard the truth. Cyprian's dictum may be taken as the norm, however much he and others may have allowed themselves to deviate from it: 'No one may undertake to purge the threshing-floor or sever the wheat from the tares by human judgement. This proud obstinacy and sacrilegious presumption spring from wicked anger.' But every decade since the dawn of the second century saw religion tend to harden more and more into ecclesiasticism; and with that hardening there developed an increasing intolerance of opinions which even in minor details deviated from the officially accepted standard. Thus in 196, Victor, Bishop of Rome, attempted to excommunicate the Asiatic churches because they held to the practice of keeping Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover, whatever day of the week that might be; and we find Tertullian madly raving at a heretic who taught that water was not necessary in baptism: there is, he tells her, nothing in common between them, not even the same God or the same Christ. This being the temper of the age, there were only wanting some favouring circumstances to cause that disposition to break out into action—intolerance to become persecution. Those favouring circumstances came soon enough, and from the quarter whence came all the sorrows of the Christian Church—its acceptance as the religion of the State by Constantine. The State's standard of external conformity took the place of spiritual soundness within; and this alien standard brought with it alien means of enforcement. The false analogy of the State caused orthodoxy to be identified with loyalty, Church discipline with police; and inviolability came to be transferred from the Truth to the Church, as being charged with the duty of maintaining order

in the sphere of belief and worship. Thus the moment of the seeming triumph of the Church was in reality the beginning of a base surrender to the spirit, methods, and ideals of the world. The State gives nothing for nothing, and the price to be paid for State protection is subservience to the State, and a more or less conscious adoption of the standards of the State. Hence the spectacle of loyalty to the State and conformity to the Church enforced as one by the heavy hand of the State, to the irreparable damage of religion; for, as a necessary consequence, the Church is dragged in its train to bless unholy enterprises—whether it be the case of Cranmer endorsing with criminal subservience the matrimonial designs of Henry VIII; or the Caroline bishops cringing before Charles II and Nell Gwynne; or Scotch Moderates of the eighteenth century clinging to patronage and 'intrusion,' with all their evils; or Servian bishops singing Te Deums on the accession of King Peter to his blood-stained throne. 'No one,' said Lord Melbourne, 'has a more sincere respect for the Church than I have; but things have come to a pretty pass when religion is allowed to invade the sphere of private life.' Such is the nemesis of Erastianism.

In so far as the control of the Church by the State is concerned, these relations lie outside our sphere for present purposes. Religious persecution as an element of police discipline is to be kept as distinct as possible from the disposition of heart on the part of Christian men which defends such a course as a duty to God and man; and it is the latter which alone belongs to the Natural History of Intolerance. The false analogy of the State, when transferred to the Church, wrought more lasting havoc than any direct interference. Augustine, for instance—to whom all heretics and the children of heretics were dangerous lunatics, to be treated accordingly — frankly avows his abandonment of his former disposition of tolerance by reason of the spectacle presented by his own city of Hippo, 'which, after having belonged wholly to the Donatists, was converted and reunited to the Catholic Church by the fear of the

imperial laws, and which has now such a horror of that unhappy schism that you could not believe that it had ever been engaged in it.' In face of such a spirit, how true is Creighton's reflection that 'it is not the wickedness of bad men, but the failings of good men, which reveal the dominion of sin'! Augustine must have forgotten that incident of the Samaritan village, or he could never have rejoiced over heretics 'reunited to the Catholic Church by fear of the imperial laws.' Nor was Augustine alone. Jerome argues that piety and zeal towards God cannot be cruelty; and he is full of anger towards a bishop because he had not destroyed a heretic in the flesh for the good of his soul—although the heresy was nothing more vital than denunciation of the adoration of relics; which shows how soon even the best men lost the simplicity of the gospel, and used the whole weight of the power both of Church and State to suppress every assertion of freedom, even upon details. The alliance with the State having made coercion possible, and the analogy of the State having made it appear desirable, the temptation to the mediaeval Church was irresistible: it launched forth upon a career of unblushing persecution, and many of the acutest intellects of the time busied themselves weaving wondrous schemes of justification for it, as though dimly conscious that such a course needed justification and defence. So we find Thomas Aquinas arguing that as it is more wicked to corrupt the faith than debase the coinage, therefore heretics deserve death more justly even than coiners; forgetting, as Mr. Haynes points out, that 'the analogy is built up on a flagrant begging of the question, namely, that heretics consciously try to persuade men to believe poisonous perversions of the truth which they know to be false.' It is true that occasionally there are gleams of something less Erastian, more generous. Bernard of Clairvaux reminded Eugenius IV that in his power he was successor not of Peter but of Constantine: and Dr. Lea tells of some pestilent heretics in the diocese of Cologne who wickedly refused to abstain from milk, eggs, and cheese during Lent; and, after futile attempts to bring them back

to the purity of the ecclesiastical faith, the archbishop let them go their own way, consoling himself with the thought that those who were loyal to the truth could not be much harmed by difference in diet! But such broad-mindedness was exceptional. The temper of the age was rather that of a Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine than of Christ; Aquinas counted for more than Bernard; and the Inquisition was at the door.

But it is not only in ecclesiastics that we find this disposition: it pervaded all religious conduct, and was the assumption underlying all religious administration. Nowhere in English literature is there a more beautiful spirit breathed than in More's *Utopia*—the panegyric on the ideal institutions and administration of the kingdom of Nowhere, with sly thrusts at the abuses which surrounded the writer at the Court of Henry VIII. 'First of all,' we are told, 'King Utopus made a decree that it should be lawful for every man to favour and follow what religion he would, and that he might do the best he could to bring others to his opinion, so that he did it peaceably, gently, quietly, and soberly, without hasty and contentious rebuking and inveighing against others. And this surely he thought a very unmete thing and foolish, and a point of arrogant presumption, to compel all by violence and threatenings to agree to the same that thou believest true.' But England was not Utopia, and Sir Thomas More, the Chancellor, was far removed from Sir Thomas More, man of letters; and just that line of conduct which he had thus stigmatized as 'arrogant presumption' was the line which he followed in dealing with those who possessed heretical books—mostly versions of the Scriptures in the vernacular—and held heretical views. Likening the heretical spirit to a carbuncle, he says, 'To the clean cutting out that part for infection of the remnant, I am by mine office, in virtue of mine oath, right especially bounden.'

But the pervasiveness of the intolerant spirit is seen more clearly still when we pass over from Catholic Europe to Protestant, and find the same characteristics; and with less

justification, in that there was no historic theory, no long tradition to be pleaded in defence. It was Luther who shrieked, 'Let there be no pity: it is the time of wrath, not mercy. He who dies fighting for authority is a martyr before God. So wondrous are the times that princes can merit heaven better by bloodshed than by prayers.' And although some allowance must be made for his horror at a reforming movement which had burst free from all control, it must also be remembered that Luther's was an essentially despotic nature, and that he was as far from the spirit of toleration as an Inquisitor. The notion of liberty, whether civil or religious, was hateful to him; and he even held that the unspeakable Turk was to be reverenced as bearing authority, for 'I am certain,' he says, 'that no authority exists without God willing it.' When we turn to that far gentler spirit, Melanchthon, we find that even he is committed to the same incongruity—the propagation of truth by the sword. 'It is clear,' he says, 'that it is the duty of the secular government to punish blasphemy, false doctrine, and heresy on the bodies of those guilty of them. . . . Since it is evident that there are gross errors in the articles of the Anabaptist sect, we conclude that in this case the obstinate ought to be punished with death.' When Calvin, to his eternal shame, burned Servetus at Geneva, Melanchthon is found among those who warmly applauded the deed. 'I assert that your magistrates have done justly, in that after trial they have slain a man who is a blasphemer. I marvel that there are those who condemn the severity.' And the scholarly Beza, amazed and grieved that any should dissent from such a godly work, cries out, 'What remains of Christianity if we silently admit what this man has expectorated in his preface?'—referring to an attack on Calvin; and he then proceeds to lay down that obstinate heretics are worse than parricides, and deserve death even if they repent.

We cannot stay to notice how the spirit of mediaeval Catholicism lived on after the Reformation in England, and manifested itself in the Anglicanism which supplanted Papalism in this kingdom. It has been truly said of Laud,

in whom the Anglican system became incarnate, that he would never convince an opponent if he could crush him: to-day Bishop Gore 'would desire a Nonconformist to be brought to the Church by the increasing sense that in proportion as he became unselfish, and threw himself upon the body he belonged to, he became conscious that as a body, as an organization, it did not represent the divine kingdom, but human self-will.' The contrast is significant of much; and however astonished one may feel at so dogmatic a pronouncement upon a matter upon which Scripture says practically nothing, we cannot but welcome the disposition which thus approaches a different body of thought. It may leave much to be desired—it undoubtedly does; but the advance upon the spirit of the Middle Ages and of Laud is immense.

And in justice to Catholicism, Anglican and Roman, we are bound to concede that Puritanism was not substantially nearer the principle and disposition of tolerance than the systems against which it fought. Creighton, in his lecture on Laud, asserts that the Puritans were fighting, not for tolerance but for supremacy; and his assertion is true of all the Puritanism which succeeded in making its influence felt in the land. If there was a Puritanism which looked beyond the prejudices of the time and loved tolerance for its own sake, not as a safe policy but as a fundamental virtue of Christian character, it is to be sought for in the few seers like Milton, and not in those who sat in councils and asserted their authority over men's thoughts as well as deeds. 'Liberty of conscience,' cries Baillie, the diligent chronicler of the Westminster Assembly, 'Liberty of conscience and the toleration of all or any religion is so prodigious an impiety that this religious Parliament cannot but abhor the very naming of it'; and in this scream he was only giving expression to the general sentiment of the Presbyterianism of his time, which was as exclusive and intolerant as the Prelacy which it denounced. The other wing of the Puritan party, the Independents, came somewhat nearer to the appreciation of the principle of tolerance. In the 36th and

37th Articles of Government, in which is embodied Cromwell's system of ecclesiastical administration, it is laid down that 'such as profess faith in God by Jesus Christ (though differing in judgement from the doctrine, worship, or discipline publicly held forth) shall not be restrained from, but shall be protected in the profession of the faith and exercise of their religion, so as they abuse not their liberty to the civil injury of others, and to the actual disturbance of the public peace on their part.' This sounds like an echo of Utopia, until one goes on to read, 'provided that this liberty be not extended to Popery nor Prelacy, nor to such as under the profession of Christ hold forth and practise licentiousness'—a qualification which ruins the value of the previous utterance as a pronouncement on the side of tolerance of spirit as well as toleration in action. It may be pleaded that the dread of Popery and Prelacy was political rather than religious: in a degree that was so, but this qualification shows how far the Independents were from that reverence for truth which is shown alike in the realization that it is able to stand erect of itself without human buttresses of pains and penalties, and that it is many-sided, and only the egotist thinks he is in possession of it all. Milton saw this clearly enough, for after telling of Typhon and Osiris he applies the story to 'a wicked race of deceivers,' who 'took the virgin Truth, hewed her lovely form into a thousand pieces, and scattered them to the four winds. From that time ever since, the sad friends of Truth, such as durst appear, imitating the careful search that Isis made for the mangled body of Osiris, went up and down gathering limb by limb still as they could find them. We have not yet found them all, Lords and Commons, nor ever shall do, till her master's second coming; he shall bring together every joint and member, and shall mould them into an immortal feature of loveliness and perfection.' But seventeenth-century Puritanism understood not the saying, and it was hid from their eyes, whilst they went forth persecuting and to persecute. The Pilgrim Fathers fled from England that they might escape the intolerance of the Anglican régime—only

to establish a régime yet more hard and intolerant than that of Laud himself. Acton concludes his essay on 'The Protestant Theory of Persecution' with a reminder which is most humiliating to all who honour the memory of those who by their noble stand against tyranny laid the foundations for the religious freedom which we enjoy to-day. Respecting the establishment of the colonies of Maryland and Massachusetts, he writes: 'The Catholic emigrants established for the first time in modern history a government in which religion was free, and with it the germ of that religious liberty which now prevails in America. The Puritans, on the other hand, revived with greater severity the penal laws of the mother country. In process of time the liberty of conscience in the Catholic colony was forcibly abolished by the neighbouring Protestants of Virginia, while upon the borders of Massachusetts the new State of Rhode Island was formed by a party of fugitives from the intolerance of their fellow colonists.'

These glances at the history of past centuries afford only too much evidence of the pervasiveness and pungency of the spirit of intolerance. Altogether apart from the persecution which the State has from time to time undertaken from a mistaken conception of the requirements of public order—a line of conduct which has to be discussed from an altogether different standpoint—we find Christian disciples of undoubted piety and devotion, belonging to all periods of the Christian era and all sections of the Christian Church, pervaded at one time or other, in greater or less degree, with this disposition which refuses to concede the possible validity of opinions opposed to their own, and by so doing kills within itself the spiritual sympathy which has affinity with Truth everywhere, and ever seeks for the element of truth in opposing systems. The peculiar peril of an age of controversy such as ours lies in the disposition to lay stress upon fragments of the truth, upon points in dispute; for this is certain, in all but the highest natures, to generate the spirit of intolerance; and the danger is rendered all the greater by the fact that there is behind such championship a passionate attachment to

certain principles, which are conceived as essential to the well-being of the race and the progress of the kingdom of God. Moreover, it is so easy and apparently effective to urge against the advocates of tolerance that they are making all matters of religious belief into 'open questions,' and that in so doing they are denying the Faith. Nevertheless, even at that risk, tolerance is the ideal to be sought after, provided it be the tolerance that is based on conviction, not on indifference. Phillips Brooks closes his first lecture by defining tolerance as, 'The willing consent that other men should hold and express opinions with which we disagree, until they are convinced by reason that these opinions are untrue.' This does not necessitate that the Christian believer should leave 'open' the great truths of revealed religion, but it does predicate a certain attitude towards those who conceive of those truths in a different fashion. It demands alike of Catholic and Protestant, Anglican and Nonconformist, the qualities of earnest conviction, lest tolerance be a thing of sheer latitudinarianism; and a genuine respect for the convictions of others, lest intolerance should do a wrong to the rights of man.

What, then, shall we say concerning the conditions under which this 'willing consent' is to grow up? What obstacles need to be removed from out of the path of a tolerance which shall be the outcome neither of apathy nor impotence? Four essentials, among others, may be noticed in closing.

I. The false analogy of the State must be banished to the limbo of exploded fallacies. Religious conformity must be recognized as resting on an entirely different basis from political loyalty. 'My kingdom is not of this world, else would My servants fight'; and however necessary force may be as an instrument for the maintenance of political loyalty, every act of violence in the sphere of the individual conscience is an act of treason to that kingdom. But it is in the realm of example, more than in that of action, that the false analogy of the State is dangerous to-day. The age of penalties, proscriptions, and tests is rapidly drawing to a

close; but the conception of authority and obedience which still dominates Catholicism was borrowed from the State in the first instance, and defended out of Scripture, by a curious exegesis, as an afterthought. It was the Empire, so long centred in Rome, that suggested to the Roman bishops those pretensions which later developed, under the fostering influence of ample forgeries, into the Papalism of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*, wherein it was affirmed in the most explicit form that it was 'absolutely necessary to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff.' How little religious basis there was for the contention is shown most ably by Bishop Gore in his careful scrutiny of early expositors of Matt. xvi., revealing the fact that 'nothing approaching ancient consent' can be produced even in support of the claim of the Roman bishop to be among bishops what Peter was really among the apostles—to say nothing of the later Roman Catholic claims. It was the analogy of the State, together with the prestige of Rome, that created the imperial conception of the Church, with all its hardness of dominion and reckless magnificence of life. And having adopted the ideal of the State, it followed as a matter of course that it must use its methods: an evangelical Church may be, and ought to be, tolerant, but an imperial Church never.

II. Intolerance is the offspring of a great fear lest truth should prove unable to maintain itself without human support. Therefore a deepened sense of the majesty and potency of truth will lead to the elimination of force, whether physical or social, as one of its handmaids. And whence is this deepened sense to come? From a truer conception of the Work and Person of the Holy Spirit. The mediaeval Church attempted to safeguard the truth by a rigorous repression of all freedom of thought, by a species of ecclesiastical police, modelled on that of the State. Modern Evangelicalism looks to the Holy Spirit to take of the things of God and interpret them unto men. One of the greatest of the wrongs done by Catholicism to the race is its implicit denial of the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the heart of

the individual, independent of the Church and its sacraments. 'Without a ministry possessing Christ's authority,' says Mr. Vernon Staley in his *Catholic Religion*, 'there can be no certainty that we possess valid sacraments, conveying the grace which they express; and if there is uncertainty about the sacraments, there is uncertainty as to union with Christ.' As though John xiv.–xvii. had never been given us, with its message of personal and individual illumination and guidance by the Holy Spirit! If 'union with Christ' did depend upon the 'valid ministry' thus defined, if the lapse of the apostolic succession through the episcopate would necessitate, as Mr. Staley says later it would, 'a second appointment directly by our Lord, and of a second day of Pentecost with a fresh outpouring of the Holy Spirit,' then no police supervision would be too jealous, no disposition of mind and heart too intolerant. The urgency of the need would be an adequate justification. But could a greater wrong be done to Truth, and to the Spirit of Truth, than thus to confine its operation to the narrow channel of a particular line of ministers? Let there be accepted a true doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and there will no longer remain the fear lest Truth may be unable to maintain itself without the aid of intolerance and persecution. 'You cannot,' says Phillips Brooks, 'make the unit to be a unit by the external unity of one hard shell. If the fruit which you try to enclose is alive, it will burst your shell to pieces as it grows.'

III. There is a Truth which has nothing to do with doctrine, but has for its essence reverence for man, his rights and responsibilities. An adequate and accurate statement of religious truth is of untold value; but what about the realization of the nature of man as a being endowed with reason and free-will, and whose opinions and conduct are only possessed of value in so far as they are free? By all means, let the 'duty of the institution to be something' be respected, but with caution lest these demands cover so wide a field as to paralyse individuality and stultify free-will. The tragedy of ecclesiasticism is not only that it has been intolerant, but intolerant in the field where

intolerance is peculiarly vicious, and in the portion of that field occupied rather by definitions than realities, by matters of interpretation and inference rather than by fundamental truths. When William Penn drew up the Constitution of New Jersey in 1676 he wrote: 'No men nor number of men on earth have power or authority to rule over men's consciences in religious matters.' From the bitter contradiction of Christian intolerance the Quaker was saved by his doctrine of the 'inward light'; and although Mr. Haynes talks somewhat wildly when he says that 'the Nazarene carpenter would hardly have understood the ideas of any Christian sect after the fourth century but the Quakers,' they are to be honoured for having consistently made religion a strictly individual matter, refusing to use pressure of any kind even when politically supreme.

Lastly, intolerance is pervaded by the egotism of personal infallibility: it cannot exist in company with genuine lowliness of mind. No true saint desires to climb on to the judgement seat of Christ; no healthy disciple claims for his body of opinion exclusive validity; and the champion of orthodoxy—be he Wesleyan, Dissenter, Anglican, or unattached—who acts upon the assumption that the cause of God stands or falls with the acceptance of his interpretation of Scripture, is showing himself to be the disciple of Tertullian rather than of Christ, and is acting in accordance with the worst precedents of the Middle Ages. 'Lay so much stress,' says Mr. Wesley, 'on opinions, that all your own, if it be possible, may agree with truth and reason; but have a care of anger, dislike, or contempt towards those whose opinions differ from yours. Condemn no man for not thinking as you think: let every man use his own judgement, since every man must give account of himself unto God.' We have tried to show how Catholicism has fallen short of the Spirit of Christ through its fruitless attempt to achieve the imperial ideal in the sphere of religion. Mr. Wesley's words remind us that the 'unity of the Spirit' is not more likely to take the form of the conversion of all systems of thought to any one existing system than the

submission of all the Churches to one Church. The only 'unity of the Spirit' worth hoping for and praying for is that which is imparted from within by the Spirit Himself; and when that is achieved organizations and dogmas will fall into their own place, and for the first time the strenuous partisan will realize that truth has been fairly equally divided between him and those against whom he fought with such fiery zeal. In short, to quote Bishop Brooks once more, the 'hope of tolerance lies in the advancing spirituality of man.' Here, as often, the blind prophet of Edinburgh saw the truth with undistracted gaze when he sang:

Gather us in, Thou Love that fillest all;
Gather our rival faiths within Thy fold;
Rend each man's temple's veil and bid it fall,
That we may know that Thou hast been of old;
Gather us in.

Gather us in: we worship only Thee;
In various names we stretch a common hand;
In diverse forms a common soul we see;
In many ships we seek one spirit land;
Gather us in.

Each sees one colour of Thy rainbow light;
Each looks upon one tint and calls it heaven;
Thou art the fullness of our partial sight;
We are not perfect till we find the seven;
Gather us in.

W. FIDDIAN MOULTON.

THE TABERNACLE: IDEAL OR ACTUAL?

The Tabernacle: Its History and Structure. By the Rev. W. SHAW CALDECOTT, Member of the Royal Asiatic Society. With a Preface by the Rev. A. H. Sayce, D.D., LL.D. (The Religious Tract Society. 1904.)

THE debt we owe to modern Old Testament scholarship is so great, the results of it are so wealthy an enrichment of our conceptions, that there is some danger lest we should allow its fascination to obscure for us the fact that not all its findings are as yet final, and that the evidence it offers is still to some extent *sub judice*. None of the schools of Old Testament learning are infallible, not even the youngest. To imagine that even in this age of scholarship we have heard the last word on Old Testament criticism would be to arrive at a premature finality, and to shut the door against all further research. 'Old things are not therefore true, O brother man, nor yet the new.'

One curious result of the new learning has been a distinct and strong tendency to disbelieve in the actuality of the tabernacle, and to regard it as a conception which had its origin after the building of the first temple. According to this view, it is simply the Jerusalem temple projected backwards, ideally, into the time of the wilderness journeyings. The temple did not arise out of the history of an earlier tabernacle. The reverse was the order of things. Just as Ezekiel is held to have projected his ideal temple forward into the Messianic age, so a post-exilic writer projects his ideal tabernacle backward to the golden age of Moses. It is not that the temple follows the arrangements of an earlier tabernacle; it is that the tabernacle idea had its origin in the actual temple, and not before. Earlier than the temple there was not so much as a tradition of a tabernacle. The tabernacle owes its form, not to a tradition even, but merely to a religious postulate.

In post-exilic times it was held that things must have been *so* ordered if they were to harmonize with the much later but absolutely authoritative theories. Thus a delicate symbolical idea comes to be transformed into tangible history. This, in almost their own words, is the teaching of Kautzsch and of some others. The tabernacle is the description of a sublime idea.

What has been the origin of a position so novel and so startling? What is there to support it? The strongest, though possibly not the earliest, consideration in support of it is the observation that the story of the tabernacle is found almost, if not quite, exclusively in the document technically known as P, a document which is confessedly of exilic or post-exilic origin. The earlier document or documents, known as J E, and also the document D (our Deuteronomy) are almost, if not quite, ignorant of the tabernacle, or at all events are silent about it. It is possible that there may be some little begging of the question here. It may conceivably have been argued, This and that passage mention the tabernacle, therefore this and that passage must belong to the later document and not to the earlier. That is a form of argument which, unfortunately, has been a little too confidently relied upon at times. It is a weakness of both the extreme critics on the one hand, and of the rigid traditionalists on the other, that they have not always shown a judicial appreciation of the laws of evidence. Moreover, it is a fact acknowledged by the critics themselves, that even the earlier documents, if they do not know of a tabernacle, do know of a 'tent of meeting.' Exod. xxxiii. 7–11 is admitted to belong to the earlier document, J E, and is not denied to be a part of the ancient tradition. Still further, as we shall presently see, the altar which Samuel built in Ramah (1 Sam. vii. 17), so far back as his time, was almost certainly built in an enclosure, still existing, which precisely corresponds in area to the measurements of the tabernacle enclosure—measurements which, on the hypothesis of the critics, were not defined till four centuries or more after Samuel's time. But let that pass. It is conceded for the

present, that, speaking generally, the tabernacle idea occurs in the later and not in the earlier document of Old Testament history. That is the foremost argument for the position of the critics in relation to this matter.

Another argument, and probably an earlier one in the order of occurrence, is the fact that the measurements given, minute as they are, have not hitherto been found to be workable. When it has been attempted to construct a model of the tabernacle from the measurements given, it has been found, for instance, that the lines provided for are mathematical lines, having length without breadth. No allowance appears to have been made for the thickness of the curtains which formed the walls of the structure. The number of pillars provided for is also said to be quite impracticable. This was probably the first hint that we might be dealing with an ideal, not an actual, construction. The hint appears to have been welcomed a little too cordially. It opened up the line of least resistance. When once you have accepted the theory of the sublime ideal, you need no longer burden yourself with the attempt to elucidate embarrassing measurements. You rise into the ampler air and leave the pedestrian ways below. The wonder, however, is not that lines should be mathematically thin as to their breadth, but rather that the *length* of the lines appears to have presented no difficulty vastly more perplexing. Let it be remembered that, so far as the critics were aware, and by their own confession, no reliable data for the exact evaluation of the Hebrew cubit were in existence. A writer in Hastings's *Dictionary* tabulates six or seven varying estimates of the length of the cubit, of which the lowest is sixteen inches and the highest is over twenty-five inches. In face of so great an uncertainty about length, it hardly seems proportionate to give minute difficulties about breadth as a starting-point for sublime ideals.

To this question of measurements we shall find occasion presently to return. In the meantime one can hardly avoid an obvious question. What could possibly have induced a writer, in post-exilic or any other times, to burden his ideal

tabernacle with prosaic details of measurement? Nothing less ideal could well be imagined than this writer's love for order, number, measure, and system. Even if accurate and workable, his measurements would be a sordid weight for a sublime ideal; and if inaccurate and unworkable, the weight is all the heavier. Read his gratuitous architectural details and building plans, his catalogue of rings, staves, borders, loops, clasps, couplings, sockets, bars, hooks, pins, cords. Surely these cannot be regarded as enhancing the ideal and the sublime. Rather they are an invitation to wander off from the ideal into a wholly different region. If it be objected that the ideal holy city in the Apocalypse is also subject to measurements and numbers and lists of all manner of precious stones, one has only to invite the objector to read the two passages in parallel columns, the one in the Apocalypse and the other in Exodus, and then to ask him whether in the matter of the sublime and the ideal they are not as far apart as Homer's Olympus is from Homer's catalogue of ships, or as the east is from the west.

A third argument in use to support the theory of a post-exilic origin of the tabernacle idea is the conviction, held by a great many, that the artistic skill in metal work and dyes which the tabernacle exhibits belongs to a later stage of Israelitish history than the nomadic; and the same is said about the organized ministry proper to the tabernacle. But it is admitted, on the other hand, that the contact of Israel with the advanced civilization of Egypt, and the identification of the earliest progenitors of the race with the Babylonian civilization, considerably modify the force of this argument.

The foregoing represents the stage of the inquiry concerning the tabernacle at which we arrive with the help of recent historical and literary criticism. But we have now to take into consideration the book published a few months ago by the Rev. W. Shaw Caldecott, mentioned at the head of this article. Mr. Caldecott possesses the great advantage, for our present purpose, that he appears to be neutral in the matter of Old Testament criticism. He is not committed to

any critical theory on the one hand, and he is not averse, on the other, to the acceptance of obviously necessary emendations of the text of Scripture. His investigations are entirely independent of either critical or traditional positions. He ignores both of them, and goes his own way. His one object has been to reconstruct the tabernacle on the basis of the directions in the well-known Old Testament passages. Of course he at once encountered the usual apparently insuperable difficulties. That did not, however, lead him to conjecture that he was dealing with an unhistoric and imaginary structure. It simply led him to the conjecture that current conceptions of the length of the cubit must necessarily be wrong. Having time on his hands and a determination not to be baffled in the construction of his model of the tabernacle, he betook himself to the study of the cubit *ab ovo*. Especially he made a minute investigation of two Babylonian documents, the Senkereh Tablet and the Scale of Gudea, and read a paper thereupon to the Royal Asiatic Society. That paper is a highly technical argument, which we do not profess to have mastered. Both the Asiatic Society and Professor Sayce seem to have found it generally acceptable, and we may therefore with some confidence take it as read. At all events it is included in the book. The result of his investigations is what concerns us more than the process of them. And the result is that Mr. Caldecott postulates three different cubits, each with a distinct and definite use; just as we ourselves have three different pounds—avoirdupois, apothecaries', and troy. If a man attempted to make up a doctor's prescription with avoirdupois weights, his embarrassment (not to mention the patient's) would be precisely similar to that of the student who attempts to reconstruct the tabernacle with the wrong cubit. On the other hand, Mr. Caldecott claims that, when the proper cubit is used, the Old Testament measurements are found to be as precise, as accurate, and as feasible as a modern architect's plans.

Mr. Caldecott finds that the hand-breadth was the original standard of measurement. In course of time the

variations in the breadth of a human hand were averaged into the uniform standard of 3.6 inches. For English people it is a convenience to notice that ten hand-breadths are exactly equal to a yard; and Mr. Caldecott has seen African native tribes checking English traders' measurements by precisely this method. Mr. Caldecott finds the three cubits in use for the tabernacle to be respectively five, four, and three hand-breadths, or 18 inches, 14.4 inches, and 10.8 inches. The longer cubit was used for the ground plan, the middle cubit for the building, and the shorter cubit for the work in gold. Adopting these three cubits, and using them in the manner indicated, Mr. Caldecott constructed his model of the tabernacle with no further difficulty; and no less an authority than Professor Sayce says he seems to have done so successfully.

At this stage of his investigations Mr. Caldecott was perhaps entitled to address a few words of remonstrance to the critics on their too hasty assumption that the Old Testament measurements were impracticable. That, however, was not his intention. Their arguments were their own affair, and not his; and as the famous barber 'went on shaving,' so he went on investigating.

It appears that somewhere near Hebron, a little off the main road from Jerusalem, there is a rectangular space enclosed by a low stone wall. The history of this enclosure seemed to be irrecoverably lost; no one had even a conjecture about it. Only, it was recognized to be of the most venerable antiquity. Something in the name of it (Ramêt el-Khalîl) may perhaps have suggested to Mr. Caldecott that it might be worth while to go and measure the enclosure with his newly discovered cubit. So a year ago he quietly packed his bag and went. He asks us to judge of his 'surprised delight' when he found the measurements of the enclosure to be an exact reproduction, four times magnified, of the tabernacle court of worship. And he, not unnaturally, finds it to be the altar unto the Lord which Samuel built in Ramah, as recorded in 1 Sam. vii. 17.

Fortified with this convincing proof of the accuracy of

his theory of the cubit, Mr. Caldecott proceeds to elucidate some Old Testament measurements other than those of the tabernacle—the stature of Goliath of Gath, for example—and also applies it to some Babylonian structures. Thither we need not follow him now, nor need we anticipate his forthcoming work on the temple. It is worthy of note, however, that he finds the Books of the Chronicles quite as reliable for his purposes as the books which the critics hold to be better authenticated.

We may now, in a few sentences, sum up the argument. The critics find Old Testament measurements do not work out, and thereupon conclude that they are not reliable. Mr. Caldecott believes the Old Testament to be unquestionably reliable, and therefore concludes that the difficulty arises from our not understanding the measurements rightly. The critics find the tabernacle to have been a sublime ideal projected backwards from a later date, but never actual. Mr. Caldecott finds the tabernacle to be a sublime ideal, as practicable as it is sublime, as real as it is ideal; a sublime ideal actually existing in solid masonry at Ramêt el-Khalîl to this day. The critics find the tabernacle ideal to have originated in post-exilic times; Mr. Caldecott finds the tabernacle ideal to be existing in masonry as early as the time of Samuel, and in quite practicable wood and curtains as early as the time of Moses. And, finally, the critics find that the Books of the Chronicles are not always reliable history, whereas Mr. Caldecott finds them, for his purpose, as verisimilar as the rest, and continues to believe in their credibility.

For our own part, we are not so distrustful of the Higher Criticism as Mr. Caldecott and Dr. Sayce would have us be. We gladly accept many of its findings, and are able to appreciate the intellectual stimulus and the mental enlargement they have given us. But we hold that Mr. Caldecott's book shows the necessity for caution, and above all for a calm and judicial consideration, and even cross-examination, of evidence from all sides before a verdict is arrived at.

HENRY T. HOOPER.

Recent Literature.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, and their Place in the Plan of the Apocalypse. By W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., Litt.D., LL.D., Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen. (Hodder & Stoughton. 12*s.*)

It is difficult to overestimate the value of Professor Ramsay's contributions to biblical scholarship. His word-pictures, not to speak of excellent photographs and maps, transport his readers to the scenes of the early struggles and triumphs of Christianity. His enthusiasm imparts glow and colour to controversies on recondite questions, which his masterly handling lifts above the dreary level on which such topics too often are discussed. His new book adds another volume of surpassing interest to the much-prized series in which a fine historical sense and first-hand archæological knowledge have been used to cast light on the writings of St. Paul and to vindicate the trustworthiness of St. Luke. The quality of Professor Ramsay's previous work ensures for his latest effort a hearty welcome; on its own merits it will take a high place amongst the most valuable of his studies in the historical interpretation of the New Testament.

In Asia Minor Professor Ramsay is on ground he has thoroughly explored. Out of his treasury he brings forth 'things new and old,' but those who are most familiar with his books and numerous articles will recognize the skill with which material collected during the researches of many years is arranged in new groupings so as to furnish the background for such themes as 'The Symbolism of the Seven Letters,' 'The Jews in the Asian Cities,' and 'The Pagan Converts in the Early Church.' All these topics, especially the first, are treated in a luminous and suggestive way. 'The Symbolism of the Apocalypse' has a deterrent sound, owing to the vagaries of speculation on this subject; nevertheless, the clue to

the significance of these symbols must be sought. Professor Ramsay's modest description of his purpose is—'merely to try to determine what was the meaning which ordinary people in the cities of Asia would gather from the symbolism: especially how would they understand the Seven Stars, the Lamps, and the Angels.' How much is implied in 'merely' making this attempt!

The figurative character of the Apocalypse is now generally regarded as a decisive argument against interpreting the 'Angels' of the Churches as men: for example, bishops. But, in regard to the sources of the imagery, opinions differ widely. Dr. Gwatkin suggests a Jewish origin; Dr. J. H. Moulton, a Zoroastrian. Professor Ramsay differs from both, and his suggestion is of deep interest, though it is not likely that he has spoken the last word on the subject. He gives an engraving, from a sketch made by Mrs. Ramsay, of certain reliefs found amid the religious monuments of Asia Minor, 'which seem to represent the divine nature on two planes, expressed by the device of two zones in the artistic grouping.' In these current religious conceptions he observes a correspondence with Rev. i. 20, 'the seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven lamps are seven churches.' With the earthly pair there is no difficulty, for the lamp is a natural symbol of the Church, in which shines 'the light that illumines the darkness of the world.' In the corresponding heavenly pair the stars and the angels whom they symbolize belong to heaven. 'As the lamp on earth is to the star in heaven, so is the Church on earth to the angel.' Hence the angel of the Church is described as representing 'the divine presence and the divine power in the Church,' yet as embodying 'in a personification the powers, the character, the history and life and unity of the Church.' These interpretations seem to move on different planes; but inasmuch as 'all that concerns the angels is vague, impalpable, elusive,' more scientific precision seems unattainable with our present knowledge; in expounding these letters it must be remembered that sometimes 'the idea "angel" drops, and the idea "Church" takes its place.' On this subject a suggestion is made which should prove helpful to students of the Johannine problem. St. John's choice of the apocalyptic form of literature for his earliest work may in great measure account for 'the marked difference in character and power between the Apocalypse and the Gospel of St. John.'

In this brief notice it is impossible to do justice to the graphic descriptions of the seven cities—'Ephesus: the City of Change,' 'Smyrna: the City of Life,' 'Laodicea: the City of Compromise,'

&c. Nor can we do more than hint at the abundance of treasure stored up in the seven chapters devoted to the detailed historical exposition of the several letters. One example may be given. Apollonius, in an address to the Smyrneans, makes implicit allusion to 'the crown of Smyrna,' which was 'the garland of splendid buildings with the Street of Gold, which encircled the rounded hill Pagos.' To the Church of Smyrna a new crown is promised. 'She shall wear no longer a mere crown of buildings and towers, nor even the crown of good citizens which Apollonius advised her to put on, but *a crown of life*. The earthly Smyrna wore a mural crown like that of her patron goddess: the true Smyrna shall wear a crown suited for the servants of the one living God.'

The notes on the various chapters give valuable references to other literature; but such a standard work as this is incomplete without a copious index.

The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. By Adolf Harnack. Translated and Edited by James Moffatt, D.D. Vol. i. (Williams & Norgate. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

This volume forms the last instalment of the well-known 'Theological Translation Library,' which has been of such signal service to English students of theology who do not read German and French. Only the first half of Harnack's *Ausbreitung* is here presented to the English reader. For a discussion of the whole it will be convenient to wait until the translation is complete. Meanwhile, however, it is desirable to point out that this latest of Harnack's treatises is as useful and important as any, except his *History of Dogma*. Probably no living theologian but Harnack could have written it. It is marked by the erudition which we associate with his name, and by that mastery over his own erudition which so few learned men have been able to attain. The field which he has covered in this last work is comparatively virgin soil. Histories of dogma there have been in abundance, though few like Professor Harnack's; but, as the preface informs us, 'no monograph has yet been devoted to the mission and spread of the Christian religion through the first three centuries of our era.' It is much easier to survey the history of thought as represented in literature than to collect the geographical and other material necessary for tracing out the steps by which the wonderful expansion of early Christianity was accomplished. Only one thoroughly familiar with the extensive literature of the early centuries could have undertaken

the task, and few men possessing full acquaintance with the mass of detail could have presented the results of investigation with the clearness and easy mastery which Harnack displays.

His characteristic doctrinal proclivities are naturally manifest here. Those who admire his great abilities are not necessarily bound to accept all his conclusions. His critical methods are not extreme as extremes are counted nowadays, and his tone is always religious and reverent. But many of Harnack's English readers, at all events, are not prepared for the freedom with which he treats his materials and the calm assumptions with which he waves aside authorities whom they are accustomed to revere and dutifully to follow. Into this region, however, we do not propose at present to enter. Our object is to describe the contents of this first volume and introduce it to our readers, leaving more minute discussion till the next appears. The ground here covered includes the first two books of the original work and part of the third. The first book deals with Judaism, the external and internal conditions of the world-wide expansion of Christianity subsequently to be described, and the transition from the Jewish to the Gentile mission. The second book unfolds the religious characteristics of the new religion, as a gospel of salvation, as a gospel of love and charity, as a religion of the Spirit, and as a religion of authority and mystery. The 'conflict with demons' is described in a long and interesting excursus, and the battle against polytheism and idolatry is vividly portrayed. The sense in which Christianity was a 'syncretistic religion,' if it at all deserves that name, is one that needs to be carefully examined; and this is one of the points on which Harnack hardly carries conviction, though a part of what he says must at once be admitted as correct and just. The third book enters upon the methods of the mission, dealing incidentally with the different kinds of missionaries, evangelists, &c., with modes of travelling, communication by means of letters, and other kindred subjects. Every one of these topics is of great practical importance, and Harnack has laid all students of Christian history under obligation by his exposition of them.

The translation, carried out by the accomplished pen of Dr. James Moffatt, has evidently been a labour of love, and is admirably executed. There are few more important subjects in history than that which is described in the preface as the task of explaining 'how and why and where, within less than three centuries, an Oriental religious movement, which was originally a mere ripple on a single wave of dissent in the wide sea of paganism, rose into a

breaker which swept before it the vested interests, prejudices, traditions, and authority of the most powerful social and political organization that the world hitherto had known.' Fresh light is shed upon this complex and fascinating problem by Professor Harnack. Every student of the history of Christianity who reads German has already familiarized himself with his conclusions, but the translation of the work into English will widen the circle of readers in this country and America, and exercise considerable influence upon the subsequent discussion of the subject.

The Doctrine of the Atonement, &c. By the late A. Sabatier. Translated by Victor Leuliette. (Williams & Norgate. 5*s.*)

The influence of Sabatier on theological thought seems likely to be more felt since his death than in his lifetime. The significance of his work becomes clearer as the years pass, and one marked current in the stream of religious ideas sets in his direction. He was an original thinker and a lucid writer, and already he is in danger of being regarded as the founder of a 'school.' The new type of Protestantism which he represents has been called by the clumsy name of 'Symbolo-fideism,' and described as a kind of 'French Ritschlianism.' It is based upon the essential inadequacy of all human religious conceptions to represent the great realities for which they stand, and the still more marked inadequacy of the terms, mostly figurative, in which we express them. Hence arises a distrust of all creeds and dogmas, if not a virtual repudiation of them, and the substitution of a personal relation to 'the historical Christ' —interpreted by a severe criticism of the Gospels—as constituting the essence of Christianity. The formula expressing this is, 'We are saved by faith, quite apart from our beliefs.' What sort of 'faith' that is which eschews 'beliefs,' we are not so clearly told. Sabatier, however, is being followed by many who are usually described as 'liberal' theologians, and all that he has written is acquiring interest as coming from him. Hence Messrs. Williams & Norgate have acted wisely in including some smaller works of his in their 'Crown Library.' The two parts of this volume contain a study of the doctrine of the Atonement in its historical evolution, and a lecture on Religion and Modern Culture. Neither is long, but both are thoughtful and suggestive. The historical survey of doctrine is able, but, we are compelled to add, very one-sided. Justice is not done to what is described as the objective view of

the Atonement, and it is too much taken for granted that there is a necessary incompatibility between it and that subjective or 'moral' view which Sabatier expounds with sympathy and great effectiveness. Orthodoxy as generally understood does not exclude the moral view, but rather lays increasing stress upon it. The question is whether the view of the death of Christ as *only* displaying the love of the Father, and thereby winning man's heart, is a sufficient account of the whole mysterious transaction; on the other hand, whether the relation of Christ's death to the eternal law of righteousness is not an integral factor in its significance, and the vindication of the divine holiness an essential element in atonement. Some of the theories of the Atonement denounced by Sabatier are no longer held by intelligent representatives of orthodoxy. We agree with him that a distinct advance has been made in this respect, and that theology has felt the beneficent influence of the improvement which has gone on through the centuries in ethical ideas and standards. But the 'moral' view of man's reconciliation with God as expounded by Sabatier does not represent the whole truth concerning the relation of Christ's death on the cross to the forgiveness of sins. Both the New Testament and, as we think, the enlightened conscience of man testify to the fact that repentance alone is not sufficient to secure the divine forgiveness of the sins of the race. Sabatier himself seems to be conscious of this when he refers, as he does all too briefly, to the relation between the solidarity of the race and vicarious suffering.

This essay on a perennially important subject furnishes little or nothing that is new to students of the history of Christian doctrine, but it certainly does put the views of atonement generally held by 'liberal' theologians in a succinct and attractive form. The lecture which forms the second part of the book, on the true method of reconciliation between religion and modern science, is suggestive, if not convincing. English admirers of Sabatier will welcome this volume, and those who cannot accept his version of the gospel as adequate will find in it much to awaken and stimulate thought.

Christus in Ecclesia. By Hastings Rashdall, D.Litt., Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, 1899–1903. (T. & T. Clark. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The school of Churchmen to which Dr. Rashdall belongs is influential out of all proportion to its numbers. We do not know how many dignitaries and prominent clergy of the Church of

England would label themselves Broad rather than High or Low, for those who are of this way of thinking dislike labels and parties of all kinds. There were few things that F. D. Maurice disliked so much as to be called a Broad Churchman. But from his time onwards the teaching of those who sympathized with him and Kingsley and Stanley—to name three very different men—has leavened the Anglican Church almost as powerfully as the Oxford Movement, though in ways much less easy to trace and specify.

In Dr. Rashdall that school finds an able representative. It is indeed almost unfair to class together men who are alike in being 'broad,' so greatly do they differ individually. Dr. Rashdall is not vague and loose, after the familiar 'hang theology!' type. He knows where he stands, and lets his readers know also, in clear, thoughtful, and vigorous English. So far as theology proper is concerned, this was proved by his *Doctrine and Development*, published a few years ago, and the present volume unfolds his ecclesiastical position with similar lucidity and force. We may perhaps most easily describe his doctrine of the Church by saying that he occupies substantially the ground taken by Dr. Hort in his *Christian Ecclesia*. That is to say, he knows history, and does not pervert it in the interests of dogma. The teaching of these sermons on The Idea of the Church, Baptism, the Eucharist, Apostolical Succession, Priesthood, Sunday, the Bible, and kindred subjects, is clear, simple, and wholesome, because scriptural. It is not that of the modern Anglo-Catholic priest, but it is substantially such as would be approved by the best Anglican authorities in the past, and (we imagine) nine-tenths of Anglican laymen to-day. It does not minimize the authority of the Church or the privileges of the clergy, but it does not magnify either after the fashion of 'Catholicism' so called, whether Roman or Anglican. The tone adopted towards Nonconformists is manly, frank, and generous. Dr. Rashdall does not profess to agree with them, but he will not 'unchurch' them. They are genuine Christians of another type, whom he thinks mistaken and would be glad to convert. If such a healthy tone of 'agreeing to differ' were characteristic of Anglican clergy generally, it would be better for themselves and the cause they represent.

Without professing to accept Dr. Rashdall's views on many topics—e.g. the Bible, Sunday, and Church and State—we heartily acknowledge the great interest, the marked ability, and, in the main, sound ecclesiastical doctrine which characterize this volume of sermons, and hope that it will be widely read and widely influential.

The Secret of a Great Influence. Notes on Bishop Westcott's Teaching. By Mrs. Horace Porter. (Macmillan & Co. 3*s.* net.)

Not many men's writings deserve or repay the kind of treatment which Mrs. Porter has here given to those of Bishop Westcott. As a rule, if the published work of a writer does not sufficiently speak for itself, the supplementary aid of the intermediary and interpreter is vain. Dr. Westcott's writings are not abstruse or recondite, and most of his admirers can understand and enjoy them without assistance. None the less, something is to be said in justification of Mrs. Porter's pious undertaking. Many readers found the teaching of the late Bishop of Durham to be vague and elusive: each single sentence, they would say, was intelligible, but the drift of the whole was hard to grasp. Dr. Westcott of set principle distrusted and avoided that sharp definiteness of dogmatic outline which most readers of theology love, and he disdained to furnish the popular illustrative helps which save the reader the trouble of thinking for himself. Hence Mrs. Porter's exposition of his leading ideas and principles will be found useful by many, and she has executed her work in such a way that, while it is interesting to read as it stands, it will certainly send those who have been interested by it to the writings of the teacher himself. Her chapters include such topics as these: General Teaching, Foundation Truths, Bible Study, Church and Creed, Worship, and Foreign Missions—each illustrated by appropriate extracts. Rev. Arthur Westcott adds an appreciation of the bishop's commentaries. But Dr. Westcott was a saint as well as a theologian. The authoress rightly says that, while his teaching is pre-eminently scholarly and fitted for scholars, it is also full of practical help and spiritual stimulus for the busiest lives. Hence her volume cannot but be useful to devout readers who cannot afford to buy many books. That it is published by Messrs. Macmillan is sufficient evidence that it is clearly printed, pleasant to read, and in every way presented so as to be worthy of its subject.

Religion and Health, their Mutual Relationship and Influence. By Norman Porritt, M.R.C.S., &c. (Skeffingtons. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Porritt has chosen a timely and practical theme, and his treatment of it is worthy of one who believes that religion is the health of the soul, and that the maintenance of the body in health should form a part of every good man's religion. A truly Christian

physician is not as rare a phenomenon as it used to be, but even now we do not very often find such a combination of qualifications as Dr. Porritt shows, proving himself to be a teacher worth listening to as regards true soundness both of body and soul. For there is no religious cant in these pages, but sane, strong, wholesome teaching upon the most practical subjects of bodily life, inspired by high spiritual principle. One of the chapters touches on the interesting question of the vitality and longevity of the Jewish race and its connexion with religion. Another brings out the varied service which Christianity has through long centuries rendered to the healing art. Another deals with the influence upon mind and body of Sunday as a day of rest; another with Mrs. Baker Eddy and 'Christian Science'; and another discusses the phenomena of physical deterioration. The most practical chapters, and in some respects the best, are those which describe the influence of health upon religion, and the consequences to health of the absence of religion in the character. It is on these topics that a doctor who is also a religious man can speak with an impressiveness which no preacher from a pulpit can rival. Not only are the well-known evils of drunkenness, secret as well as overt, forcibly pointed out by Dr. Porritt, but also the bodily and mental mischief wrought by over-eating and self-indulgence of all kinds. The moral lesson hereby suggested is pressed home upon the conscience by an experienced medical man who knows how sure and often how unsuspected such mischief is. The closing chapter of the book unfolds impressively and eloquently what the writer holds to be the present duty of the Christian Church. 'Following the lead of its Lord and Founder, the Church should realize—and act up to the belief—that nothing which adds to or takes from the physical well-being of her children is too insignificant for attention.' This doctrine has a better chance of being heeded to-day than it had a generation ago. And none can better help to carry it out than that noble band of men who adorn the ranks of the medical profession and are at the same time worthy members of the Church of Christ. The terrible old proverb, *Tres medici, duo athei*, has happily lost the meaning it may once have had. The medical students of to-day are neither the materialists nor the libertines their predecessors were supposed, almost as a matter of course, to be. Christian doctors are indeed the very salt of the earth. Christian ministers who wisely preach 'the gospel of the body'—the bearing which the gospel of Christ, rightly understood, will have upon all bodily habits and appetites—may do much to

promote good citizenship as well as individual salvation. Dr. Porritt's book is just such a one as Charles Kingsley would have delighted in, and we cordially commend it to our readers as containing wholesome teaching both for this life and that which is to come.

The Book of Genesis. By Alexander Maclaren, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. *7s. 6d.*)

The publishers of this volume announce that it is the first of a series of forty to be issued in due course, containing Dr. Maclaren's expositions of Scripture as preached and published during a long and fruitful ministry. The author himself writes no preface, nor gives any sign as to the conditions under which these sermons, drafts of sermons, and sermonic notes have been collected and arranged. We presume he has himself prepared them for the press. But the question naturally arises, because it is tolerably clear that many have appeared in print before, and now, in the treatment of the same theme, there is a good deal of repetition. The subjects of Abraham's temptation, Esau's sale of his birthright, and Jacob's wrestling with the angel, for example, are each handled two or three times; the same thoughts, and often the same words, recurring at intervals. A minister who has preached for half a century necessarily repeats himself, but he does not usually print his studies of the same theme side by side.

We do not make these remarks complainingly in Dr. Maclaren's case. That which might well be a law for a smaller man fails in its application to a prince of the pulpit such as Spurgeon, Parker, or Maclaren. Different as these three great preachers were, they were alike in the fertility of their expository power. Few indeed could pour forth volume after volume as Mr. Spurgeon and Dr. Parker have notoriously done, and as Dr. Maclaren proposes to do, without exposing the comparative slenderness of their homiletical stores, and repeating themselves so as to weary their readers. It is one amongst many testimonies to Dr. Maclaren's powers that the repetitions of this volume do not pall, but are interesting to the student, just as a number of similar 'studies' by a great artist become more significant and valuable by juxtaposition.

There is no need at this time of day to characterize Dr. Maclaren's work. When we say that in his own well-known style he gives us some fifty homilies based on passages in the Book of Genesis, ranging from the 'Vision of Creation' to 'A Coffin in

Egypt,' we have probably said enough to enable our readers to judge of the contents of this volume. We may add, however, that those who read it hastily will get many valuable suggestions as to general homiletical treatment, while those who read it carefully will find many a sentence and phrase which show that in detailed workmanship, as well as in the general plan of a discourse, Dr. Maclaren is effective and happy. For example, on the story of the Fall in Eden, he says, 'These are still the two lies which wile us to sin: "It will do you no harm," and "You are cheating yourselves out of good by not doing it."' On Cain's sin: 'When men break away from God, they will soon murder one another.' On Enoch's translation: 'Enoch was led, if I may say so, round the top of the valley, beyond the head-waters of the dark river, and was kept on the high level till he got to the other side. You and I have to go down the hill, out of the sunshine, in among the dank weeds, to stumble over the black rocks, and wade through the deep water; but we shall get over to the same place where he stands, and He that took him round by the top will take us through the river; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.' On Mahanaim we read that it was as Jacob went on his way that the angels of God met him, and on the dusty road of common life. 'If the week be empty of the angels, you will never catch a sight of a feather of their wings on the Sunday.' But one cannot sample a house by producing a number of bricks, though in this case the shape and style of the bricks used are not unimportant elements in the excellence of the whole building.

The chief objection likely to be made against Dr. Maclaren's handling of Old Testament themes is that he takes so little account of modern biblical criticism. This is not because he is ignorant of it. Constantly, by the turn of a phrase, he shows the discerning reader that he has weighed what the critics have to say. But he is too wise to discuss these questions in the pulpit, and at the time when most of these discourses were written the members of an ordinary congregation had not heard so much concerning criticism as they have been obliged to hear during the last few years. Many devout souls will give thanks that here at least is a preacher who knows how to enable them to enjoy the pure honey of the word without compelling them to analyse the wax of the comb.

For ourselves, we have read this book with interest and profit, and rejoice to think that the gracious and stimulating ministry exercised so long in Union Chapel, Manchester, is to be prolonged through the press for many years to come.

The Forgiveness of Sins, and other Sermons. By George Adam Smith, D.D., LL.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. 6*s*.)

The title-page and the dedication of this volume introduce the Professor of Hebrew in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, as the former minister of Queen's Cross Free Church, Aberdeen. Happy is the Church from whose pastors such professors can be selected, and in the chairs of whose colleges such preachers can be found. In accordance with this change of title, Dr. George Adam Smith appears in the majority of these discourses in a new rôle. With the exception of *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, his published writings have hitherto dealt almost exclusively with the Old Testament. In this series of sermons the proportion of New Testament to Old Testament subjects is as two to one. Yet in expounding the central truths of the Christian gospel the preacher often enriches his arguments and enforces his appeals by illuminating quotations from psalmists and prophets. In the New Testament he finds the full results of an 'age-long struggle to light and peace.'

A modern note is struck in the first sermon, which aims at answering from 'the Scriptures and our own experience' the question: In what does the forgiveness of sins consist? The argument from experience is used to confirm and not to supersede revelation; moreover, apt historical allusions entwine a strand into the argument which makes it a threefold cord. 'So long ago Isaiah found it'; . . . 'so also long ago a psalmist felt it': these are characteristic sentences which link present-day forgiveness of sins with the experience of the saints in the days of the apostles and in the old time before them. Dr. Smith directs special attention to one element in the forgiveness of sins—'God's new trust in the soul He has pardoned'; but, although he states that his treatment of the great theme is not exhaustive, it seems fair to say that he dwells too exclusively on those consequences of sin from which forgiveness cannot set us free. By the side of his wholesome warning the glad 'no condemnation' shout would have been welcome. Scripture and experience prove it to be the preparation for that most inspiring assurance: 'God still trusts us; God believes us capable of doing better.'

A striking feature of these sermons is surprise-power. Sometimes attention is arrested by a question to which the true answer is not that which springs most readily to our minds. 'In our Lord's life on earth, what were the quietest moments?' The moments He spent alone in communion with His Father in heaven

is a plausible but incorrect reply. The glimpses given in the Gospels of our Lord's moments of prayer show that to Him prayer was not 'the mere preparation for the battle, but the battlefield and the battle itself.' In the strength of the victories gained there He went calmly to do His mighty works 'with a word or even only a gesture.' Sometimes a startling antithesis arouses interest, as when we read in the introduction to the sermon on 'The Good Samaritan': 'The story begins with a question about eternal life, and ends with the payment of twopence. Along which line lies much of its significance for us.' Sometimes the flashlight of psychological analysis reveals profound meanings in familiar phrases. In the fine study of 'Esau' the words 'I am at the point to die' are shown to mark the coming to a fatal crisis of two habits—'the habit of yielding to appetite, and the habit of indulging in exaggerated feelings about oneself.' Then follows a scathing denunciation of the sinfulness of exaggerating our ill-health, our overwork, or the wrongs we suffer from others. 'Esau's fatal crime may be repeated by any of us who are not born hairy, who are not wild hunters, but plain, tame, church-going men and women.'

The Higher Criticism of which Professor George Adam Smith is so distinguished an exponent does not prevent his preaching on 'Esau' and on kindred themes. He knows that the word 'profane' exactly describes the Edomites; he thinks that Esau's character may be 'in part the reflection of the qualities which his descendants developed in opposition to Israel'; but he finds that 'the parallel between Esau and the nation he founded is far from perfect.' Some of the qualities of the Edomites do not appear in the portrait of Esau; the story as it stands 'is not the reflection, always more or less vague, of the surface of a nation; but the record, keener, deeper, and more tragic, of the character and experience of an individual.' The sermon-taster will find that the spiritual flavour of these discourses is not spoilt by criticism, and the sermon-builder will discover new methods of hewing out and shaping stones from the unexhausted quarry.

Humanity and God. By Samuel Chadwick. (Hodder & Stoughton. 5*s*.)

We all know that Mr. Chadwick is a popular preacher, but if this volume is entirely representative of his ordinary ministry we congratulate him upon the congregation to which he is privileged to preach, and them upon the preacher whom they are privileged to hear. Both by the greatness of the themes, and the adequacy

of the way in which they are treated, this is a volume which vindicates and enhances the Methodist tradition, and of which any preacher might be proud. The book is one of marked characteristics, the most outstanding of which is the uniform greatness and importance of the subjects of which the sermons treat. Mr. Chadwick does not dwell either intellectually or spiritually in the environs of the gospel, but right at its very heart. Nearly every sermon deals with some aspect of a truth which is fundamental: they are profoundly theological—but with a difference. It is not theology which is abstract, cold, aloof; but theology in close touch with human life, the spring of holy energy, the reason of noble endeavour, and the root of calm peace. This gives a tone of intense reality, a power of searching criticism, to many of the sermons which makes the reading of the book tonic and inspiring. There is also a strong note of intellectual energy, we had almost said of intellectual severity, sounding in every part of the volume. There is little adornment, no literary allusiveness, hardly a quotation; but everywhere truth keenly and surely perceived, then wrought into congruity in the preacher's mind, and then set out with a clearness and energy which are unmistakable in their lofty significance and power. There is no sentiment, and but little of that deep feeling which in some men is so powerful in carrying a position by assault, but everywhere the witness of a mind which is alert, strong, tenacious; closely in touch with reality, both in human nature and the word of God, and seeing their relations and adaptations; and expressing itself with clearness, certainty, and power. The style is crisp and nervous—there are very few semicolons in the book—and the thrust of some of the sentences is like that of a keen rapier in a master-hand. The volume is full of compelling appeals, but it is the appeal of truth which cannot be gainsaid, the sovereign energy of the irresistible logic of reality. Altogether it is a noble volume of sermons, the work of a strong thinker, and of a man of quick spiritual sensibilities and deep religious convictions; and in the day when Mr. Chadwick consented to the publication of this book the vision to which he was not disobedient was surely a *heavenly* vision.

The Twentieth Century New Testament. A Translation into Modern English from the original Greek [Westcott and Hort's text]. Revised Edition. (Horace Marshall & Son. *2s. 6d.* net.)

The aim of the anonymous translators who are responsible for

this version is 'to render the New Testament into readable Modern English.' What is now called the Tentative Edition appeared in 1901, and was well received. That more than two hundred thousand copies have been sold is one of many welcome signs of unabated interest in the contents of these sacred writings. The publishers state that all the profits have been devoted to the production of this new and final edition. This may well be the case, for the revision has been thorough and scholarly; moreover, it is so extensive as to make the revised edition 'virtually a new translation.' The use of imitation India paper reduces by two-thirds the thickness of the book; it is excellently printed from new type, and the disuse of italics is a great gain.

Of the many changes we have noted in the Gospel according to St. Matthew, only one seems to us to be a change for the worse. In Modern English 'Lake' is better than 'Sea of Galilee.' The alterations furnish evidence of a conservative tendency in the minds of the revisers. In the Beatitudes 'blessed' takes the place of 'happy,' and the awkward 'for it is they who' becomes 'for they.' 'It is you who are the salt of the earth' might have been similarly changed with advantage. There is, however, no comparison between the two renderings:

1901. 'Happy are the sorrowful, for it is they who will be comforted.'

1904. 'Blessed are the mourners, for they shall be comforted.'

Very welcome is the alteration in the startling version of the Golden Rule:

1901. 'Always, then, treat others as you would like them to treat you.'

1904. 'Do to others whatever you would wish them to do to you.'

A careful comparison of the two renderings of difficult passages in the Epistles yields similar results. The change in the closing words of 2 Cor. v. 3 is not an improvement: 'we shall not be found without bodies' (1901) is better than 'found discarnate' (1904). In the same chapter 'at the bar of the Christ' is, to our regret, allowed to stand. On the other hand, there are many alterations which merit unstinted praise. As an example of the admirable work done by the revisers, part of St. Paul's hymn in praise of Love must suffice (1 Cor. xiii. 6–8):

1901. 'She has no sympathy with deceit, but has full sympathy with truth.

She is proof against all things, always trustful, always hopeful, always patient.
Love never dies.'

1904. 'Love never rejoices at evil, but rejoices in the triumph of truth;
Love bears with all things, ever trustful, ever hopeful, ever patient.
Love never fails.'

In this passage careful attention to trifles has brought the translation much nearer to perfection.

The Twentieth Century New Testament, in its final edition, is a valuable companion to the Revised Version of 1880. Those who study the two translations, side by side, will gain a true and deep insight into the mind of Christ, the teaching of His apostles, and the early history of Christianity.

Introduction to the Study of Christian Ethics. By A. E. Balch, M.A. (Charles H. Kelly. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

We have several well-known introductions to the study of ethics, one or two of which have won for themselves a place of real distinction, but there is not the same choice of manuals of introduction to the study of distinctively Christian ethics, and therefore this volume should find and fill a place of its own. It is evident that Mr. Balch has been a painstaking and careful student of the subject, and he has given us a book which is full of thought, nice discrimination, and clear exposition of a difficult but profoundly interesting subject. It is impossible, within our limits, to give an adequate conception of the variety and subtlety of the themes which are discussed; only those who have studied the subject know its intricacy and difficulty; but everywhere there is the evidence of a serious mind confronting great problems with courage and wisdom, and endeavouring to lay bare their large implications. In the opening chapter the writer vindicates the value of ethical study, and tentatively defines its boundaries; he then passes on to place ethics in relation to other cognate studies, to discuss what is involved in the assertion that man is a moral agent, the objective conditions of ethical life, and the moral conflict which is involved. In discussing the question of what is the highest good, the writer naturally has much to say of the various types of ethical theory which have sued for the suffrages of men, and then in two luminous chapters expounds the Christian conception of the *summum bonum*,

and the example of our Lord as the complete presentation of the Christian Ideal. The latter part of the book is engaged in making clear what are the inward dispositions which aid the achievement of the Christian Ideal, ethical progress, Christian duties, and social institutions. Everywhere throughout the volume there is evidence of fairness, even toward those from whom the writer most profoundly differs; a skilful handling of intricate and perplexing details; a sure and firm grasp of the Christian position; and a power of exposition which makes a recondite theme intelligible to a careful and thoughtful student. We think the volume, as an introduction, is a little overburdened with criticism of differing theories, which are quite in place, indeed necessary, in a treatise, but in an introduction are likely only to confuse the student. A strong framework of positive teaching is always the best preliminary to the study of any great subject, like that of ethics: then the student has a criterion of judgement, a standard of appeal. And further, the volume would be greatly enriched in value, either by the addition of a preliminary analysis, or an index at the end, or both. This is a valuable guide to the study of a great and fascinating subject, and will be a real help to those who read it with thought and sympathy.

A Sacrament of our Redemption. By W. H. Griffith Thomas, B.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Portman Square. (Bemrose & Sons. *2s. 6d.*)

A scholarly yet popular, succinct yet comprehensive, inquiry into the meaning of the Lord's Supper as it is revealed in Holy Scripture and stated in the Prayer-Book and Articles of the Church of England. Unlike Bishop Gore, whose method is to 'approach the Eucharist first from outside,' Mr. Thomas begins with the teaching of the Gospels and of the Epistles; by their testimony he then proceeds to test ecclesiastical authorities. The doctrine of the Holy Communion, stated in 1900 in a declaration of the English Church Union, is traced to the writings of Dr. Pusey and to Tract xc; it is clearly shown to be a novelty in the Church of England. 'No one can legitimately call it a development of the old Church of England doctrine of three centuries; rather was it a new deposit, the introduction of a fresh germ.' In two exceedingly valuable chapters, as lucid as they are logical, current fallacies are exposed. How conclusive a refutation of the Tractarian doctrine of a Eucharistic sacrifice is contained in the simple words: 'In the Lord's Supper Christ is neither offered "to" God nor "for"

man; He is offered "to" man as Saviour and sustenance to be accepted and welcomed by faith'! This excellent treatise furnishes wise guidance in days when evangelical Christians have need to be 'specially jealous for Scripture truth on the Lord's Supper.'

The Century Bible: Samuel. Edited by A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D. (T. C. & E. C. Jack. *2s. 6d.* net.)

Professor Kennedy's volume will add distinction even to *The Century Bible.* The critical position as to the composition of the book is very clearly set forth, and in a brief introduction a mass of information is given as to the text, the Greek Version, the place of 'Samuel' in the canon, the historical value of the work, and other questions. Professor Kennedy shows that the oldest parts of the book are little younger than the events they record. He calls attention to the incomparable gallery of historical portraits here preserved, and brings out the importance of the book for every student of early Hebrew religion. A good working outline is provided for the student, and the appendix on the Ark will be of great service. The notes are a real guide to the meaning of obscure passages. This is a little commentary, but it is a masterpiece.

The Century Bible: Job. Edited by A. S. Peake, M.A. (T. C. & E. C. Jack. *2s. 6d.* net.)

This volume is worthy of its place in a series of Old Testament expositions which has begun so well. It is intended for the ordinary reader, but it is such work as only a highly trained scholar could have done. The introduction is a full and admirable piece of work. Mr. Peake feels that the man who follows Dr. A. B. Davidson should have good reason for his boldness, and he finds it in the important exegetical and critical results which have been reached in the last twenty years. The writer's position as a critic is fair and moderate. There are some portions of the Book of Job—for example, the speeches of Elihu—which are now generally held to be additions. To these he adds chap. xxviii. and the descriptions of leviathan and behemoth. He holds that the prologue and the epilogue form part of the main body of the book, though they may not improbably have been embodied from an earlier work. He would bring the date of composition down to about the year 400 B.C. The section on 'The Art of the Book' gives an excellent summary of its literary qualities. As to the expository notes, we have tested them at some crucial points, and find them most helpful in character, shedding much light on the difficulties of this magnificent

piece of Scripture. The volume forms a most satisfactory handbook, and gives work of the highest value at the lowest possible price.

Not Left without Witness; or, Divine Truth in the Light of Reason and Revelation. By John Blacket. (Elliot Stock. 6*s.* net.)

The author of this able little book hopes that it may be of use to those who fancy that there is some real antagonism between reason and revelation. His aim is to show that a rational knowledge of God and of the soul is possible, and that the truths of divine revelation are in harmony with the conclusions of reason and the instincts of our spiritual nature. In this we think that he has been decidedly successful, especially considering the limitation of space and the importance and extent of the matters to be dealt with. Within this volume Mr. Blacket has condensed the results of wide reading and careful thought. His style is clear and vivacious, his reasoning sound and convincing, and the whole work is touched with an evangelical brightness and warmth which at once increases its interest and adds to its effect.

Religion for all Mankind. Based on Facts which are Never in Dispute. By Charles Voysey, B.A. (Longmans, Green, & Co. 1*s.* net.)

This volume seems to be intended by the author as a sort of summary of the doctrines of the Theistic Church, of which he is the founder. From it we gather that he claims to have found in his outlook on the world, and in his own sense of what is right and fitting, sufficient ground for discarding the Christian faith, and affirming a scheme of religion of which the following appear to be some of the salient features:—That 'it is God who has made men what they are—ignorant, imperfect, selfish, and even cruel'; that 'sin is a necessary part of the divine plan in bringing all men to a state of goodness and happiness'; and that the death of Christ as an atonement for sin 'is a glaring stain and blot on the pure righteousness of God.' We do not doubt Mr. Voysey's entire sincerity, but this attack on Revealed Religion only leaves us with the impression of hazy misconception and shallow reasoning.

BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL.

Western Europe in the Eighth Century. By E. A. Freeman. (Macmillan & Co. 10*s*.)

THE above title, which stands upon the cover of the volume now under review, and by which it will, in all probability, hereafter be generally known, does not precisely indicate the ground covered thereby. This is remedied, however, on the title-page by the addition of the words *and Onward*. Of the four chapters into which the narrative falls, two—the first and the fourth—deal with events which belong to centuries other than that which figures in the title. It is well, therefore, that the possible reader should be reminded that the scope of this able and interesting volume is wider than will immediately appear to him if it catches his eye in a library catalogue or bookseller's list.

It is a matter for much congratulation that these valuable historical materials, which the late Professor Freeman had laboriously gathered together, and to some extent thrown into shape at the time of his lamented death, have not been allowed to pass into oblivion: history would have been the poorer for the loss. The editorial responsibility which their publication necessarily involved has been assumed by Freeman's son-in-law, Canon Scott Holmes, himself an historical and antiquarian writer of some distinction. Owing to the incompleteness of the MSS., Canon Holmes's task has not been without difficulty; but he has well acquitted himself, and the result is more satisfactory than, perhaps, under the circumstances could fairly have been expected. Even so, however, the historical student cannot read the book as it now appears without feelings of deep regret, and thoughts of what it might have been had the writer's life been spared a little longer. It is manifestly a fragment. Here and there sections are broken off abruptly, or we meet with but the title of a section that should have been; in some cases lengthened periods comprising many eventful years drop out altogether; and of course the final touches of the master's hand are lacking, a grave loss to any work. Of the incompleteness thus occasioned an example may be given. The events of Pippin's reign are recorded with some minuteness, but the concluding section, which would have dealt with the last years and death of the first

Karling king, is unfortunately lacking. Then follows a great break in the sequence of events; the story of Pippin's greater son, the first Holy Roman Emperor, is passed over without a word; the next chapter opens four generations later with the year 888, a date upon the importance of which due emphasis is laid, and details the first beginnings of Parisian France and the Germanization of the empire under Otto. In other words, Modern Europe is revealed as already taking shape.

It need hardly be said that, bearing as it does the name of E. A. Freeman on its title-page, *Western Europe in the Eighth Century* is a most valuable and interesting work. Professor Freeman has, it is true, been convicted of occasional inaccuracy, and of sometimes piecing together details gleaned from various sources in a way that has been described as making rather than recording history; at times also his personal feelings obtrude themselves in such a manner as may almost be called uncouth, and cannot be regarded as that of the ideal historian—absolute impartiality. But when all this is said, Freeman stands forth conspicuous as one of the greatest masters of his craft that the later Victorian era produced. In all his work he evinces a strong grasp, clear insight, and fullness of information which are at once the admiration and despair of humbler workers in the same field. There is a certain rugged massiveness about his style that can hardly fail to impress, while at the same time it is decidedly suggestive of latent strength. Admirers of Freeman will turn lovingly to this and the companion volume, *Western Europe in the Fifth Century*, which preceded it by a few weeks, and has already received notice in these pages, as the last work of the tireless worker whose busy pen is now at rest for ever. Characteristic of these volumes, as compared with some of Freeman's earlier work, is a certain self-repression and calmness of tone—the calm of evening shall we call it? The writer, for instance, can now speak of France without showing those traces of irritation and resentment against the modern application of the name with which we are familiar, nor is his feeling in favour of a republican form of government to be gathered from these pages.

The period dealt with in the volume now under review is one of the highest interest and importance. It simply bristles with questions over which one might linger long: such, for instance, as the rebirth of the Western Empire; the creation of the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See, and the growth of the greatness of the Popes; and the emergence of a potential France and Germany out of the wreck of the Roman Empire of Charles the Great.

In the earlier portion of the volume the main interest of the story centres around the rise to supreme power of the Frankish Karling House. Those of our readers who are familiar with Döllinger's learned and interesting essay, 'Pope Gregory II and the Emperor Leo the Isaurian,' in his *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages*, will study with much interest the discussion by Freeman of the real aims which Gregory strove to realize in his relationships with Leo III and Charles the Hammer. The English and the German historian have points of contact, and are agreed in their rejection of the interpretation put upon the facts by Gibbon and Gregorovius, that to all intents and purposes the Pope placed himself at the head of an overt Italian movement against Constantinople. According to Döllinger, the Pope's fear of the Lombard was stronger than his dislike of the heretical emperor, whose support he felt to be necessary against the former. To Freeman the Pope appears to have resisted a local impulse on the part of the Romans to choose a new emperor for themselves, who should replace the Isaurian iconoclast, of whose conversion he still had hopes; though later he appears to have desired to get rid of the emperor without falling into the clutches of the Lombard king, and, with this end in view, appealed to the Frank for aid. For a further discussion of a somewhat obscure question, we must refer our readers to Professor Freeman's book, which may be supplemented by reference to the others also named.

Much space is given to Pippin; and rightly so, for his place in general European history is a more important one than perhaps is generally recognized. Not himself a Holy Roman Emperor, Pippin was the father of such in more than the literal sense. But if not emperor, he was patrician of the Romans, whatever be the exact significance of that title. On this last point, the Patriciate, Freeman is full and good; the subject is one in which more is involved than appears upon the surface, and the treatment here accorded to it is perhaps the best that we have seen. But perhaps the most interesting pages in the whole volume are those which discuss the perplexing and ill-defined relations of the Emperor Constantine, Pope Stephen, and King Pippin, and their use of the convenient but ambiguous phrase, 'Roman Republic,' which might mean many things, and doubtless did mean something different on the lips of the several parties concerned. The three chiefs named appear to have been in some sort of treaty with one another, using terms which each of course interpreted in his own way; though one may believe that the Pope had the clearest understanding of the three, and secured

his own advantage with no little diplomatic skill, if he did not actually outwit the Emperor and the King. At all events, from this time may be dated the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See, a result which it may fairly be conjectured neither Constantine nor Pippin had really taken into their consideration.

There are several other topics which we had set down for some remark, not only in these earlier chapters, but also in the last, which traces out the course of events consequent upon the break-up of the empire of Charles the Great. The Saxon Otto and the Parisian Duke are interesting figures and real initiators, upon whom one would fain dwell for a moment, but at present may not. We can but spare a closing word for the appendix. This portion of the volume, which extends to a hundred pages, almost one-fourth of the whole work, will probably be more appreciated by historical students than by readers who have a merely general interest in the subject; but the former will find it at once most valuable and interesting. Under nine different heads, some of the more debateable points which arise in the course of the narrative receive critical treatment, and are discussed in the light of the statements made with respect to them in the original sources and by some of the leading secondary authorities; thus forming, in some respects, perhaps the most helpful portion of the whole volume. This it does mainly by bringing the reader into contact with the sources of the history, setting his critical faculties at work, and affording him an opportunity of a comparative study of the authorities, whereby he may be led to form some opinion of his own upon the matters at issue. It is perhaps hardly necessary to remark that, in order to use this portion of the volume to the best advantage, some knowledge of tongues will be required. The task, however, will not by any means prove so formidable as perhaps appears. It is easy reading for the most part, and a very elementary knowledge will enable the reader to pick his way through the extracts given, without any great difficulty. It but remains to add that, though it is impossible not to feel that the book falls short of what it would have been had the author himself lived to complete it, even in its present form *Western Europe in the Eighth Century* cannot be regarded as other than a most important contribution to English historical literature; and the competent editing of Canon Scott Holmes has placed all interested in the subject under very deep obligation to him. One thing, however, is lacking which it would have been easy to supply—a good map of contemporary Europe; an inconvenience which we think that Professor Freeman, who was very insistent upon the

necessity of reading history with a map, would himself have guarded against. We ourselves have used Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas*, which is at once inexpensive and, within its limitations, good.

Theodore Watts-Dunton: Poet, Novelist, Critic. By James Douglas. (Hodder & Stoughton. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Fashions change in biographies. Such a volume as this would, a generation ago, have been considered in anything but good taste, if published during the lifetime of its subject. It discusses the literary, and to some extent the personal, life of Mr. Watts-Dunton with a freedom of description and eulogy which used to be thought appropriate only in a biography proper. But we have changed all that. The statesman, the poet, the novelist, the actor are appraised, so to speak, in their presence; their private life becomes public property, and they are enabled, whether it is pleasant or distasteful to themselves, to anticipate what will be said of them after they have passed over to the majority.

We will not discuss the propriety of this. For better, for worse, it is the habit of our time, and in the case of Mr. Watts-Dunton there were special reasons why such a description and appreciation of himself and his work would be generally welcomed. It was said of him in earlier years that he courted obscurity as much as most writers desired publicity. He was known to the initiated as a poet of at least the second rank, and as one of the half-dozen living literary critics who really count. But to the public his very name was unknown; and if it had been more familiar, his work was perhaps not such as would have been generally appreciated. His contributions to the *Athenaeum*, extending over a quarter of a century, contained literary treasure enough to make two or three reputations. But it was literally buried, and its lawful possessor repeatedly declined either to unearth it himself or allow any one else to do so. Hence Mr. James Douglas felt—and rightly felt, as we think—that it was only just to the author and the public that, if possible, this reserve should be broken through, and that the intervention of a judicious friend might be useful. Mr. Watts-Dunton somewhat reluctantly consented, but the task of persuading him was probably made easier by the success of 'Aylwin' and 'The Coming of Love.' The reading public had become interested in the novelist and the poet, and it remained for Mr. Douglas to reveal to them a literary critic of the first order.

His work has been a labour of love, and, granted his point of view, he has written an interesting book. It gives a full description

of Mr. Watts-Dunton and his work, abundant extracts from the *Athenaeum* articles and elsewhere are incorporated, and the numerous illustrations give a concrete interest to a purely literary life. A very serious drawback is that Mr. Douglas allows his enthusiasm to run away with him. A critical examination, with plenty of fault-finding, was not intended — *bien entendu.* But it was not necessary to rush to the other extreme and scatter superlatives on every page. The end of legitimate 'appreciation' is defeated by excessive and indiscriminate laudation. For example, many of us may admire Mr. Watts-Dunton's contribution to Chambers's *Cyclopaedia of Literature* entitled 'The Renascence of Wonder' without considering it as 'undoubtedly the greatest philosophical generalization of our time.' The 'remarkable originality of this wonderful poem,' the 'sublime power' of a sonnet, the description of 'Aylwin' in hyperbolical terms as 'this magnificent fugue of prose,' and of Mrs. Gudgeon as 'the only example of absolute humour which has appeared in prose fiction,' so that she is 'a fount of esoteric and fastidious joy'—are illustrations of phrases so constantly occurring as to become a fount of positive repulsion, such as neither Mr. Watts-Dunton nor his work at all deserves. That the fulsomeness of praise is perfectly sincere and springs from genuine and unrestrained admiration is clear, but the end Mr. Douglas had in view would have been better secured had he 'gushed' less.

For he has rendered a service to literature. Two things were needed in relation to Mr. Watts-Dunton's work—a sympathetic interpretation of his significance as a poet and novelist, and a discovery to the public of his value as a critic. Mr. Douglas has undertaken both these tasks, and performed them, on the whole, well. The latter is perhaps the more important of the two. The easily intelligible unwillingness of Mr. Watts-Dunton himself to dig into piles of periodicals and disinter long-forgotten articles seemed to call for the intervention of a friend well acquainted with his work, who would show to the world what the inner circle of well-informed readers had long known concerning his literary criticisms. His articles were not 'reviews' in the technical sense. But they were inspired, as few reviews are, by original ideas on life and literature, and they set forth such thoughtful principles of judgement as gave them far more than a temporary value. We need not say, with Mr. Douglas, that his hero 'poured them forth in a stream, often a torrent, coruscating with brilliancies, and alive with interwoven colours like that of the river

in the mountains of Kap described in his birthday sonnet to Tennyson.' But we may say that it would be hard to find in this country during the last thirty years many more illuminating and suggestive critics of poetical and imaginative literature than Mr. Watts-Dunton. Much of the work he did in this direction was too good to be allowed to perish. Mr. Douglas has rescued some of it, and those who read carefully the essay on the Psalms here reprinted, the fragments on humour, the fine passages on irony and some other extracts from the *Athenaeum* articles, will consider that the reproduction of these would go far to justify the publication of the volume.

General readers will find more widely interesting matter. Mr. Watts-Dunton's intimate relations with Tennyson, Swinburne, Rossetti, and Morris amongst the poets, and other eminent literary men, give a strong personal interest to the story of his life. The book, in spite of its somewhat glaring faults, will be found attractive, both by the admirer of poetry and the student of literature, not to mention him who may be called without offence the average subscriber to Mudie's library.

Thomas Moore. By Stephen Gwynn. 'English Men of Letters.' (Macmillan & Co. 2*s.* net.)

There is something almost pathetic in the rapid decay of Tom Moore's popularity as a writer. Fifty years ago he was adored by the public. Who reads him now? Fifty years ago Lord John Russell could write, 'Of English lyrical poets, Moore is surely the greatest': now, but for his 'Irish Melodies,' all he wrote is forgotten, or nearly so. Even 'Lalla Rookh' is no longer regarded as of any account. This is not merely due to a change in taste—to the fact that the conceits and florid style of that day are not tolerated now; there is a deeper reason, which Mr. Gwynn admirably phrases when he says, 'the weight of personality was lacking in Moore.' He was a poet *from without*—with an ample poetic vocabulary, a smooth and flowing style, and a metrical knack; but there was no great depth of character in him, no strength. He was not the *man* that his contemporaries were whose work is far more enduring, such as Scott, and Wordsworth, and Coleridge, and even Byron. And so, though his work was voluminous, it has mostly proved ephemeral.

Regarded as a critical estimate of Moore's poetry, Mr. Gwynn's book is discerning and just. As a biography it is complete and entertaining. The reader cannot fail to follow with interest the

fortunes of this gay, charming, warm-hearted man; and will not wonder that he was, and continued to be to the close of his life, one of the most popular men of his day. But one doubts whether he ever realized the true earnestness of life.

Sydney Smith. By G. W. E. Russell. 'English Men of Letters.' (Macmillan & Co. 2*s.* net.)

This distinguished member of that honourable family, 'the old Smiths of Essex,' who 'never had any arms, but invariably sealed their letters with their thumbs,' has found a sympathetic and able biographer in Mr. Russell. Without personal sympathy, it would have been difficult to give living interest to the memory of one who in the esteem of the present generation has sunk into a witty Whig pamphleteer who happened to be a clergyman, remembered only for excellent jests which have passed into proverbs. But Mr. Russell has not simply revived the recollection of the brilliant Edinburgh Reviewer and the writer of 'Peter Plymley' and 'Archdeacon Singleton,' he has shown what were the real character and aims of a man of whom Macaulay said that it was 'his misfortune to have chosen a profession at once above him and below him.' Above him it certainly was, for, though an excellent preacher of virtue after eighteenth-century ideas, Sydney Smith regarded Christ simply as an example, recognized no doctrine of mediation or the Cross, and, as a climax to his sermon on 'The Character and Genius of the Christian Religion,' declared, 'The gospel has no enthusiasm.' He sneered, with more wit than wisdom, at Methodists and 'consecrated cobblers'; but Carey will be remembered long after the witty diner-out and clever writer of political critiques is forgotten. None the less, it is well that every man of letters who deserves a place in this excellent series should be portrayed by one who understands and sympathizes with his work and aims. Mr. G. W. E. Russell has special knowledge of his subject, and has had access to special information through his family and friends. He tells us that from his youth he has had no more favourite reading than 'dear old Sydney's' Collected Works. Probably few men living could say this. Mr. Russell's genial presentment of the man and the writer will do much to revive and maintain general interest in both.

GENERAL.

The Old Road. By H. Belloc. With Illustrations by William Hyde. (Constable & Co. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.)

CHAUCER glorified the road from London to the shrine of à Becket by his *Canterbury Tales.* Many to whom that way by Greenwich, Rochester, and Sittingbourne is familiar, are ignorant of the route followed by Henry the Second when he went to do penance at the tomb of the murdered archbishop. It was the way taken by travellers from Normandy and Brittany who landed at Southampton and pushed on through Winchester and Farnham to the shrine. Pilgrims from the West of England joined the road at Winchester or Guildford. It still bears the name, as it passes through Surrey and Kent, of The Pilgrim's Way. Thirteen years ago Mrs. Ady, wife of the rector of Ockham, published a charming book on the subject, which lingered pleasantly over the spots dear to the pilgrims of olden times, and helped its readers to watch the cavalcade moving on from point to point along the pleasant ways of Hampshire, Surrey, and Kent. Mr. Maurice Hewlett recently ventured, with no small success, to write a set of stories dealing with the same route, under the title of *New Canterbury Pilgrims.* It has been reserved for Mr. Belloc to go over the road as an antiquarian trying to discover its lost fragments, and to mark out the whole route with some approach to scientific exactness. He has exercised a severe restraint over himself, and only a gleam here and there reminds us of *The Path to Rome,* with its gay badinage and love of adventure. Our traveller kept his eyes open to the humours of the way, as we learn from sundry allusions, but he has not allowed us to share these pleasures with him.

What he has given us is a study of the road and of the influences that shaped it. As a Roman Catholic he evidently hungers for the old times. For him Canterbury has lost its glory. In closing his book he says: 'The city whose name and spell had drawn to itself all the road, and the shrine which was its core, remained to be worshipped. The cathedral and the mastery of its central tower stood like a demand; but I was afraid, and the fear was just. . . . I knew what had fallen upon the original soul of the place. I feared to find, and I found, nothing but stones. I stood considering the city and the vast building, and especially the

immensity of the tower. Even from a long way off it had made a pivot for all we saw; here, closer by, it appalled the senses. Save perhaps once at Beauvais, I had never known such a magic of great height and darkness. It was as though a shaft of influence had risen enormous above the shrine—the last of all the emanations which the sacred city cast out outwards just as its sanctity died.'

That is the minor key in which the music closes. Those who have least sympathy with this sigh for vanished superstitions, and resent such a phrase as 'vapid degradations of religion' (the Waldensian, for instance), will feel keen interest in other sides of this fine study. It opens with a section, 'On the Road and the Fascination of Antiquity.' Mr. Belloc describes 'The Road' as one of those primal things which move us so mightily. We are slow to feel its influence, but those who love to explore even their own country on foot catch its spirit. 'They feel a meaning in it; it grows to suggest the town upon it, it explains its own vagaries, and it gives a unity to all that has arisen along its way. But for the mass The Road is silent; it is the humblest and the most subtle, but the greatest and the most original, of the spells which we inherit from the earliest pioneers of our race. It was the most imperative and the first of our necessities. It is older than building and than wells.'

Such feelings prompted Mr. Belloc to undertake this volume. 'Not only did I desire to follow a road most typical of all that roads have been for us in Western Europe, but also to plunge right into the spirit of the oldest monument of the life men led on this island—I mean, the oldest of which a continuous record remains.' He wished to tread exactly in the footprints of these pilgrim ancestors, and timed his journey so that he should reach Canterbury on December 29, the anniversary of the archbishop's death. That made the expedition a winter pilgrimage. Short days sometimes interfered with the search he and his companions were making for traces of the way. One can understand what a happy thing it was when on July 7, 1220, the remains of the saint were removed from the tomb in the crypt to their new shrine at the eastern end of the cathedral. The Feast of the Translation eclipsed the actual martyrdom, and turned the winter journey into a great summer holiday.

In the second section of his book Mr. Belloc discusses the causes which determined the track and guided its course from Winchester to Canterbury. The North Downs were a kind of natural causeway for travellers who landed in Kent and wished to

push westward. 'There runs from the neighbourhood of the Straits of Dover, right across South England, in a great bow, a range of hills, which for its length, unchanging pattern and aspect, has no exact parallel in Europe.' The way in which Mr. Belloc deals with the question of places of landing on the Kentish shore is fresh and instructive. The sea made Canterbury, for at whatever point wind and wave made the visitor from the Continent land in Kent, Canterbury was the city to which all roads converged. Winchester also owed its position to the sea. It was the inland town to which Southampton led. 'Thus it was that Winchester grew to be the most important place in South England. How early we do not know, but certainly deeper than even tradition or popular song can go it gathered round itself the first functions of leadership. It was possessed of a sanctity which it has not wholly lost. It preserves from its very decay a full suggestion of its limitless age. Its trees, its plan, and the accent of the spoken language in its streets are old. It maintains the irregularities and accretions in building which are, as it were, the outer shell of antiquity in a city. Its parallels in Europe can hardly show so complete a conservatism.'

The Old Road from Winchester to Canterbury dates far back to British times, and was used by the Romans, but it owes its preservation to the murder of Thomas à Becket. That tragedy sent a stream of pilgrims along this venerable highway when it was on the point of disappearing. From step to step the visitors had to take the oldest of paths. Traces of their presence are found all along the route. St. Catherine's was built on the cliff above the river Wey; the lonely peaked hill of St. Martha's was crowned by the Martyr's Chapel. When pilgrimage to Canterbury ceased, the attempt to escape turnpikes served to perpetuate the Old Road. The highway along the summit of the Hog's Back, between Farnham and Guildford, was far better for vehicles than the track which follows the 300-feet contour on the south side of the hill; but it was a turnpike road, while the ill-kept track below was free. The old Pilgrim's Way thus found new use as a modern thoroughfare. The chalk had also helped to preserve the Pilgrim's Way, for chalk retains the traces of a road generations after it has been abandoned, and, as this ground was little built upon, the traces were not disturbed.

The Pilgrim's Way from Winchester to Canterbury is 120 miles long. Sixty per cent. of the road is known, the rest is unknown. There is no continuous gap of seven miles between the parts that are known. The known portions are ten, thirteen, and even

fifteen miles in length. In trying to discover the unknown pieces, Mr. Belloc's method was to collate all the characteristics which could be discovered in those that were known, and apply these to the search for traces of the missing portion. He found that The Road never turns a sharp corner unless compelled by a precipitous rock or a sudden bend in a river; it always keeps to the southern slope, where it clings to the hills and to the northern bank of a stream. The simple reason was that the southern slope is dry. The Road does not climb higher than it needs to do. These and other simple principles guided the search, and it is sometimes quite exciting to follow the investigation, which was conducted with such minute attention. Mr. Belloc is an enthusiast for the chalk, which he describes as 'the principal treasure and core of our lives.' Chalk pits are a delight to him. 'I know them and I love them all.'

St. Martha's made a great impression on the travellers. 'The spot, for all its proximity to London and to the villas of the rich, possesses a singular air of loneliness. It has a dignity and an appeal which I had thought impossible, in laud of which every newspaper is full.'

The view of the whole valley of the Medway, seen from above Wrotham, was one 'of astonishing effect, such as I did not know to be in South England.' It had 'a character of space and dignity which not even the Itchen valley from the heights, nor the Weald from the crest of the Surrey Downs, could equal.' The book will appeal strongly to those who wish to track this pilgrim route through three famous counties. Every lover of English will delight in its descriptions, its superb landscape illustrations, and its splendid maps. It is the most important work on *The Old Road* which has yet appeared, and we should be thankful if Mr. Belloc would make a summer pilgrimage along the same route to clear up some of the unsolved problems, and give free rein to his fancy and observation as he did in his *Path to Rome*.

The Canterbury Pilgrimages. By H. Snowden Ward. (A. & C. Black. 6*s*.)

This volume of Messrs. Black's attractive 'Pilgrimage Series' ought not to be overlooked by any one who wishes to get a clear view of the 'Cult of St. Thomas,' and what it meant for mediaeval England. It gives a chronicle of the archbishop's life, and of the tragedy that closed it; then it describes the miracles said to have been wrought at his tomb, and helps us to see how the cult laid hold of England, and how

it finally lost its power. The road taken by Chaucer's pilgrims and that from Winchester are traced, and details given as to the chief places visited by those who were on their way to the shrine. Chaucer has a chapter to himself, and notes are given on the *Canterbury Tales*, with well-chosen extracts. Mr. Ward covers the whole ground, and knows how to make his book really attractive both to the student and to the holiday-maker. It has fifty effective full-page illustrations of scenes on the way, from photographs by Catherine Ward; some good maps, and many woodcuts taken from mediaeval manuscripts.

The Natural History of Animals: The Animal Life of the World in its various Aspects and Relations. By J. R. Ainsworth Davis, M.A. Half-vol. viii. (Gresham Publishing Co. 7*s.* net.)

Professor Davis and his publishers are to be warmly congratulated on the close of their great task. The natural history of animals has never been treated in so suggestive a manner as in this masterpiece, and every one with a taste for such subjects will regard this as one of the most delightful and instructive of books. The illustrations are notable. The model of the pigeon is most ingenious and useful. The coloured plates are very effective, and the black and white are just what a reader needs to profit by Dr. Davis's descriptions. The topics discussed in this half-volume are 'Utilitarian Zoology' in such aspects as fishes as food, fur-bearing mammals, and other creatures captured for various economic purposes. Then come two chapters on 'Animal Foes' and one on the 'Zoology of Sport,' which will be studied with special interest by all kinds of huntsmen. The section dealing with the 'Fauna of Various Regions' is one of the most valuable, and there is much to learn from that entitled 'Philosophic Zoology,' which discusses evolution. Closer study only brings out the riches of this great work and the abounding material gathered thus together for the benefit of studies in all departments of zoology.

Hymns by Horatius Bonar. Selected and Arranged by his Son, H. N. Bonar. (Clarendon Press. 6*s.* net.)

This selection from the six hundred published hymns of Dr. Bonar has been made with good taste and sound judgement. As we turn over the pages the sense of obligation to the writer deepens. This is a rich legacy from one pen, and it is a legacy which all Churches have rejoiced to accept. It was Dr. Bonar's invariable

custom to grant permission to use his hymns free of charge, on condition that the words were not altered. They were largely adopted by the Roman Catholics, to the author's great delight. Mr. Bonar gives some interesting details as to the circumstances under which some of the most popular of his father's hymns were written, and he helps us to see the writer as he saw him, full of enthusiasm for the classics, rich in kindly humour, and devoted in all things to his Master and his Master's work. The volume is a beautiful memorial of one to whom all the Churches are debtors, and its facsimiles of some of the hymns add much to its interest.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge publishes a second edition of Monsignore Duchesne's *Christian Worship* (10*s.*), translated by M. L. M'Clure. It has been revised with great care, and contains some additional matter of considerable interest just received from the author. A translation of the *Peregrinatio* of Etheria is given, and the authorship of that document is now definitely traced to a Spanish nun called Etheria, who lived in the province of Galicia. The text of the *Exultet* of Bari is also added. This is the most important work which has appeared on the subject, and the new edition will be of great service to all students of the origin and evolution of Christian worship.

The Christian Sunday, Four Lectures by the Right Rev. Alfred Barry, D.D. (S.P.C.K., 1*s.* 6*d.*), is a timely and forcible statement and appeal. Bishop Barry takes nothing for granted, and his moderation in statement gives weight to his whole argument. It is a little book which ought to be widely circulated. The two chapters on 'The Divine Institution of Rest and of Worship' are especially valuable.

Vivian Grey. By the Earl of Beaconsfield. Two Vols. (Alexander Moring. 7*s.*)

This is the first part of the Centenary Edition of Lord Beaconsfield's novels. *Vivian Grey* has been known to our generation by the Bowdlerized edition which the author published in 1853, after his first leadership of the House of Commons. Its full interest as a revelation of the '"wonderful boy" in all his self-conscious, daring, sensitive, generous, bitter, vehement, erratic, brilliant, and withal raw, youth' is only to be gauged by perusing the original edition of 1826. Mr. Lucien Wolf has written an Introduction which throws much new light on the circumstances in which the story was written, and on the early life of Disraeli. That subject he has made his own, and we owe much to his research. The story is an astonish-

ing production for a youth of twenty-one, who threw off more than eighty thousand words in three weeks. The revelation of the writer's views on an endless variety of subjects is not less entertaining than the glimpses of contemporary celebrities with the clue to their identity given in the notes. The illustrations add much to the value of an edition which will be eagerly sought after by admirers of Lord Beaconsfield.

Yesterday's To-morrow: A Romance of the Restoration. By Dora Greenwell M'Chesney. (J. M. Dent & Co. 1905.)

The writer shows herself quite at home amid the personages and scenes, the social atmosphere and political movements, of the period in which her story is placed. Her characters come before us with lifelike distinctness and truth, and the story, which has a fine ethical tone, moves on rapidly and full of incident, holding fast the reader's interest to its telling and dramatic close. In fact there is so much that is good in this novel that we cannot help thinking it might have been even much better. For on looking closely into it we become aware of a certain lack of substance and finish which, in this case, seems to indicate haste of production rather than want of imagination and insight.

An Alphabetical and Chronological Arrangement of the Wesleyan Methodist Preachers, and Preachers on Trial. Twentieth Edition. Enlarged and Revised by D. J. Waller, D.D. (Methodist Publishing House. 1905.)

This new edition of 'Hill's Arrangement' brings the work down to the Conference of 1904, and to all who are interested in the ministers of Wesleyan Methodism and the working of the itinerant system it is indispensable. The chronological list prefixed is interesting, showing, as it does, that there still lives one minister, Rev. Richard Rymer, who dates from 1829, and that more than a dozen are happily still living who entered on their work more than sixty years ago. Dr. Waller has prepared the new edition with care, as all who know the practical value of this book will recognize.

Social Diseases and Suggested Remedies. By the Rev. John Blacket. (Arthur H. Stockwell. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.) State Socialism is discussed in its economic as well as in its moral aspect. The author—an Australian Methodist minister—holds that there is an anti-Socialism which is censurable, but subjects the theories of secularistic reformers to a trenchant criticism. Of Mr. Henry George's remedy—the confiscation of land values—he says that

social and moral effects are expected from it which only the gospel of Christ can produce. An interesting account is given of some Australian socialistic experiments. Village settlements, established on a communistic basis, proved to be 'socially as great a failure as financially.'

The fourth volume of *Emerson's Works* has appeared in the York Library, published by G. Bell & Sons (*2s.* net, cloth; *3s.*, leather). It contains a collection of miscellaneous pieces, dating from 1832 to 1882. None of these were included by Emerson himself in any collection of his writings, and some of them only deserve to be perpetuated because of the light they throw on his literary history. The most interesting are taken from *The Dial*, and will be valued as specimen contributions to that remarkable publication. We question, however, the wisdom of reproducing many of these scattered pieces. Some of them are quite unworthy of the reputation of the author, and what he himself had deliberately left to perish it is hardly wise or fair to resuscitate.

We have also Received—

THE last volume issued in Dent's series of 'Bible Characters and Scripture Handbooks,' containing an account of *St. Peter and his Training*, by Rev. John Davidson, M.A. (*9d.* net). It is furnished with a frontispiece, map, tables, and questions, and forms a very suitable little volume for Bible-class use.

A new edition of Bishop Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims* (the ninth), published in a neat form by Messrs. Longman at *6d.* net.

A sixpenny edition of *Some Thoughts on Inspiration*, by the Dean of Westminster. This contains three lectures delivered by Dr. Armitage Robinson in Westminster Abbey last December, together with an address to Sunday-school teachers, dealing with the same important subject of the right interpretation and use of the Bible.

The Lord's Supper, a thoughtfully written and useful pamphlet, by Rev. T. W. Drury, Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. It is published by Bemrose & Sons (*6d.*), and will prove a useful antidote to current High Sacramentarian doctrine.

Golden Sunbeams for 1904 (S.P.C.K., *1s. 4d.*) is a bright magazine for boys and girls, with good pictures, telling stories, and many helpful little papers.

The New Zealand Official Year-Book for 1904.

The Rapid Review. Jan.–Mar. (Pearson. *6d.*)

The Review of Reviews. Feb.–Mar. (Mowbray House. *6d.*)

Periodical Literature.

IN this section it is not intended to attempt the impossible task of summarizing or reviewing the contents of even a portion of the numerous current reviews and magazines. But, in days when so much excellent work appears in ephemeral form, it is desired to draw the attention of our readers to selected articles which appear from time to time in periodicals sent to us for notice, as well as others which appear to be of general interest and importance.—ED.

BRITISH.

The Edinburgh Review (January–March) opens with an article on *The Reformation in England*, based upon the second volume of the *Cambridge Modern History*. The conclusion arrived at is that 'the movement which is variously styled Renaissance, Reformation, and Revolution proclaims the duty of men to think for themselves; and to this doctrine, whatever the Romanizing party may say, the Church of England stands committed.' This is followed by articles on *Aubrey de Vere*, who, as a poet, is declared to have 'lacked every element of popularity,' but, as a man, to have been possessed of singular personal charm; on the *Colour Question in the United States*, which is treated as a question of Franchise; on *Sweden*; &c. The longest is devoted to Bishop Creighton, and the best (by far) to Sir Edward Burne-Jones. This is of permanent value both as a charming appreciation of the great painter, and as a descriptive analysis and critical estimate of the pre-Raphaelite movement. The dual character of that movement, 'the dwelling on the past, and the application of it to the present,' is traced in the work, not only of Burne-Jones and William Morris, but of Ruskin, 'the intellectual centre of it, who combined in himself both aspects.'

The Quarterly (January–March) also is rich in biographical papers. The lighter and brighter side of Bishop Stubbs's mind is not lost sight of in the course of a judicial estimate of the man and the historian, and several of his wittiest epigrams in prose and verse are given. In *Horace Walpole and William Cowper*, a series of parallels and contrasts, by Mr. R. Prothero, the singular fact is noted that neither of these distinguished letter-writers ever mentions John Wesley, and that 'even Cowper's solitary reference to Charles Wesley under the transparent title of "Occiduus" is one of disparagement.' The paper is full of delightful pictures of eighteenth-century town and country life, and the contrast between the two sets of letters is skilfully drawn. The freshest and most beautiful contribution is a *Study of Canon Ainger*, by

Miss Edith Sichel, who seems to have penetrated into the very recesses of his 'many-sided, many-cornered nature.' It is a charming picture of a singularly versatile and winsome personality. One is not surprised to learn that the canon came of a French Huguenot family, that many of the best witticisms in the *Punch* of the seventies were concocted by Ainger and Du Maurier, 'while their dogs walked round Hampstead Pond,' and that one so serious and yet so much in society maintained a marked 'aloofness from modern thought and from the probings of a younger generation.' The paper has attracted much attention, and is, it may be hoped, the nucleus of a brief biography.

Mind (January–March) appeals chiefly to experts in philosophy, but there are two articles of wider interest—one on a group of *Christian Mystics*, by Professor Lamba, in which Madame Guyon, Francis de Sales, St. Theresa, Ruysbroeck, Suso, and Tauler are used to illustrate the author's naturalistic theory of the phenomena of religious mysticism; the other, by Mr. J. Hutchinson Stirling, on Professor Campbell Fraser's *Biographica Philosophica*, abounds in interesting personal reminiscences of the autobiographer and his friends; of Sir William Hamilton, e.g., 'perhaps the most learned Scot that ever lived,' and of Chalmers haranguing a company of professors, students, and ploughmen in a barn, 'his lightning-swift right arm, like a God-compelled piston-rod,' working out and in till 'roof and rafters, walls and hearers *burn*.' Incidentally, Mr. Stirling supplements Kant's famous saying about the starry heavens and the moral law by a passage which he translates from an earlier and less known work. 'The aspect of the starry heavens on a clear night awakes in us a joy which only noble souls feel. In the universal calm of nature, and in the peace of the senses, the hidden faculty of the immortal spirit speaks to us indescribably, and breathes into us thoughts which may be felt but not possibly expressed.'

The Contemporary Review (January).—In a curious paper on *The Dual Nature of Deity* Mr. George Barlow maintains that the Divine Nature combines the masculine and feminine elements to be found not only in human nature but throughout the universe. Like Zinzendorf, he speaks of the Holy Spirit as the Divine Feminine; and, like F. W. Robertson, he makes much of the fact that in our Lord there was 'neither male nor female,' but a combination of the characteristics of both. In the same number Dr. Vernon Bartlet shows by a detailed exposition that the Oxyrhynchus *Sayings of Jesus*, while adding nothing to our knowledge of our Lord's words, 'save as to their power to quicken souls to high and pure thought as well as life,' yet 'represent the results of early Christian experience and meditation,' and thus 'form an interesting and valuable link between the canonical and uncanonical Gospels.' Writing on *The Bankruptcy of the Higher Criticism* (in February), Dr. Emil Reich accuses its exponents, when dealing with the origins of Bible history, of the folly of relying exclusively on philology instead of taking into account the principles of 'geo-politics.,

What made the Semitic and other tribes so important a factor in history was neither their language nor their race, but their geographical position and the political exigencies of that position. The 'border nations,' the Hebrews, Greeks, Phœnicians, placed like the modern Japanese between vast empires, were compelled to 'mature their mental and physical endowments,' and to maintain a constant struggle for existence, in the course of which potent personalities, the real makers of history, were produced. That Judaism is not 'a theft from Babylon,' Dr. Reich thinks can be shown from the recently discovered and evidently independent legends of the Masai, a detailed account of which is given in the body of this most interesting and important, if, in places, too contemptuous article.

In the March number Canon Cheyne replies to Dr. Reich, 'whose knowledge of biblical antiquity, and of the critical literature respecting it, looks very superficial,' and whose article is described as 'an appeal to popular religious prejudice.' His reliance on the traditions of the Masai, as described by Captain Merker, is discounted by the assertion that the captain 'assumes the main results of higher criticism,' and that 'his main suggestions do not affect the question as to the profitableness' of that criticism. The canon does not undervalue political and racial considerations, but defends biblical philology, which is 'not a mere study of words.' He also defends some of the conclusions of Driver, Kautzsch, and Winckler.

The Nineteenth Century (January).—Lord Roberts's article on *The Army as it was and as it is*, ending its survey of fifty years of change in armaments and tactics with an appeal for universal military training, has excited much interest, and may result in increased attention to the physical culture and discipline in self-reliance of our youth. In the February number Baron Suyematsu describes the methods of teaching morality in the schools of Japan; and Professor Vambéry, in *The Awakening of the Tartars*, calls attention to a formidable source of trouble fast developing among the Moslem subjects of the Tsar. Unlike the *moujiks*, these numerous and warlike peoples do not find in their religion either sanction or encouragement for submission to tyrannical or autocratic rule.

The Fortnightly Review (January) has at least one article of permanent interest, in which Professor Schiller, describing *The Progress of Psychical Research*, summarizes the work of the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers, and shows its bearing on the question of immortality. Myers's interpretation of the facts established by the Psychical Research Society 'has for the first time rendered a future life scientifically *conceivable*, and rendered much more *probable* the other considerations in its favour. *And, above all, it has rendered it definitely provable.*'

The February number opens with an appreciative essay on *King Lear in Paris*, by Maurice Maeterlinck, in which a recent writer in the *Débats* is rebuked for his depreciation of this masterpiece. According to M. Faguet, the critic in question, there is not a man in Europe

capable of writing *Hamlet* or *Othello* or even the *Tempest*, but 'almost anybody could write *King Lear*, with the exception of a few passages which, taken together, would not fill a page.' In most of Shakespeare's tragedies 'coarse melodrama is mixed with work of art'; this is 'little more than hideous, coarse melodrama without admixture.' M. Maeterlinck, on the contrary, 'after surveying the literature of every period and of every country,' thinks it 'safe to declare that the tragedy of the old king constitutes the mightiest, the vastest, the most intense and stirring dramatic poem ever written.' It is 'the most human of plays, the most elemental.' He also notes that Shakespeare is lyrical in his tragedies in proportion to the madness of his hero. In *Lear* his lyricism 'overflows, torrential, uninterrupted, and irresistible, hurling together in immense and miraculous images the oceans, the forests, the tempests, and the stars, because the magnificent insanity of the dispossessed and desperate old king extends from the first scene to the last.'

In the number for March Dr. Macnamara extracts *The Romance of the Census* from the General Report just issued, and would have been still more interesting had he been able, as he intended, to draw a series of contrasts and comparisons between the census of 1901 and that of 1801, the first that was made in England and Wales. In the same number Mr. William Archer has a lengthy appreciation of Ibsen as revealed in his two volumes of letters, which are described as 'extraordinarily interesting, and even fascinating.'

Blackwood (January). — In her recollections of a visit to Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton in 1857 'E. H. J.' speaks of his interest in sympathetic snails. He had discovered that any two of these creatures between whom there is this *rapport* or sympathy, if put into different bottles, can be made to shake each other, at whatever distance—a curious anticipation of wireless telegraphy. A snail telegraph is said to have been afterwards employed during the siege of Paris.

The Renascence of Sycophancy (in the February number) is a not unmerited castigation of Mr. Douglas's *Life of Mr. Watts-Dunton*, in Blackwood's most brilliant and trenchant style.

À propos of the agitation for the abolition of Greek in the March part, 'Mercator Anglicanus' puts in *A Plea for the Abolition of all Learning*, after the satirical manner of 'Maga' in its palmiest days—a most amusing skit. Another paper, in the form of a letter to a mother who is thinking of sending her son to the university, passes the various colleges at Oxford and Cambridge under review, and comes to the general conclusion that 'the Cambridge curriculum is the sounder and more practical,' but that Oxford 'imparts more culture.'

The Monthly Review (February) is remarkable for a defence of *Nihilism*. If we may believe 'Alexi,' the Nihilists are not anarchists. They are 'highly cultured and high-minded people,' with no personal ends to serve, and with no personal grievance against the autocracy. 'They simply ask for concessions which are the commonplaces of every

free community,' and if, in certain cases, they advocate assassination, it is 'because there is no other remedy.' There is also a temperate article, full of concern for *Religious Instruction in Primary Schools*, by the Rev. E. B. Ottley, advocating a scheme under which 'every child, as far as possible, shall be educated in his parents' creed by a teacher who holds that creed.'

The National Review (March).—In a brilliant and trenchant article Dr. William Barry traces the connexion between *Agnosticism and National Decay*. By an agnostic he means 'every one who has, consciously or unconsciously, decided that nothing can be known of the origin, the end, or the purpose of things, and who therefore acts as if human hopes and fears are alike to be interred with his bones.' Religion, for a large and influential section of society, 'is no longer on its trial, it has ceased to exist.' To an amazing extent, society has translated these agnostic views into a code of conduct: 'There is one life, the present; one duty, to make the most of it; one irretrievable failure, to have passed by, or thrown away, opportunities of happiness during this brief season.' And the consequences are beginning to be seen, in the decadence of the race, the result of 'frauds in marriage, a dwindling birth-rate, unlimited divorce, degeneracy in offspring, the abuse of stimulants and of pleasure, the clouding of the intellect; all which are fated to terminate in one disease—the denial of the will to live.'

The Independent Review (March).—In an anecdotal article Mr. C. S. Roundell gives some interesting *Recollections of Mr. Gladstone* —of his earliest speeches, his methodical habits, his sensitiveness to his surroundings, his power of work, the progress of his mind, &c. From others the writer brings confirmation of the story of Mr. Gladstone's backwardness at figures when a boy; and he bears personal witness to his aversion to the Revised Version of the Bible. 'I said of his reverence for the Old Version, "Really, you speak of it as if it had come straight down from heaven." To which he replied, "It came down a great deal straighter than this one."'

The Journal of Theological Studies for January contains abundant material of interest to scholars, but little that would attract the ordinarily intelligent reader. Some of the chief articles are: *The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood*, by Canon Kennett; *Suggestions on the Origin of St. Matthew*, by Mgr. A. S. Barnes; and *A Criticism of Dom Chapman's Views on the Historical Setting of 2 and 3 John*, by Professor Vernon Bartlet. In addition to *Notes and Studies*, which appeal to a very limited circle, Rev. C. H. W. Johns writes on *Assyriology*, and Rev. F. E. Brightman on *Liturgics*. It is well that the high scholarly standard of this periodical should be sustained, but the current number is unusually austere in its disdain of subjects of general interest.

The International Journal of Ethics for January discusses several topics of interest to ministers. The first article, by J. A. Hobson,

is on *Gambling*, which he defines as 'the determination of the ownership of property by an appeal to chance.' We commend his exposition of the deleterious effect of this practice in its various forms—on the Stock Exchange as well as the racecourse, on the intellect as well as on morals—to those men of the world who have said that it was impossible to prove that 'play' in the technical sense is immoral, if carried on in moderation. Professor Dennis deals with a subject which in the Southern States of America is a burning one, and which has more bearing upon other countries than might at first sight appear—*Lynching*. Another article, by Professor James Seth, is on the relation between Ethics and Aesthetics, or, more simply, Art and Morals. Another, on the *Mariage de Convenance* in France, touches upon delicate and important questions which concern the very roots of society in that country. We mention these four subjects as illustrations of those which lie on the borderland between the spheres of the pulpit and the legislature, and in which ministers, if they be themselves thoughtful and competent, may do much to educate and influence public opinion. The review from which we are quoting takes no account of the influence of religion; but if religion be not potent in these departments to-day, it is largely the fault of its teachers.

The January number of **The Hibbert Journal** well maintains the high standard set in previous issues. The discussion of theological and philosophical questions, which this able review is doing much to promote, is as interesting as ever. Two articles are devoted to the Church crisis in Scotland, Mr. Taylor Innes dealing with the question of Creeds, and Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) touching on more general topics. The former of the two is specially able. It contains arguments which should surely have found a place in the pleadings before the House of Lords; they might conceivably have altered its decision. Three articles, written independently, are connected by their treatment of a common theme—*The Warp of the World*, by Newman Howard; *The Universe and Beyond*, by Professor Keyser; and *Mind and Matter*, by Sir Oliver Lodge. The last of the three contains a timely exposure of the weakness of Haeckel's philosophical position. It cannot be too clearly or too often pointed out that what is so often objected to in books like the *Riddle of the Universe* and *The Wonders of Life* is not their science, but their philosophy, falsely so called. It does not follow that an expert in physical science makes a specially trustworthy guide in philosophy: usually the opposite holds true, for obvious reasons. If a theologian raises this objection, however, his judgement carries little weight; it is therefore well that a scientific teacher of the first rank, like Sir Oliver Lodge, should point out the distinction between sound physical science and unsound metaphysical philosophy and draw its obvious moral. Dr. B. W. Bacon of Yale continues his investigation of the Johannine Problem, but sheds no new light upon it. He describes the Johannine writings as 'the X-literature, which in its whole structure reveals to us the effort of Paulinism in the

second generation after the great apostle.' The arguments on which Dr. Bacon bases this amazing view of 'X-literature' show that he has not discovered the root of the equation which gives us the value of *x*. The important section of the *Journal* which contains 'Discussions, Reviews, and Bibliography of Recent Literature,' continues to be one of its most interesting and valuable features.

The Primitive Methodist Quarterly for January, which appears in a new and more attractive garb, provides a variety of literary entertainment for its readers. It contains no fewer than sixteen articles, ranging from *The Centenary of Primitive Methodism* to the characters in *David Copperfield* and *The Watts Room at the Tate Gallery*. Two are on preaching—*Puritan Preaching in England*, by A. A. Birchenough; and *The Preaching to secure Conversions and Holiness*, by Joseph Pearce. The section entitled 'Views and Reviews in Brief' gives scope for the notice of passing events in the Churches; whilst Professor Peake's 'Survey of Current Literature' is—it is hardly needful to say—ably conducted, and it adds greatly to the value of the periodical.

The Church Quarterly Review for January is a fairly interesting number. Its tone on the ecclesiastical crisis in Scotland is as sympathetic towards the United Free Church as might be expected from an organ that is never sorry to find an opportunity for lecturing 'Free' Churches of all kinds. In another article it discusses Books of Devotion, but the writer apparently recognizes only those of one type. *The Science of Pastoral Theology* advocates a more systematic study of a department of clerical work which the writer thinks has been less cultivated in the Church of England than in the Church of Rome. Perhaps the best article in the number is that which deals with *A New Apologetic*. It is based on Mr. Illingworth's *Reason and Revelation*, and contains some thoughtful and timely remarks on the present aspects of the defence of the Christian faith. But the writer lays far too great stress upon 'the traditions of the Christian society' and 'the apparatus of beliefs and practices,' which for him form an essential part of Christianity. It is not with these that the modern conflict is concerned; and while we quite understand their importance for those who are pledged to uphold certain ecclesiastical theories, the *New Apologetic* will not succeed in its main object of defending the fundamental truths of religion if Christianity is to be identified with certain forms of church government and ritual observance.

The Dublin Review (January–March).—An able writer on *The Morality of the Creator* grapples closely and powerfully, if not altogether successfully, with the perennial problem of evil. How could a Being who is perfectly good create such a world as this? The answer will be found, the writer thinks, if we can ascertain the purpose of the creation. This he represents as 'the glory of God through the manifestation in space and time of the created likeness of the divine nature, and of God as the final cause of all created existence,' and adds

that 'if the permission of evil be necessary for the full accomplishment of this end, it must be absolutely right that evil should be permitted to exist.' The bearing of the question on the doctrines of Evolution, the Incarnation, the Atonement, and Future Punishment is also discussed. Another writer takes Mr. Mallock to task for his levity and flippancy in dealing with sacred things, especially in his story, *The Veil of the Temple*, and in his *Religion as a Credible Doctrine*. The rebuke is dignified and detailed, and far from undeserved.

We greatly regret the discontinuance at the beginning of this year of **The Critical Review**, which had for many years past been conducted with great ability by Dr. Salmond of Aberdeen; the more so, because its cessation was partly due to the serious illness of the editor.

Its place will hardly be taken by a new magazine, to which, however, we may extend a cordial welcome. It is called **The Interpreter**, and its object is to discuss questions of science, literature, and archæology, which bear direct or indirect relation to the Bible or affect Christian faith. Its aim is 'construction, not destruction,' and the editor wisely says, 'We know no means to attain this end but fidelity to truth.' The first number includes an article by Canon Driver on *The Permanent Religious Value of the Old Testament*; another by Canon Kennett on *Our Lord's Reference to Jonah*; and another by Professor Lock on *The New Sayings of Jesus*. Rev. C. H. W. Johns writes on a subject he is specially qualified to discuss—*Assyriology and Inspiration*. The value of the articles varies, as might be expected, Professor Kennett's suggestion concerning Christ's reference to Jonah being fanciful and far-fetched; whilst Dr. Driver's paper, above referred to, an excellent account of the code of Hammurabi, and an article on the possibility of miracles, help to make up a good number. We observe that the periodical is described as 'a Church monthly,' and the contributors announced all belong to the Church of England. The publishers are Messrs. Brown & Langham, and the price, 6*d.* net. We may add that the second (February) number is quite equal to the first, the chief contributors being Rev. C. H. W. Johns, who writes on *Assyriology and Inspiration*; Rev. W. Allen, who deals with *The Birth of Christ in the New Testament*; whilst Mr. Brook furnishes a second able paper on *Miracles*.

The Expository Times for January contains, in addition to a sermon of Dr. Sanday on *The Living God*, and a pointed and effective *Twenty Minutes' Address* by Dr. Barber on Conversion, two somewhat longer articles which claim attention. Professor Ramsay discusses the date of the Apocalypse, and inclines, along with many of the best modern authorities, to return to the traditional opinion and place it in the age of Domitian. It is interesting to watch the changes, as of fashion in dress, which mark critical opinion on some standard topics of discussion. Professor R. Mackintosh writes in the January and February numbers on the *Dawn of the Messianic Consciousness in Jesus*—an expression which we acknowledge is not to our taste. It indicates a subject on which the Gospels give us no light, and the writer is as unsatisfactory and un-

convincing as might be expected in his speculations upon it. Professor Vernon Bartlet contributes illuminating criticisms of Ramsay's *Seven Churches* and Drummond's *Character and Authority of the Fourth Gospel.*

In the number for March the editor discusses an interesting question, how far italics should be used in a translation to indicate words not found in the original. We are glad to find that he agrees with Dr. Weymouth, and would banish them entirely from a version of the Scriptures, so far as this purpose is concerned. Foreign theology bulks largely in this number. Dr. Hastings is doing excellent service in thus advising his readers of the chief current publications of German theologians and critics.

The United Free Church Magazine for January contains an excellent portrait of Principal Dykes; an article by Dr. Lindsay on *Luther's First Appearance before the Diet of Worms*; one by Dr. Denney on Ramsay's *Letters to the Seven Churches*, and other interesting matter. The portrait of Dr. Fairbairn in the February number is a striking one; and Dr. Garvie, in his sketch of the career of the learned Principal of Mansfield, says that his distinctive contribution to theology is 'the affirmation of Christ's consciousness of God, and of the Church's consciousness of Christ as the formal principle of Christian dogmatics, and of God's Fatherhood as its material principle.' Rev. S. G. Maclennan writes suggestively on *G. F. Watts, Artist and Prophet.*

The March number contains a portrait and interesting sketch of Dr. Crum Brown, Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh, a man of European fame in his own department. The still unsettled Scotch Church question is discussed in an able paper on *Churches and the Law*, by Professor Alexander Martin, who criticizes a pamphlet by Dr. Mair of the Established Church. Other papers on lighter topics make up a good number.

The second number of **The Liberal Churchman** appeared in March, containing articles by Professor Lobstein on *Poetry and Truth in our Religion*; *Religious Training of the Schoolboy*, by H. Bompas Smith; and one on *The Physical and the Spiritual*, by C. H. Parez. The Notes and Reviews of Books in this number are interesting.

AMERICAN.

Bibliotheca Sacra.—The January number opens with an informing article on *Religious Life in Modern Japan*, by Rev. Geo. E. Albrecht. The belief of the majority of the people is an amalgam, and their religious life is complex. Buddhism was introduced in the sixth century, but did not supplant the old Yamato religion, from which Shintoism derived its belief in the Mikado as 'virtually chief god in the great pantheon.' The sources of Bushido, the precepts of knighthood, are found 'in Buddhism, with its calm trust in fate; in Shintoism, with its central teaching on loyalty; in Confucianism, with the benignant char-

acter of its politico-ethical precepts; and in the democratic theories of Mencius.' To-day the Shinto priest and the Buddhist bonze are contesting with the Christian preacher for religious supremacy. Good reason is given for taking a hopeful view of the prospects of Christianity in Japan. In 1873 the edicts against this 'evil sect' were still in force; if the rate of progress during the last thirty years be maintained, the evangelization of Japan will be complete in 107 years. Three of the leading dailies in Tokyo are edited by Christians; names of Christian novelists and writers on philosophy, &c., are given to show that Mr. Aston in his *History of Japanese Literature* underestimates the influence of Christianity. The chief difficulties are: the intense nationalistic spirit which leads many to regard Christianity as an exotic, and the lamentable prevalence of materialistic teaching in the High Schools. Yet a conviction is growing in responsible circles that 'morality without religion has been weighed and found wanting'; as to the future: 'Eternal life through Christ will be more powerful than eternal death through Buddha.'

The first article in **The Methodist Review** (New York and Cincinnati) for January–February is by Professor Kulms of Middletown. He draws a striking contrast between the religious life of Italy and that of Switzerland, much to the advantage of the latter. Several articles refer, directly or indirectly, to preaching. Dr. Mudge of Boston augurs favourably of *Present-Day Methodist Preaching*, rather as judged from a literary point of view than because of its power to move the conscience and quicken the life. He notices the wealth of quotation, poetical and aesthetic, which abounds in the discourses of to-day, but remarks that 'some silences on certain points are to be regretted,' and 'the non-doctrinal character of the discourses is rather marked.' R. J. Wyckoff in the next article describes *Dante's Message to the Preacher*. He says, 'I have but one aim: to tell what Dante has done for me, and this is after the manner of Methodists.' Another short article is on *The Preaching needed for the Times*.

The Methodist Quarterly Review is the title of the official organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. It is edited by Dr. Tigert, whose interesting paper on *Biblical Criticism and the Christian Faith* at the Oecumenical Conference of 1901 will be in the memory of some of our readers. In the January number Dr. Tigert begins what promises to be a valuable series of articles in exposition and defence of Christian faith. The first is entitled *The Nature of the Christian Religion*. That may seem indeed an elementary question to be discussing in this year of grace; but on this side of the Atlantic lectures on *What is Christianity?* are largely attended and listened to with growing interest. Dr. Tigert's answer to the question well deserves careful reading, especially on the part of those whose duty it is to expound Christianity in a period of religious unsettlement. A suggestive subject discussed by Dr. C. F. Evans is *Our Church Press as related to Christian*

Character. A writer who would really 'let himself go' on that subject might easily cause a sensation just now either in England or America. The whole number of the review is interesting, and the friendly rivalry between North and South is well maintained by Dr. Kelley and Dr. Tigert respectively. Methodism in the United States has reason to be proud of both periodicals.

The American Journal of Theology for January contains the following amongst other articles:—*The Babylonian and Biblical Accounts of the Creation*, by Professor Sayce of Oxford; *Mythological Terms in the LXX*, by H. A. Redpath; and *The Fundamental Problem of Religious Belief and the Method of its Solution*, by Dr. S. F. M'Lennan of Oberlin. The article which has interested us most contains the substance of an address on *The Relations of Old Testament Science to Science in General*, delivered by Dr. Karl Budde of Marburg at the Congress of Arts and Science in St. Louis. The professor was obliged to speak in German, and half his audience, being unable to understand him, left the room soon after he began. The address certainly deserves the careful consideration which it can only obtain when read at leisure at home. It is impossible to summarize it, but we may say that the problem for the student is how to combine that unity of all science, and especially theological science, which Dr. Budde rightly lays down as a fundamental principle, with the uniqueness of the religious history of Israel. It is easy to deny the latter, as the rationalist does; and again to proclaim the exceptional character of biblical theology, as believing exponents of it are bound to do. The problem is how to keep in view together two principles which seem hopelessly to diverge. The interest of Professor Budde's address lies in the way in which he meets this difficulty. At least half of this well-printed and ably edited review is occupied with comparatively brief notices of books. This portion of its work is, however, carefully, not perfunctorily, done, and a useful guide to theological literature is thus provided for American readers.

The most important article in the last number of **The Baptist Review and Expositor** (Louisville, Kentucky) is by Professor Stalker of Aberdeen. It is entitled *Jesus Christ the Giver of the Ethical Life which He Demands*. The title is cumbrous, but Dr. Stalker renders timely service in showing that, whilst our Lord is the greatest of all the prophets, He was and is much more than a prophet—a Saviour. Professor A. H. Newman contributes a keen but kindly and appreciative criticism of Dr. A. H. Strong's *Systematic Theology*. This book, decidedly Calvinistic as it is, deserves to be better known than it is on this side of the Atlantic. It is not without faults, as Dr. Strong's former pupil, Professor Newman, shows. But it contains much solid and able work, and is much easier of reference in its one well-printed volume than Hodge's similar treatise in four. But these are not days in which elaborate systems of theology on a Calvinistic basis are much studied, either by the many or the few.

FOREIGN.

Theologische Rundschau.—Meinhold's review of recent Old Testament literature in the January number of this magazine begins by calling attention to the new matter in the second edition of Guthe's *History of the People of Israel.* In an excursus Guthe examines and rejects Winckler's theories which resolve the figures of the patriarchs into solar and lunar myths. Meinhold complains that Guthe does not recognize Winckler's withdrawal of his hypotheses, 'at any rate so far as Abraham and Joseph are concerned.' Readers of Dr. Emil Reich's powerful article in the February number of the *Contemporary Review* should bear these facts in mind. His exceedingly able contribution to the subject is, in our judgement, marred by the question-begging title, *The Bankruptcy of the Higher Criticism*; the severe strictures of Guthe and others prove that higher criticism has not assimilated Winckler's speculations. Although on some points he differs from Guthe, Meinhold warmly recommends his work as 'a trustworthy guide to the history of Israel.'

Meinhold thinks highly of Spiegelberg's *The Sojourning of Israel in Egypt.* The author is described as an Egyptologist who is devoting himself to the study of Pentateuchal criticism in the light of the monuments. Spiegelberg utters a timely protest against the tendency to attach undue importance to the *argumentum e silentio.* In the Nile Delta there are very few monuments. The national pride of a Hebrew, capable of inventing the story of Moses, would have prevented his representing Israel's first great man as receiving his education at the Egyptian court; this narrative must be fact, not fiction. To some of Spiegelberg's suggestions Meinhold puts a note of interrogation, but he is of opinion that the material collected is valuable, and that on the whole it is handled scientifically.

Theologische Literaturzeitung.—The first book reviewed this year is Dr. Giesebrecht's *Outlines of the History of Israelitish Religion.* It appears in Teubner's series (No. 52) of popular handbooks. For a shilling German students may obtain a manual of nearly 140 pages, which so good a judge as Volz describes not only as written with competent knowledge and skill, but also as bringing out clearly the main facts in the divine education of Israel. From the very beginning of Israelitish religion the overruling providence of God is plainly seen and is carefully traced. The Old Testament relates how in manifold ways the religious life was planted in the men of God, and by their means in others. Emphasis is laid on the 'pure religious life' of the leaders of Israel, and this is regarded as the explanation on the human side of their 'pure religious knowledge.'

There are several points of general interest in Clemen's appreciative notice of Dr. Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents.* An excellent feature of this work is an elaborate defence of the tradition which asserts that the Apostle John resided at Ephesus. Clemen holds

that Stanton is right, notwithstanding the objections advanced by Bacon in *The Hibbert Journal*. High praise is given to the exceedingly lucid style and orderly treatment of difficult questions: owing to these admirable qualities, the reader gains a clear understanding of the most complicated problems. Clemen closes his review by saying that the frequent references to English authors, as well as the book itself, show 'how much we have still to learn from England and America.'

To a later number (February 3) Oldenberg contributes a searching criticism of a Dutch work translated into German: *Indian Influences on the Gospel Narratives*, by Van den Bergh van Eysinga. The judgement of an Oriental scholar like Oldenberg is of special value. It is as follows:—'So far as the Canonical Gospels are concerned—it may be different with the Apocryphal Gospels—Buddhistic influences cannot be proved, and are hardly probable.' He allows the possibility 'in the abstract' of the influence of Buddhism penetrating the early Christian communities, but he regards the evidence of Western knowledge of Buddhism in ancient times to be shadowy.

Theologischer Jahresbericht.—In the latest issue of this most useful and comprehensive survey of theological literature (xxiii. 5) the section dealing with *The Philosophy of Religion and Apologetics* is edited by Dr. Arno Neumann and Dr. Max Christlieb. Their sympathies are with the advanced school of thought, and their 'liberal' tendency imparts additional value to some of their judgements on works dealing with the present-day relations between religion and science. Commenting on the issue of the ninth edition of Du Bois-Reymond's famous lectures on *The Seven Riddles of the Universe*, Dr. Neumann says that still 'this undogmatic scientist cries Halt! to all who, like Haeckel, attempt premature reconstructions of the universe, but not to those scientists who are engaged in practical researches.' Another reference is afterwards made to the 'endless Haeckel controversy.' Freiberg's *Anti-Loofs* is a counterblast to Loofs's *Anti-Haeckel*; it strives to show that Dr. Loofs lacks the requisite scientific and historical knowledge, but is described as 'a bungling piece of work.' Freiberg mistakes hatred of the Church, of theologians, and of Christianity for enthusiasm in the cause of truth. He makes use of undigested fragments from the writings of Kalthoff, Steudel, &c. His vulgar pamphlet is altogether on a lower level than that on which the fight for truth should be waged. Haeckel will certainly not rejoice in such an alliance. Yet even Freiberg does not venture to excuse Haeckel's theological 'howlers.' In regard to Kalthoff it may be said that critics like Holtzmann and Bousset have shown the futility of his endeavour to prove that the main features of the portrait of Christ were in existence before a line of the Gospels was written. In *The Wonders of Life* (p. 74) Haeckel favourably contrasts Kalthoff with the great majority of modern theologians, because he is continuing the work of the 'honourable and gifted' Strauss.

Outside Germany comparatively little has yet been heard of another

Jena professor—Dr. Rudolf Eucken. He is a theistic philosopher, whose influence is spreading in circles to which evangelical theologians find it difficult to obtain access. Dr. Neumann reviews a recently published volume of his *Essays*, dealing with such subjects as 'The Attitude of Philosophy to the Religious Movements of Our Time,' 'The Modern Man and Religion.' The work of Professor Eucken is said to be held in 'ever-increasing esteem'; as a proof of the honour which he has in his own country, it may be mentioned that he was chosen to give the festival oration at the Jena University celebration of the opening of the twentieth century. In the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (July 23, 1904) Dr. E. W. Mayer of Strassburg spoke with high eulogy of this address as a characterization of the nineteenth century, and as an earnest plea for the culture of that 'inward life' which links man to 'the eternal order.' In the same review extracts are given from another essay, in which Eucken points to the modern man's discontent with modern culture as the sign of a movement towards religion. 'In vain does Positivism protest against the possibility of religion. . . . Unquestionably, to it the Future belongs.'

Preuschen's **Zeitschrift** has not commenced a new volume in time for this report, and we have therefore only what we left over from the autumn issue—the important paper of Wendland on Σωτήρ: *A Study in the History of Religion*. Wendland starts from Soltau's theory that the application of the title 'Saviour' to Jesus, as well as the ascription to Him of virgin birth, originated in a Christian revulsion from attributes assigned by pagans to Augustus. Against this Wendland sets Harnack's view that Christian usage had its roots in Judaism alone, and only in the Fathers are the pagan terms definitely claimed as due to Christ alone. In establishing a view not seriously differing from Harnack's, Wendland begins with describing the earlier Greek use of Σωτήρ, which was an epithet of certain gods, especially Zeus, Apollo, and Asklepios. It came into large use for 'heroes' (i.e. deified ancestors), and so passed on to living men, in an age when the distinction between gods and men was breaking down on both sides. The Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucidae in Syria vied with each other in the blasphemous extravagance of divine titles they accepted. Antiochus Epiphanes, that is, 'god incarnate,' represents the climax. Among pre-imperial Roman examples, the assignation of the title *soter* ('a word too big for one Latin word to express it,' says Cicero) to the unspeakable Verres creates the most startling impression, but subsequent history was to see more diabolical 'saviours' than Verres thus honoured by a cheap and possibly profitable servility. After defining the word as involving always the deliverance from distress, Wendland deals with its use in the later books of the New Testament, where he recognizes a passage outside the purely Old Testament conceptions seen in the name 'Jesus' and its explanation in Matt. i. 21. In the Pastorals and 2 Peter, and other New Testament books written (as Wendland assumes) after the accession of Domitian, we have phraseology richly paralleled in that of the Hellenistic and

Roman king-cultus. The Christians might well reclaim this language from such misuse for Him to whom it was all-appropriate, more particularly when the mortal strife had blazed out between the worship of the Caesar and that of the Christ. The carefully worked out antithesis of Christ and Augustus, the centre of Soltau's theory, belongs to a later time, if real. The article must be referred to for illuminating exegesis of several passages: incidentally may be noted Wendland's treatment of Titus ii. 13 and 2 Pet. i. 1, where it is an 'exegetical mistake' to separate 'our (great) God' from the 'Saviour' following. The reader of Deissmann's *Bible Studies* will remember how that pioneer scholar has used the pagan imperial title 'Son of God' as 'yielding a contribution to the question as to how' the Christian title 'might be understood in the empire' (p. 167). Reference might also be made to a note in the *Expositor* for December 1903, p. 438, where an Egyptian inscription is cited: 'To Nero . . . the Saviour and Benefactor [cf. Luke xxii. 25] of the world!' 'If Nero is to be recognized in the Apocalypse,' the note continues, 'his appropriation of this title is in striking accord with the principle which in this book always makes the devilish parody the divine.'

The Revue de Deux Mondes (March) has two articles of general interest—the one literary, the other scientific. *L'Œuvre de Sainte-Beuve* is a short history of literary criticism in France, followed by a detailed description of the works of Sainte-Beuve, who, while pre-eminent as a critic, is shown to have been most at home, and most himself, in his masterly work on Port Royal. He is described as one of the greatest of French moralists. 'From his works might be extracted a large volume of pensées, maximes, and reflections which would take their place naturally by the side of those of the most famous observers of the human heart. You feel in them a man who has long lived at Port Royal, and who justifies the saying of Royer-Collard: "He who does not know Port Royal does not know humanity."' *Au Dela du Microscope* is a luminous and fascinating summary of the work of the German physicists, Siedentopf and Zeigmondy, in Hypermicroscopy, and gives some account of the apparatus, which has been recently simplified by two French savants, MM. A. Cotton and H. Mouton. The new apparatus multiplies a thousandfold the power of the old instrument, and renders visible granules of a diameter of from five to ten millionths of a millimetre. Important results have already been attained in biology, physics, and chemistry, and further discoveries are anticipated in bacteriology, petrography, and anatomy.