
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. 208. OCTOBER 1905. Fourth Series. No. 4

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

OCTOBER, 1905

SOME CHRISTIAN ASPECTS OF EVOLUTION.

IT is not strange that the doctrine of evolution should have taken a hold upon the present age, which has in many quarters become a tyranny. It is a grand and comprehensive idea, which has now been taught to speak the language of the palpable sciences to every ear. It also clears up several of the more obvious difficulties that have posed the ordinary intelligence in the natural world by indicating that creation is not yet done. And 'every new idea,' says Goethe, 'acts like a tyrant when it comes to light: hence the gain it brings only too soon turns to loss.'

It is a youthful mistake, of course, to suppose that the idea of evolution in nature entered through Darwin or even Lamarck. It was a philosophic idea long before it was scientific, and it was far more comprehensive. It did not even dawn with Hegel (who has room for Darwin's greatness in a side pocket). It plays an unformed and mystic part in the Neoplatonic systems of Alexandrian times, and, through Augustine, had much place in mediaeval thought. It was an intuition of speculative genius, (like so much in Lucretius, for instance,) before it was a biological theme.

There is no doubt, also, it still exerts a great imaginative fascination. No small source of its influence is outside of its scientific utility as a hypothesis. Its popular spell is largely aesthetic; and it is due to the imposing features read into it by the imagination, which quietly elevates it from a physical hypothesis to be a scheme of the world. It seems to bring life from the dead. It represents a kind of Evangelical Revival, if not indeed a Reformation, in the scientific mind. It offers to the mind, in a world which had seemed to antiquity so finished and fixed, the spectacle of a universe in vital movement, a ζῶον, in movement, too, on a vast scale, and in an overwhelming *crescendo*. Creation seems at last to be on the march—nay, on the path of victory. It is as if we were lifted to a place where we could safely look down on the whole battlefield of existence and see in rapture the vast deployment of the fight. It replaces the old mechanical conception of the world by the more engaging idea of organic growth. At the same time, it spreads the realm of cause and law to cover the vast region of new knowledge laid open by the explorers in all kinds; so that our growing experience reveals still a universe ordered in all things and sure, controlled, not to say centralized, yet instinct with vitality and promise. Again, it calls upon every individual to show cause for its existence in its contribution to the whole; and this, even if it swamp the individual's ultimate right to be which is drawn from his relation to the absolute God, is in tune with other instincts of the age, and seems a useful curb upon unchartered egoism. It seems to show that the moral and social forces, which repress undue claims for self, are the great agents and guarantees of human progress, that godliness is not only good but useful, and profitable for both worlds if we look widely enough. And it appears to take some of the gloom from the struggle and pain of existence by showing that it is not all fruitless, not gratuitous and suicidal, but a condition of progress so far. It writes one aspect of the Cross, its sacrifice, on the whole area of life, and traces the roots of it among the minute crevices of all sentient being. It may at once be said that

in principle the evolutionary idea has a place and value in science that can never be lost, however questionable we may find it in philosophy. And it has foregleams and points of contact for the nobler morality, fatal as it may be to it on the whole (for its altruism has a strange trick of suddenly doubling back into a hard egoism). But to fight it or begrudge is no duty of religion, and no service to it, so long as the theory is not elevated to be a new religion, and a complete guide of life.

I.

The doctrine is now so well established upon its own ground that it can afford to welcome some indication of the limits within which it must move.

In the first place, it does not cover the whole of its own area. The part of it which deals with descent may be sound, but it does not follow that the other part, the theory of selection, is adequate. There would seem to be other factors involved in the process than adaptation to environment. It is not yet shown to be impossible that the distinctive native constitution of the organism may not have its effect among the forces that determine the result. And the theory of selection will not account for the cases of 'sudden and discontinuous variation' which, from their first beginning, have 'more or less of the kind of perfection which we associate with normality.' The doctrine is far from final on the side of selection as distinct from heredity; and there is room for another Darwin to arise to do for *his* positions much of what *he* did for those that went before. Within biological science itself there are many who are preparing the way for such a genius, and making the need of him more and more clear.

It has been pointed out, also, that there is a lack of clearness in the idea even as applied to its own area. There is a silent substitution of a qualitative for a quantitative. Selection is a mechanical idea; it is the adjustment of parts, or of the creature and its environment. Whereas the idea suggested by evolution is an organic one; it is the growth from within outward of a self contained force, which is not

a mere abstraction, nor a brute urgency, but force, surely, with a specific content of features and qualities imposing themselves on the surroundings. And no small amount of the fascination in the doctrine arises from this quiet transfer to mechanical conditions of associations which only belong to an organic and organizing power. Indeed, it is not fair to class the Darwinian evolution with those ideas of evolution which have belonged to speculative science from antiquity downwards. These all insisted on the evolving of something already within—whether as the educt of a minutely preformed creature, or as the product of a mere epigenetic power. But in biological evolution there is no such interior, and the forms and species are but the result of chance variation, and external collision.

II.

At most, and even supposing the missing link or links were found, the doctrine simply registers a method of past procedure. It has no world goal. It has no teleology on one great cosmic scale. There is nothing that gives us to know the problem set us as living souls in the world, far less to find ourselves in that problem. It does not explain the world, it only marshals it. It is an organizer and not an interpreter. It sets up the type in lines and pages, but it cannot read the book or open its seal. It follows its grammar, but not its logic; and it does not discern its spirit. It is not revelation, but illumination. Knowledge of the world is one thing, and that can be expressed in science; but the explanation of the world is another thing, and it has to do with destiny. Even the knowledge is as yet very incomplete. At the source of each step is a variation whose cause is unknown, and whose method of appearance is unexplained. Far less have we a causal explanation of the origin of one particular variation—consciousness; less still of the origin of self-consciousness and spiritual, responsible life. There is no scientific bond connecting the finest movement with even a primitive consciousness. And the gulf is not bridged between the ideas and duties in human

thought and the pictorial conceptions of the animals below. But supposing many of these gaps were connected up, we should still have but a splendid sequence, waiting for its true explanation in some great interpretive *Word*. This word can only express an end, goal, or destiny; and for such a word science not only has not, but cannot have, the secret. Explanation has far more to do with purpose than with cause or method. *How* man was made does not tell us *why* he was made, and cannot. History alone does not give destiny. It is only in a modified sense that the history of a truth is its criticism. We may ask what caused all this and marshals it, or we may ask what means all this and crowns it; and while science has a place in dealing with the first question, with the second it has nothing to do, nor anything to say upon it. The answer to the first does not necessarily answer the second, and the second must not arrest the first. Science seeks causes or methods, but not ends. She can but know and formulate the world so far as it has gone, she cannot interpret it by the end to which it is going. She must claim the region of etiology, but let teleology alone. The explanation of the world is in its nature revelation, and only faith can apprehend it. For it is an unfinished world, and a destiny corresponding to its vast scale cannot be forecast by us. But it may be foretold to us, and in principle it is—in the absolute revelation which breaks through the midst of history in Christ. The goal of the world is a spiritual power already in the midst of the world. The final whole is given us in Christ's spiritual whole. It is the perfecting, the universalizing of our present miraculous communion with the Eternal God. It is the kingdom of God—which is given us and not achieved, which is matter of revelation and not of discovery. Redemption is man's destiny. The purpose of the world is the correction of a degenerate moral variation on its way to become universal. Only our responsive faith gives us that knowledge of the infinite whole in which evolution works as a partial procedure. Yet for explanation it is the whole that we need. I am not myself a true and whole self till I find my place in the whole. We need

something on which man as evolved can stand while he construes the process of his evolution. For our security we ask, What is the vast power going to do with us at last? We need a moral, universal, and final teleology; and that is the gift in Christ. Let us only take care that we treat that gift as a teleology and a power. Let us not waste it upon questions of causes, to which it brings no direct answer. In this region its best service is the promotion of a true science, equipped for causal research, and counting among its first equipments those spiritual and ethical conditions in which alone a true science can rise and thrive.

What is the end of it all? *Cui bono?* Who gains by the struggle? And what science can tell that? What evolution? What induction? For all that appears the individual is a mere pawn in the game with our dark partner; and not the individual only, but whole species and races. Even when the individual seems to thrive, it is at the cost of his moral initiative. The doctrine of evolution substitutes process for effort. We are caught in a tendency which, we are taught, no effort can control. We are borne along on a tide against which we cannot swim. We learn the fruitlessness of moral struggle against these age-long forces that have submerged so many of the best moral attempts. We climb a climbing wave. We are creatures of the time and of the world. We lose the moral vigour which resists a majority, the public, or the priest; and the moral sympathy which helps to its feet the inferior race or the struggling right. We learn to distrust truth itself. It is all relative only, something in the making, and something which we can make. And it is all over with truth when man feels himself its creator. His truth is not worth martyrdom then, for it is too changing to be an object of faith; and is hardly worth propagandism, for it will change ere he can convert an audience, to say nothing of a generation. Reality gives way under our feet, and standards vanish like stars falling from heaven. 'Growth (it comes to be thought) does not issue from being, but being from growth.' Man becomes his own maker, and he has a moral fool for his product.

Goodness, by becoming but one contributor to the struggle for existence, ceases to be goodness and becomes a mere utility. A spiritual interior ceases to be man's distinction. And the scientific thinker himself, thus hollowed out, ceases to trust and respect his own thought; he himself comes to be part of the lie of an empty world. Thought on these false lines, therefore, destroys its own conditions; it commits suicide, and mankind evolves over an abyss.

III.

And when we ask what progress means, what it is measured by, how it is distinct from mere movement, what shall we reply? What entitles us to say whether any increase of movement or complexity is progress?[1] Must the newest be the truest? We have from science no answer. Evolution is quite silent, because quite ignorant, as to its own goal and standard. It looks to yesterday with a smile, which fades whenever its glance turns to to-morrow. To what do we move? Over Niagara? To what do we climb? To the top of a slumbering volcano, on whose slopes the vines grow lush only because of its one day fatal fires? What has the individual to reconcile him to all that is exacted from him in toil, suffering, and death to feed the progress of the race? What profit is there in his blood? What is the recompense of whole races and ages thus crushed and erased? What private, personal, inward, and spiritual gain have they won? Why should they toil and suffer for the sake of a posterity equally blank and barren? The struggle naught availeth. What is there to translate their cross into glory, their sorrow into hope? What is to transfigure their body of grief and death? What is to change them from victims into martyrs, and from martyrs into the seed of some triumphant Church? If there be any such integrating agent it must surely be something which is at once the final victory and the present power; some

[1] The very Church has come to confound size with power, and bustle with growth. It gets excited about a Church census, and it stupefies its ministers by incessant demands for what is slangily called 'work.'

purpose which runs through all things as the truth in all and the crown upon all; some will which turns mere matter into purpose, which elects to proceed in the way of selection, and to sustain in the way of communion. We must find the end of living in the living God, the goal of all in the stay of all. And this is a power which we have only in the revelation of the Cross and its foregone (may I say its proleptic?) conquest. The empirical world is far too vast, complex, and tragical now for any philosophy of history to prophesy its goal from the necessities of speculative surmise and the categories of an irresistible ideal imbedded in thought. We must turn for our certainty elsewhere where philosophy fails as a foundation. We turn to historic faith and its experience. We are cast onward and upward to faith as our divine destiny. We were born to believe; and we are harried, as it were, into our heaven. We are carried reluctantly to our true glory, which is to know because we trust, rather than trust because we know. Our chief knowledge is of that whereby we are known. We are cast upon faith, neither as a *pis aller*, nor as a leap in the dark, upon a faith which finds in the historic work of the superhistoric Christ an absolute warrant of the kingdom of God as the close and crown of all. This realm will not be on earth; but it grows from earth, though planted from heaven. It is only evolved because it has been infused. It is one of the great gains of our time to have realized the organic continuity of the spiritual future with the growing present. The modern world but prolongs the soul of the seen through the crisis of death. And our heaven is more a fulfilment of our earth than its reward. Glory is but the consummation of grace, and grace arises in the very heart of nature and history, though it springs out of neither. The kingdom of God is to faith the immanent truth of things, their soul and *nisus*, subtly, slowly supreme on earth, and eternal in the heavens.

IV.

It has been often enough admitted by leading exponents of evolution like Huxley, that the doctrine contains nothing

incompatible in principle with a teleology. And a great jurist who studied the doctrine from the view-point of his own science (Ihring), adds that 'the idea of an end proposed by God for the world is quite compatible with the most rigid law of causality.' Everything turns on the kind of teleology and the range of its lines. There is nothing in evolution fatal to the great moral and spiritual teleology of Christianity, whatever may happen to the antiquated, and what I ask pardon for describing as even the paleyological, forms of design.

This old conception of purpose in nature was mechanical, and did not rise much above the level of contrivance. Nature was construed as if it were a product of skill like human art. It was noticed that man in the production of things most valuable always preceded the means with an end conceived in thought. He proposed the result first as an end in his thought, and then disposed his resources to its attainment in face of obstacles foreign to himself. This analogy gave the devout mind a deep sense of an intelligent personal creator and governor of the world *ab extra*. But it fails when the range of thought passes beyond mechanism, transcends contrivance, and engages with the final problem and purpose of all reality. It does not give us an immanent God but a Demiurge. Growth, and not manufacture, is the method of reality. Manufacture, indeed, was but a halfway-house on the road from a theory of chance to the theory of growth. Plan and its pursuit form but a subsidiary element in all the greatest energies of life. The great products flow not from an understanding which anticipates every perilous juncture and is ready with the right means to deal with alien and intractable material, but from a germinal idea or power which pervades matter, from its central throne makes all things new, and lives in the world it has made. It is so with Christianity, which flows in its true course and conquest of life from the vital principle of faith in Christ. And it is so with every minor product and victory of the spirit on the great scale. Nay, the scheming understanding itself is a product of evolutionary growth.

The lower teleology fails also to deal with the problem raised by pessimism, whether Being blindly blundered on man's suffering soul, and stumbled on a lucid interval of intelligence, out of whose agony it must find its way back into the dark reality which is the ultimate power in things; whether the good of life is not the negation of ultimate reason, purpose, and adjustment; whether thought's business is not to hasten the death of thought and so escape its pain. It fails, too, when it is asked whether the adaptation in the natural world is not imported into it by *our* purposive reason, and imposed by us on what is really no more than the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence between different forces. We must grant to pessimism that that simple teleology will not apply if we are looking for all things to work together for our natural and worldly weal. An individualist teleology, or an eudaemonist, can no longer be maintained. The world does not exist for the happiness of its several units. It is there for man only as a member of society, and for his happiness as a lover of the kingdom of God. And we must also concede to the evolutionists that in some regions utility is only provable as the outcome of variation, selection, extinction, survival, and evolution through a conflict of immense duration and infinite experiment. But if it be proposed to limit the whole process of existence to the field of these concessions, to make the principle of natural well-being or biological fitness the scheme to which the whole creation moves, we object to such a dwarfing of life, man, or the world. History alone bears witness to a destiny far beyond a range so narrow. The pessimist must be reminded that an intelligence which embodies purpose and yet is unconscious may be conceivable at the end of an evolutionary series, but not at its beginning. The mechanism of purpose once stumbled on might run on as a kind of unconscious habit, as automatic intelligence without initiative, like the nesting instinct which builds the abode for the family but in thousands of years does not alter its fashion or adjust it better to the creature's need. But this could not be the primal Being. Even if the final unconsciousness

were a return to the unconsciousness of the beginning, why must we say that the consciousness which is at least penultimate has no counterpart at the origin of the series? There may be, there is, an unconscious element in mind; but a conscious mind can only arise from conscious mind. The cell capable of development into conscious mind cannot be divorced from conscious mind at the outset without postulating a breach and a miracle greater than the special creation of separate species. Conscious purpose must have presided over the origin of the moral world, however remote or however simple that origin may have been. The *Iliad*, it has been said, could never arise from a fortuitous concourse of letters. And the infinite interlocking of conditions in the growth of a unitary world of body, soul, and society could never have arisen from an accidental collision of causes all disparate and purposeless.

There is, for life at its last and largest, an end of all things which is only given in the moral world. There are so many cases of maladaptation both in nature and society that it is impossible to base a fixed faith on a teleology which takes account only of the happy adjustment we can trace in either. It is not in nature at all that we can find nature's end. Nor is it in living society that we find the sure word of prophecy as to the social goal. And if it be in history, it is not in history as a series. It is not an induction from the whole area of history (which we see not yet), or the abstraction of an apparent tendency. It is at a point of history, where for once and all the soul becomes a personality as absolute and final as it is in God. In Jesus Christ we have the final cause of history, and the incarnation of that kingdom of God which is the only teleology large enough for the whole world. It is to faith, to the loving soul believing in Christ, that all things work together for good. Let the text be finished. All things co-operate for blessing to them that love a God in Christ reconciling the world, and are the called in His purpose. It is this frame of mind and heart that all nature and history are adjusted to produce at the long last. It is this order of heart that is the destined and called, according to life's

original and final purpose in God. And it is this faithful union with Christ that affords to the individual soul power to rise up against the pressure of an environing world and an evolutionary past, and to assert itself with an originality which the vast process tends to stamp out. This is especially so in the case of repentance against a degenerate past. It is only faith, and faith in Christ, that enables the soul, lamed by its own schism and treason, to resist the tendency to go with the huge natural stream, and to submit to be classed as a thing among things. Each man, indeed, is a child of his age, but only so far as the form of his problems go. Their essence is perennial. And the answer must come from that in him which is both within and above his age, which links him to the Unseen and Eternal and gives him intelligence of its ways. Redemption is the one goal. Christ is the purpose of God for the world. The Redeemer Himself is already our redemption, the Saviour is our sanctification, who Himself is made unto us righteousness and perfection. Our salvation is to be in Christ, and we are complete in Him, in whom and for whom are all things.

Till science appreciate and explain the historic fact of Christ, it has not subdued the world. When He is explained we possess the world's explanation. Only, it is an explanation which to science as science is always impossible. For science cannot concern itself with ends or destinies. And these are the categories that explain Christ. It was in these He chiefly wrought. And the Christian explanation proceeds by the knowledge of faith, not of sight; by the faculty which interprets the value of facts, and not simply their cause or co-ordination. It appreciates the why of the world, and not simply its how. Science here is like the balance which says this is heavy and that is light, but cannot say if either be silver or gold.

So, besides the limitations of the evolution doctrine in its own area, there are great areas of existence and life to which it does not apply at all. What solves the biological problem does not solve the philosophic. The formula for the evolution of a section is not the norm for the evolution of the whole.

The great conflict of the age is the battle for a spiritual interior, a spiritual totality, and a spiritual interpretation of life and the world. This is the test of every new doctrine which comes before us. Does it make for the spiritual value of life? Or does it discourage it? Or does it preclude it at the outset? And judged by this test the higher we rise towards man's spiritual life, the more inadequate does the evolutionary principle seem. It would be foolish to say that our spiritual life is unaffected by it; but it would be more foolish to say that it is expressed by it, far less explained. Evolution is not the complete formula for human progress. Righteousness and peace are worth more than mere progress and prosperity, and what does not bring them is neither a revelation nor a gospel.

V.

Reference has been made to the sudden appearance of well developed variations in the biological region, and the same phenomenon is much more striking in the moral and spiritual world. I allude, for instance, to the emergence, at very early and immature stages, of men uniquely endowed, who carry genius to a pitch which all after ages can but submit to admire afar. Homer, Virgil, and Dante, to say nothing of the Bible writers, may have appeared on the summit of particular civilizations, but they belong to the race more than to epochs, nations, or civilizations; and in the history of the race they appeared early, and not late. And the like applies in a higher degree to the appearance of Jesus Christ Himself, as the spiritual focus of the race. Here spiritual mankind produces its blossom long before its leaves. And the finisher of its spiritual life is at the same time the historic author of it and its fountain-head. Moses created Israel; as Heine said, *er schuf Israel*; he was not its great product. And so the fullness of Christendom is He who made Christendom and was not made by it. Great men are not made great by their *milieu*, which gives them no more than a field and form. It provides them a language, it offers them their problems, and presents them the issues. But the

answers are latent in the miraculous quality of their native genius, and not inhaled by them from the spirit of their age. They are not orators who absorb a vapour and give it forth as a flood. They are prophets whose spiritual quality is an original but rational mystery, and whose revelation is as secret in its source as it is fertile in its course.

Whenever we have great spiritual initiative there the theory of natural evolution must retire. Its tendency indeed is to crush out that initiative, and to suppress for ever the individual which for a moment it evoked. Like a stamping machine it goes on to produce an immense number of individuals, but to starve individual variety. It extends the multiplicity of the world, but discourages its characteristics. It increases quantity and reduces quality. It enhances the numbers only to depress the inner wealth and intrinsic resource of life, to increase the people and not multiply the joy. This is the result of a democracy merely natural and evolved.

In the region of moral freedom this is especially true. No freedom of this high sort is possible on a theory of natural selection. And with moral freedom vanishes the initiative which is the real spring of human progress and the real condition of glory. There could indeed be no fall in a purely evolutionary world; but we pay too dearly for the immunity at the cost of that liberty which, if it do make fall possible, is yet the only condition of true life, as of fresh resurrection. The higher we rose there would be the less power of new departures, and the deeper we fell there would be the less possibility of revival and recovery. The tragedy of existence in the area of natural selection is great enough, the fruitless sacrifice, the pitiless, deadly fate; but if the principle of natural selection were made to cover the whole moral area the tragic meaning of life would die away, we should lose the sense of tears in human things, and we should be left with the sordid miseries that are enacted among creatures incapable of the tragic sense. Concurrently with the victory of Darwinism, literature develops its Badalia Herodsfoots and its Tales of Mean Streets. To banish the tragic sense

from life, as all evolution and much religion of the breezy sort tend to do, is to condemn us to a shallow happiness which has within it the conditions of endless ennui and fatted death. Attention has been called by critics to the present decay of tragedy and the passion for comedy, high or low—and mostly low, or trivial at least. Comedy was the drama of the Restoration, and it turned out the tragedies of the great Puritan age. It is not an accident that a similar taste coincides with the obsession of the public mind by the evolutionary idea. Whatever discourages greatness of soul, spiritual enterprise, and moral initiative makes for the rule of the comic spirit, the mocking, the ironic providence, and it worships the great 'Aristophanes of heaven.' It is the badge of our evolutionary time, which rejoices in excellent periodicals and is a fine taster of the tertiary poetry, but has little sense for great literature or ultimate thought. It is the index of the suppression of soul and the evolution of everything else, religion included—except faith. And the moral callousness of our present phase of public life and government, the thirst for empire, the loss of chivalry, and the growth of cynicism, indicate a state of mind produced by a general belief in little higher than the struggle for existence. Let us hope that the collapse of Mr. Kipling's genius indicates also the collapse of the public temper which idolized him.

VI.

The slowness of moral progress also, compared with mere civilization or social evolution, might suggest to us that there is in the moral realm some action which is rebellious to the evolutionary law. How comes it that moral progress is so slow while the advance of civilization gains in velocity as it moves through time? (Is this the acceleration of a falling body?) If moral progress be the chief, how is it that it does not run with all and more than all the accumulated speed of the forces that led up to it? Is it not because in the moral region we are in another than the evolutionary zone, where we must stoop to conquer and go back to leap? We have to return to fight out

anew the old conflicts and regain the old conquests. Each man and age has to return for itself to headquarters; and we cannot pick up our goodness, our character, just where our father left off, as we can with his research, his estate, his position. No age can inherit moral worth, as it does civilization, by legacy. We cannot live upon our father's faith as we can on his fortune. An uncertainty keeps invading the moral foundations of life which does not assail its achievements, and we must here know for ourselves. And this return, this arrest, alone suggests a great qualification upon any theory of mere development which pretends to cover the world. When we enter this region, we draw near to the world's centre, where its unity and totality reside. We are in contact with processes which involve the vital all and regulate the world's soul, processes which are utterly recalcitrant to the formula of a sectional sphere. It is even questioned by many whether in all these centuries of evolution the average man is really better, more worthy and noble in his motive or ideal than he was before. We need not answer the question. The very fact that it is capably raised by men who would never think of stirring the same question about social development in the more outward and natural sense shows that they recognize a vast difference between the two worlds of morals and of civilization in their principles of progress. We may discard, if we think well, the theological explanations which are offered in doctrines like those of original sin or total depravity, but we ought to recognize that they arose first as explanations and were not spun as dreams. They were efforts to explain things which we alert dreamers are pleased to ignore. They were forced from men by the existence of highly intractable facts. And facts which remain when these explanations are discredited. The absence of explanation to-day is due in some part to the absence also of that courage which faced the facts, and that insight which realized their moral seriousness.

But it is something more grave than moral slowness that we have to contend with when we come to the summit of evolution in man; it is moral sedition. It is not mere

spiritual reluctance; it is recalcitrance and rebellion. It is not that progress lags, but that regress speeds. The higher we rise in the scale of development, the more we are impressed with degeneration as an active and deliberate force. If it be true that there is in man a steady current of exaltation, it is equally true that man also makes his debasement one of his serious pursuits. There is not only indifference to his good, nor aberration, but hostility, which can be bitter. And this cannot be integrated into any theory of natural development. It belongs to a region which natural faculties can neither explain nor reform. We come to a point where nature, and even genius, must give place to grace, where salvation must take up what development laid down, and redemption give us what even our goodwill failed to attain. We arrive at a perversion whose only remedy is conversion, and to a principle which is revolution rather than evolution, or, in so far as it becomes evolution at all, is the evolution of a fundamental revolution in Jesus Christ. But it is not unjust to say that the vogue of the evolutionary theory, its popular vogue outside of strictly scientific circles, owes much to the fact that it has a great ally in the indifference, passing into hostility, of the average man to moral effort or spiritual height. He would be carried, for he cannot go, like a heathen god.

VII.

There is another consideration. The study of history soon shows that the race does not move forward in an unbroken progress like a mighty stream. There are periods when it seems to contract in all ways, to say nothing of stagnation. It grows narrow without growing deep; and it seems even to settle into malarial swamps. (That it appears to go backward would not matter, because it might be progress none the less. The river may return upon its course in many a curve, moving all the time in growing volume, through a country blessed and beautified, to the sea.) But the analogy of a stream is drawn too much from mere natural process to fit the level of growth where man appears.

And what we have there is rather to be described as progress by crisis, by catastrophes (or, if we keep the previous image, by cataracts). Beyond the steady conflict of the struggle for existence the course of history gets into tangles and knots at particular periods. Seasons of calm and beauty discharge themselves in thunderstorms, which clear the moral air and open space for new energies and new periods. There are harvests which are the end of an age. Good and evil work together till their intrinsic antipathy refuses any longer to be compressed; then there is an explosion which changes the face of things. There comes a day of the Lord, and a new world. The appearance of good often has its first effect in aggravating the energy of evil. The revelation of sanctity is at the same time a revelation of sin: and the growth of the one accentuates the antagonism of the other. The one forces the other to show itself plainly, to throw off its mask, and to put forth all its wicked resource. Grace enters to develop sin into transgression, to bring sin to the surface and make it overt. Then comes the encounter, and the prince of the world is judged. These Armageddons are repeated in history, issuing in waves, as it were, from the central and absolute crisis of the Cross. And what we look down on from God's right hand is a great wager and waver of battle, a winning campaign of many swaying battles, progress by judgement, a rising scale of crises, working out in historic detail to an actual kingdom of God, with its strategic centre and eternal crisis in the death of Christ. The Scripture idea of history is not a stream of evolution but a series of judgements. It is an idea more revolutionary in its nature than evolutionary. It is a series of conversions rather than educations. The world is redeemed rather than perfected, and it is saved by 'shocks of doom.' It is there that we find the formula of providential evolution, and therefore of all evolution upon the universal scale. The key is a moral one; and the principle of a saving judgement is deeper than that of a guiding providence. Its pattern is very different from the formula of a simple evolution as we might deduce it from the growth of our stature, or the

life-history of a species. We have some prelude of it in the catastrophes which have ended epochs or species and made room for others on their graves.

VIII.

I have spoken of the inadequacy of evolution as a formula for the region of spiritual originality, and for that of the morally backward and froward. But there is another area besides, where its writ does not run. I mean the whole world of the changeless which is so indispensable as a background, an interior, nay, a constant source for the world of change. The development of spiritual faculty it is that brings us into touch with this permanent world. As we rise in human affection we realize how fixed the primal passions are. The human heart beats to the same measure to-day as in the Eddas. 'Homer's sun lights us, and we see it with the same eyes.' The old and aching riddle of life is substantially the same for us as it was for Job. The refinement and flexibility of human relations demand more and more urgently a fixed moral world, an eternal and immutable morality, an authority that cannot be shaken, a standard that is not relative but absolute for the soul. Even change lends itself to a philosophy of development only in so far as it is methodic, calculable change, normal variation, going on by fixed laws, and partaking of the uniformity of nature. Parallel to all the change is a presence and permanency of law which gives it its scientific value. The laws of the persistence of matter and the conservation of energy are inseparable from every extension of the area of evolutionary change. Without this permanent element evolution is impossible. But it is an element which accompanies the evolutionary process rather than is subject to it. It holds change in a hand that knows no change. The very regularity of change lifts it out of the realm of change. And we are warned here of our approach to a region which is not subject to mutation, but is the source of those very fixtures and orders that convert variation into real progress and life. For the fixity that regulates such change is but an

index of a spiritual fixity at once final and fluid, whose true name is the Eternal God, leading all time and marshalling all space.

In the evolution of history we who are alive are not simply at the end of an ordered series, the last links in a continuous chain. The fixed order of the past has not simply made us possible, or been the pedestal on which we stand. But all that is most permanent in the past lives on in us. In a true sense we are all the past. We do not stand apart and regard it simply as a panorama; we embody it and live it out in the conditions of our time. And it is impossible to take a scientific view of our time unless we transcend it, and realize in it the elixir of the past. The spirit of an age can only be valued by reference to an ageless spirit. And, indeed, could we have a present if there were not some spiritual pause within life, some inland lagoon of being, some repose of life within itself, some arrest of perpetual variation and process, and some elevation of the successive points of movement above the mere sequence of time into the co-existence of eternity. To make all but movement, process, and evolution is to dissolve and empty the present, and to pulverize the soul. We do not realize our present except in the power of a present which is timeless and superior to time and time's methods. If everything in us moved as fast as all around us, there would be no progress, certainly no sense of progress, or even of movement. All would feel stationary. To perceive movement we must be fixed beyond the flux; and that we may call it progress our footing must be above it. For the translation of movement into progress implies a judgement of value. And for such a verdict there must be a place of judgement fixed and secure within both present and past, before whose stable seat the panorama passes and takes sentence as it goes. And what applies to life and history applies to the whole of existence, to all the phenomena of our experience at least. We do not understand any one of them except in its relation to the whole. It is the infinite whole that explains the part and gives it its value and life. It is

the whole not only as around the part but as in the parts, not as environment but as soul. In one wide word, the fact, or the time, is only intelligible by the presence and energy in it of eternity. 'Every moment,' says Goethe, 'is of infinite value, it is the representative of all eternity.' The moment must not engross and limit us. Something exempt from evolution is the condition, the πού στῶ, not of the evolutionary future alone but of the real present. The condition of all change, and its law, is the changeless; and both evolution and its science are impossible if we renounce the idea of an eternal world which is not subject to its law, neither indeed can be. This eternity has time, and chance, and change not only beside it, but beneath it. They issue from it and they return to its presence to be judged. And this Eternity must be spirit with its living mastery over time. Without this eternal Spirit there is no knowledge or command of time. Time has not even existence. For two successive points cannot form time unless they cohere in something which is superior to movement and exempt from time. Without this spirit we cannot read time's changes aright. But for this changeless continuum in memory, we could not remember enough to recognize change. That is to say, we have no possible science of evolution except from the vantage ground of an exempt region which evolution does not rule but only partially express. What is it that distinguishes progress from mere extension but some contribution from the timeless life which makes the new thing not simply another thing but a different, not merely a prolongation of the past but an enrichment of it with its own power?

The great movement of life for each generation is not from the present onward into the future; it is from the present upward and outward into the eternity which pervades it, and which does not simply surround it but perpetually receive it. We must cease to construe evolution so exclusively in the category of duration or sequence. We must not view it so much as the advance of the present into the future but as its translation into spiritual reality. We

must learn to think more of the qualitative and less of the quantitative movement in things. The social and useful must become the moral and holy. Eternity stands at the heart of each moment, as Christ stands at the heart of all time. This eternity is the source of each mysterious variation, and it is also the unseen providence which controls all the variations to their collective end. It is something that cannot be given by evolution, which is but the formula of a time process; and it is something that it cannot take away. History, natural or political, survives its agents and its historians, but it cannot outgrow its Maker and Builder, who is God. 'What is eternity,' says Ritschl, 'but the power of the spirit over time?'

IX.

It must be fully recognized, of course, that evolution plays a great part both in the moral soul and in the history of society. Character can only be formed by a process; it cannot be created. And society has no abiding city. A social condition which claims eternal permanence raises its hand against its own mother. It rose from the impermanent, and it must not deny its birth. The social idea is one of constant growth. What arises perishes, what abides is what was always there. But it will be shown later within what limitations this is true, for Christian history in particular. It may be well here, however, after the admission just made, to indicate some dangers of a moral kind which waylay evolutionary doctrine, and to indicate some cautions.

The most obvious peril needs, perhaps, the least attention here, after so much said on the subject by every Christian thinker. It is the erasure of the absolute distinction between good and evil, and the destruction of the idea of sin by the denial of moral freedom. The real danger, after all, is not the doctrine of evolution, but the doctrine of monism which underlies it for so many, with its wiping out of the essential difference between God and the world, right and wrong. Evil is then something which might possibly have God for its Author. Christ is but a phase of life, a flash of history.

We have only a less or more, or perhaps a thereabouts. We have only more or less bondage, but no real freedom. And no freedom means no responsibility and no guilt. Man has never fallen, he has only lagged.[1] He has not sinned, he has only erred. He has not chosen the evil and refused the good. He has only been handicapped by the start given to the sensual and selfish impulses at the weak outset of his racial history. There is no need of repentance, and no question of forgiveness—unless it be our forgiveness of the Maker who overloaded the first raw stages of our career, and so stunted our growth and reduced our pace. The distinction between good and evil is easily lost if the mind is turned from what is above and concentrated on the things behind. If we are always looking to our issue from matter, we forget that the goal and distinction of man is the spirit of God. We forget that the image of God lies nearer our true origin than any cell or simian. And not only so, but we come to regard sin, and especially refined sin, which loses its grossness without parting with its guilt, as no more than our incomplete stage; and so regarding it we become tolerant of it—tolerant, that is, of what is intrinsically bad, devitalizing, and so at last fatal to that life of the soul which is the true progress of man. Thus the moral principles of evolution are such as make evolution impossible. A thoroughgoing doctrine of evolution destroys the possibility of evolution. A doctrine that issues thus is suicidal. Its principle robs it of power to cast off its deadliest defect. And it need not be pointed out how utterly incompatible it is with a religion which lives and moves in repentance and the faith of a real forgiveness.

X.

But, again, there is much in the doctrine of evolution to destroy a feature so essential to moral character as humility. It cannot be good for the soul to look down on all that we

[1] It is not a question, of course, of the historicity of the narrative of Genesis and the version of a fall given there.

look back to. Each age then becomes the object of its own chief admiration. And each man will go on to treat his age as his age treats the past. With the love of humility, sympathy and pity must also be lost. To look down on the past is to lose respect for the present, which is a past ere we have well spoken. To view our long parentage as a sacrifice for ourselves is a habit that must extend in individuals till it become the sacrifice of the whole present to themselves. How alien it all is to the Christian mind! In Christianity the higher we rise the more we realize our imperfection and guilt. It is a great but guilty past we look down on, marvellous but deplorable; and it is *our* past; and as we increase in moral sensibility, and identify ourselves with it by moral sympathy, we become more intolerable to ourselves, till we learn to bear with ourselves in the forgiveness of God. We can abide the past only by grace of that revelation which creates a profound humility in the present. We can read the past, and measure it aright, only as we see it in Christ, in the Eternal thought and, above all, the Eternal purpose. It is our Redeemer that gives us the standpoint of eternity from which alone we truly view each age converging to our feet. It was the same Eternal to whom we bow that stood over each age, read it clear, and received it at last; and we know it best when we read it with His eyes, from our place with Christ at God's right hand. We have clear prospect o'er our being's whole. The largest vision is the humblest; and the vision which does not humble is but partial and false. The progressive spirit is morally hollow, and fatal as well, if it encourage in an age the pride and insolence which not only go before a fall but produce it. There is nothing humbling in a view of the world which is evolutionary and no more. There is much that is crushing at one time, and much that inflates us at another. But there is nothing to teach our dying life that in dying behold we live!

XI.

Again, the moral inquirer might ask whether it is the highest qualities that this struggle for existence draws out

when it is extended from the biological to the social area and made a principle of action. He might observe, with pain, that as the struggle grows older and more refined it is the commoner, not to say meaner, faculties that succeed. Courage succumbs to cunning, and nobility to astuteness. Democracy, as giving the freest scope to the struggle, does not tend to produce really great men. In many ways it is a moral failure. Its idols are not of the finest quality. Its potentates are of the earth earthy. Its affinities are with a plutocracy rather than with an aristocracy, either of taste, principle, genius, or faith. It is venal and gullible. It is not certain that in this struggle the better will prevail or the worthiest find place. The fittest are often the least worthy. And it is certain that the tendency at least is to supersede coarseness by cleverness, and simplicity by ignoble art.

For it is another drawback to evolution that it measures everything by present utility and treats nothing as an end in itself. It tends to exclude purpose and dwell in utility. Everything is viewed as it may contribute to some fashion of life conceived and not revealed. We cultivate an earthly other-worldliness. We aspire to a mere millennium at best. Some Utopia is our goal, not a present God. Nothing is of final and absolute value within life. This inevitably means a hardening and flattening of life, and it breeds that vehement restlessness of the hard, the tense, and the lean. We are not living, but always wanting to live. We live in gasps, dashes, and breathless moments. Our object is motion and not action; life is something we snatch at, and the iridescent bubble bursts as we seize. We live in a passion for the thrilling, the new, the next article. We crave for effects, sensation, all the monotonous kaleidoscope of the average man, and the dreary excitements of suburban mediocrity. Attention is monopolized not by life but by its lenitives, or by the means of living, or of aggrandizing life. The absolute value of the individual disappears. The mere fact of the individual, it is true, is exaggerated. He is insulated as atom from all the rest of the world by the absence of any but a causal nexus. He is knit into no fabric of purpose or

destiny, of sympathy or glory. His existence, his demands are extravagantly emphasized. But meantime his *worth* is diminished. He grows as a unit, but he fades as a world. He has place and force, but no interior, no meaning. He is a quantity without quality. He issues, in the most favoured cases, as the unmoral *Uebermensch*. The right of the weak vanishes, as does the pity for the weak. The infinite preciousness of the soul sinks. The value of life decays. With the soul's worth sinks the soul's freedom. Liberty is of small account. 'Empire' and 'firm government' engross men's thought and care, as ends and not means. Religious zeal and even unction are found to co-exist with moral stupidity and vulgarity. These are fruits which we see only too palpably round us. And they are much due to the extent to which evolution has unconsciously become a theology, and has ceased to be a scientific hypothesis. It has spread, by an act of imaginative and non-moral faith, from being a theory of nature to be a solution of the world, from a fact of observation to be a philosophy, even a guide of life, nay, a form of religion. From a sectional formula it becomes the principle of the whole. From a method it has become a doctrine, and then with the stalwarts a dogma. Have the extravagant claims of a narrow theology ever been more grasping and withering than this in certain well-known cases? It is a case of hasty idealization in which imagination plays as much part as knowledge, and dogmatism ousts philosophy. A leap is made for an aesthetic and imposing completeness of system which is a work of art more than science. We are supplied at best with an object of reverence rather than faith, and a source of enthusiasm rather than love, wherewith to replace the spiritual trusts and divine affections that have been thrown away on the plea of being outgrown.

XII.

The doctrine of evolution is a record, or a theory, and not a standard. If it aim at perfection it carries no clue to what perfection is. It has no absolute cosmic end. If

it speak of moral perfection, it works in a circle: it is begging as its definition the question to be solved. It has taken for granted that perfection is morality. It has not told us, and cannot tell us, what moral, as distinct from material or civilized, means. So the world has gone, it says; but it has no word of how the world should go, or shall. You cannot educe the conscience from a mere happy complex of natural tendency or aspiration. You cannot get a 'must' out of mere spontaneity. And if it point the individual to his own perfection and the culture of a beautiful and symmetrical character, it talks from a balloon, not from the experience of life. It substitutes an aesthetic for an ethic. It takes no account of the one-sidedness of all endowment, on the one hand; nor, on the other, does it realize the limitations placed on everybody who is not a Goethe by the necessities of their calling and its inevitable development of them in particular directions. It is not the balanced men that are the 'providential personalities.' A defect of faculty which spoils our balance, mental or temperamental, is not necessarily a moral defect.

And evolution is a theory of but a part of the universe. When it does not extinguish a soul, it leaves the soul without a law of duty, because it leaves it without a goal of endeavour. It gives us a formula for certain facts, but no precept or obligation for moral acts. It describes certain procedure, but provides us with no test of life and no rule of judgement. Supposing that evolution has brought us to where we are, is there any real reason for pursuing the path of that progress? What means has the evolution of the past for convincing us that the same course should rule the future? Are the blessings of progress so unmixed and indubitable as to leave no room for doubt that it must be the formula of the future? How can evolution convince us of its claim to be the method of all time and of all existence? There was a time when the idea did not exist, as man's conscious principle at least. Antiquity was occupied with the idea of fixity, finality, and not movement, not progress. Is it certain, on evolutionary grounds

alone, that we ought not to return to that idea of the *beati possidentes*, though now perhaps on a larger scale? The river moves to the sea by many a backward turn; how shall we know that the sea does not lie to the rear of our whole previous course, and that the present or proximate age may not be the point at which history turns to retrace its way, forsake the old direction, and seek its destination in an ocean as monotonous as the billows of mist and cloud where it rose? The mere evolution and variety of existence is a very empty and abstract creed. We must know that what is evolutionary is humane, is heart, conscience, and soul, something with inalienable feature and spiritual nature. And this is a certainty that evolution in itself, the mere formula of the physical and social past, cannot give us. It gives us an endless increase of complexity, but it does not give us in its midst the infinite simplicity, repose, and character, which are the staying power of life, the source of its mightiest ideals, and the seat of its permanent authority. It increases change, sacrifice, and pain. It sets history in a bloody flux. Some powerful thinkers have concluded that all progress in civilization means a decay of happiness, that sensibility to pain grows keener, while the appetite for enjoyment becomes more intense. Civilization, they say, develops wants more quickly than it can supply them, and rends the soul, even to collapse, with desires which it can neither satisfy nor control. Development increases discontent and destroys illusions, till life goes out in dust. The theory of evolution is then incompatible with the culture of happiness or the communion of blessedness. It does not enhance for us that eternal and inmost power which is our refuge, recompense, and courage after the worst that the outward world can do to unsettle, pierce, foil, and crush us. That refuge and that goal, that finality of thought and power, that spring of heart and hope, is only to be found in the moral soul. And our authority can only be found in the great white throne where, in the soul, Christ sits at the right hand of God. The goal of a humane end is a different thing from the formless goal of an indefinite progress. The progress does not guarantee the

humanity. And the Christian position is that this truly, universally, and finally humane end of action is to be found both as ideal, as impulse, and as authority only in the redemption by Jesus Christ; which divine rescue is the greatest source in the world of human progress.

XIII.

I have admitted the large extent to which evolution must be recognized in the course of history, which has now been changed from a picture-book to a great and ordered treatise. Human history becomes the evolution of purpose. And since Christ, it appears as the evolution of the redeeming purpose of God. The revelation of this purpose was indeed the first influence that led to the construing of history as a vast historic evolution; and it remains the greatest of such influences. Christ, it was seen, could not be crucified again. When He entered history once for all it gave to all history the unity of His person and work. And a universal history presided over by one purpose must be an organic and an evolutionary history as soon as the catastrophic idea of the parousia in the New Testament had disappeared from practical expectation. All things were moving to the city of God shining upon the far horizon of expanding time. The antique idea vanished in which history was a series of cycles or periods repeating each other without a common aim or progress. All that had gone before had been working up to Christ, and all that followed was to work Him out. And to-day this is the theme to which the historical process moves. No doctrine of evolution is sound history, or other than sectional, which does not leave place for the redeeming purpose of God by intervention and revolution, and take its own place under it. No evolutionary order must exclude that moral teleology whose key is not in nature or society but in the kingdom of God. Natural process does not carry with it its own explanation or reveal its own goal. And the crucial point of this issue, the focus of the problem, is the historical appearance of Christ which publicists persist in refusing to

assess. It is true that He came in a fullness of time. He was long prepared for, long prophesied by men who did not know all they said. But Christ was not simply the product of the past, He was not merely the flowering of His race, the fruitage of the soul, the genius of goodness. The spiritual life He represents is not another faculty but another self. It is a new order of life, a new kind of reality, and a new test of it (indeed, the final test, as being eternity in action). It is not a new energy in man, but man, the whole eternal man, as a new energy, with a new power to give scope and value to every partial and inferior energy which swells the forces of civilization. Not only was His character a divine act, but His gospel was still more so. God not only produced Him, but acted finally through Him. It is thus that He gives us the fixed point at which we can make stand against the torrent of civilization, and bring our hurried evolution to its moral senses. We get foothold in the Eternal. For the spiritual life in Christ is not a mere feature or aspect of man taken by himself, but it is the whole man, as partaker and agent of a higher being than his own, and an eternal. Psychology will not explain Christ—as it cannot explain the inspiration of the prophets whose burden He was. He produced the prophets more than they produced Him. They came because He had to come. And we could say this even if we denied that His heavenly personality had been the agent of their inspiration. Again, He Himself grew. He grew even in the clearness of His grasp of the work given Him to do. It may be that the cross was not in His first purview. But when all such things have been admitted, He is not explained. He is not explained when we have made all due concessions to the historical treatment of His religious environment. The connexion between Him and His antecedents is not causal, but teleological. He was the inspiration of prophecy, as its end more even than as its immediate source. He was, as Hegel would say, the 'truth' of prophecy. He was not a product of the past so much as of the future. He was the reaction of all eternity upon time, an invasion of us by that Eternal of whom the future and the unseen is a part

so much greater than all we see in the past. Always the best is yet to be; but also the best is the God who always is. Christ was the product of the final divine plan and the absolute divine purpose, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. He was more of a miracle than a product, the intervention of the Great Final Cause more than the Great First Cause, a miracle of grace more than a miracle of power. He was not the expression of latent law, but the incarnation of unique Grace, utterly and for ever miraculous, however we read His birth, and however we treat His wonderful works.

XIV.

And the like applies to the history of His Church. Much has been done, and much is to do, in the application to the Church's history of the evolutionary principle. Doctrine especially has been powerfully shown to be an evolution of the thought of faith, faith's progressive consciousness of itself. But let no such fascination blind us to the miraculous, the revolutionary nature of the faith itself thus evolved. That is the product of no psychical process. We believe in the Holy Ghost. We believe in the essentially miraculous nature of the spiritual life. With and beneath all the historic evolution of the Church is the perpetual self-reformation of the gospel, the new creative action of the Spirit, His inspiring and guiding presence by the supernatural power of a real effectual communion with the miraculous Christ. It is the very nature of the Church to be supernatural, as it was the nature of the Church's indwelling Lord—supernatural in His soul and work, however, we regard His actual entrance on the world. History, indeed, does not give destiny, but in Christ destiny is given in the midst of history, by the way of history, and under historic conditions. Revelation is a historic fact, but with a value much more than historic. It is the decisive, absolute incarnation in a soul of that eternity which each moment only represents—but does represent, if it is viewed scientifically, viewed in relation to the whole of reality.

P. T. FORSYTH.

RUSSIA IN UNREST.

1. *Russia in Revolution.* By G. H. PERRIS. (London: Chapman & Hall. 1905.)
2. *Russia under the Great Shadow.* By LUIGI VILLARI. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1905.)
3. *Russia.* By SIR DONALD MACKENZIE WALLACE, K.C.I.E., K.C.V.O. In Two Volumes. (New Edition. London: Cassell & Co. 1905.)
4. *The Expansion of Russia,* 1815–1900. (Cambridge Historical Series.) By F. H. SKRINE. (Cambridge University Press. 1903.)
5. *The Russian Peasantry.* By STEPNIAK. (New Edition. London: G. Routledge & Sons. 1905.)
6. *Tolstoy and his Problems.* By AYLMER MAUDE. (London: Grant Richards. 1902.)

MR. JOHN MORLEY has said in his volume on Burke that practical politicians and political students should bind about their necks and write upon the tables of their hearts the famous passage from the *Memoirs of Sully,* that 'The revolutions that come to pass in great States are not the result of chance, nor of popular caprice. . . . As for the populace, it is never from a passion to attack that it rebels, but from impatience of suffering.' This we shall strive to bear in mind as we write. The present revolutionary movement in Russia may have its root far back in the undoing of the reforms of Alexander II, and in the violent reaction which took place towards the close of his reign. The Crimean War was the forerunner of a peaceful revolution. Out of that fierce struggle Russia emerged chastened. The Tsar found in disaster a wise counsellor. He was prepared to listen to the cry of national

aspiration, as yet only half-articulate, that Russia should be led along the path of progress to the social and economic goals attained by Western Europe. He summoned to his aid the most enlightened of his ministers and of the aristocracy, and launched the Empire on the perilous seas of reform. Press censorship was relaxed, the universities were thrown open, and the youth of the common people crowded to their doors. The malign labours of the secret police were much restricted. The gigantic institution of serfage holding in bondage forty-seven millions of people—an institution which true patriotism, wherever it could find utterance, had not ceased to denounce—was now to be assailed by the Tsar himself, with the approbation of all classes of his subjects except some of the nobles, whose main source of wealth lay in the serfs of their estates.

Serfage had not sunk to the degradation of negro slavery. It retained some of the happier features of patriarchal control. The serf had a prescriptive right to enjoy the lands assigned from ancient time for his maintenance. He was protected by law from tyrannous excesses. But morally the system was hateful, obliterating responsibility and debauching the mind of those who held property in human life; while, by the extravagance it fostered, it led to the disintegration of ancestral estates, and entailed the blight of poverty alike on the peasantry and the land-owners.

The campaign against it was conducted with singular ardour. When Alexander II had set his iron will on this high achievement he never looked back till emancipation was brought to a successful issue. There were stupendous obstacles to be removed, conflicting interests to be harmonized, concessions to be won from lukewarm magnates, rights to be respected, great sacrifices to be made;—and all this was accomplished mainly by the Tsar, aided by a zealous band of enlightened patriots. Friction disappeared under his vast personal influence. The nobles, rising above selfish considerations, fell into line with their sovereign in his resolve not to create out of his liberated subjects a landless class. Freedom was to be accompanied with a perpetual

enjoyment of their homesteads. And on March 3, 1861, 'the Magna Carta of the Russian peasant abolished serfage throughout the Empire.' Local self-government was conferred, and protected against the interference of the landlords. The village lands were vested in communes. The communes were grouped in cantons with municipal institutions and tribunals.

This magnificent stroke of statesmanship was followed by political development on constitutional lines. In 1864, Zemstvos, local and provincial, were established to 'give greater consistency, independence, and confidence to the economic administration.' Space forbids our entering at length on the prerogatives of these institutions; but it may be said that the local Zemstvo is a popular assembly constituted of delegates elected by communes, municipalities, and land-owners. The provincial body is made up of representatives sent from the local Zemstvos. Among the powers entrusted to them, in the first instance, were the care of primary education subsidized by the State, sanitation, and roads. They appointed justices of the peace and supervised agriculture. Further reforms succeeded these. The entire system of legal procedure was recast. The executive was no longer to control the judges, who were for the future to retain office during good behaviour. Justice was to be dispensed not in secret, but under the eyes of the people. Law was simplified and cheapened.

Reform extended to the army and navy. Endeavours were made to raise the standard of military education. To relieve the financial stress resulting from the recent war, when the yearly deficit rose to £80,000,000, economies were introduced which restored credit abroad and confidence at home. The construction of railways by the aid of foreign capital was promoted, 600 miles annually being laid down between 1856 and 1870. Efforts were put forth to utilize Russia's latent resources in labour and raw material. The volume of trade increased immensely.

Marvellous prosperity was expected as the result of these measures. Political freedom was to be the heritage

of all. Russia had taken a great stride forward. The stigma attaching to a nation that holds a large part of its subjects in bondage was removed, and conscience had asserted its authority over self-interest. But disenchantment was at hand. A violent revulsion of sentiment set in. The pendulum swung from elation to despondency. The nobility took alarm, 'half-crazed by the phantom of approaching ruin.' The smaller proprietors, insolvent before emancipation, in sore need of cash, sought to realize the bonds received from the Government as payment for lands, flooded the market with them, and nothing could arrest consequent depreciation. The peasants, ignorant and suspicious, resented 'the obligation laid upon them to purchase the land which they had considered their own by prescriptive right' under a patriarchal régime. With communal relations they were unfamiliar, and they fretted under their new burdens,—and not without reason, for the price paid for their holdings was often far in excess of the value of the land. The universities, where the youth of the land collected, soon became a fruitful forcing ground for the doctrines of Socialism under the influence of men like Herzen, a political exile, whose incendiary journal, *Kolokol*, was eagerly read. Sympathy with popular movements in the direction of liberty, as in Poland, was openly and defiantly declared, while the severe treatment of any who were known to be unfriendly to the autocracy fostered a spirit of revolt; for the hand that signed the Magna Carta was ever heavy upon the man of advanced views. The secret press was scattering broadcast treasonable literature.

Now it was the storm began to mutter. The Tsar, who had hoped to liberalize the constitution and conciliate his people without relaxing his despotic rule, disappointed and yielding to the instinct of fear, himself again seized the reins of authority with which, for the time, he had entrusted Miliutin, who had been the man of his right hand in carrying out the reforms, but whom he now relegated to obscurity; whilst he 'recompensed with neglect or disgrace,' as Mr. Skrine has said, the noble men who were the colleagues

of this enlightened statesman in achieving emancipation. Muraviev came into power, with his retrograde measures. Attempts to assassinate the Tsar precipitated the reaction. Leading liberals, who had led the van in the path of constitutional reform, were dismissed from official positions. Measures of repression were adopted — espionage, arrest, imprisonment in the fortresses, with intellectual isolation, deportation to Siberia. The bureaucracy was permitted practically to destroy the tentative scheme of self-government which patriots fondly hoped was to pave the way for a constitution. 'Law,' Mr. Perris says, 'staggered for a moment on infant legs, and then collapsed.' Sagacious members of the *noblesse* who had heartily entered into the work of the Zemstvos (now reduced to impotence) retired in disgust. The new jury system was crippled, and judges were again placed in the hands of the executive. In the universities the Courts of discipline ruled mercilessly, and expulsions outnumbered admissions. 'The Holy Synod became a very Inquisition, the terror of Jews and heretics of every kind and degree.' The press was gagged, except that attacks on Ministers of the Crown suspected of liberal tendencies were permitted. Public opinion was suffocated. 'The weight and degradation of arbitrary rule was felt in every nook and cranny of public and private life.'

If the agony of a people groaning under undiscriminating tyranny cannot find legitimate expression it is certain to find illegitimate; and forces will be evolved that will strike for liberty, though it be at the cost of the very existence of the oppressors. The unrest, which has periodically raged as a storm-scourged sea in this mighty nation, has its cause here. 'I tremble,' says Edmund Burke, 'for the cause of humanity, in the unpunished outrages of the most wicked of mankind'; he refers to arbitrary monarchs. 'But,' he proceeds to say, 'there are some people of that low and degenerate fashion of mind, that they look up with a sort of complacent awe and admiration of kings who know to keep firm in their seat, to hold a strict hand over their subjects, to assert their prerogative, and, by the awakened

vigilance of a severe despotism, to guard against the very first approaches of freedom. Against such they never elevate their voice. Deserters from principle, listed with fortune, they never see any good in suffering virtue, nor any crime in prosperous usurpation.' This quotation is not meant to be the prelude to an apology on our part for Nihilism, beginning at this crisis to take definite shape, with its vicious anarchical spirit and its blood-stained record; but as sustaining us in saying that we cannot wonder at its rise.

Nihilism, from being 'rather a mannerism than a cult,'[1] a revolt, having little political significance, against attempts to fetter thought, became, as moulded by Herzen and Bakunin, 'a sharply defined and highly militant creed,' only too eagerly accepted by perfervid Slav youth chafing under tyranny. As yet it was unsullied by plotting and murder, but it preached the total destruction of the old order—'of Governments, law, property, privilege'; that 'an international State of workers might be erected on foundations cleared of effete matter.' It was not till later that it adopted as its weapons dynamite, the knife, and the pistol; and that its watchword became terror. Spreading by secret propaganda with amazing rapidity among university professors and students, and 'intellectuals' generally, it was met with counter vigilance by the Government. From 16,000 to 20,000 persons were sent annually as exiles to Siberia, and yet, so far from Nihilism being checked, organized missionary effort was attempted to win over the mass of the peasantry. Then was seen the strange phenomenon of young men and women abandoning their homes and studies to 'go among the people,'—so ran the catchword. They entered the peasant's fetid hut and strove with words of sympathy and hope to make converts; but with little apparent success. The suspiciousness ingrained by centuries of slavery was proof against the allurements of the Socialist; and inherited devotion to the person of

[1] Skrine.

the Tsar, together with some slow sense of gratitude to their liberator, were too deeply rooted to be eradicated by the teachers of what Mr. Skrine calls 'the sombre gospel of negation.'

The cold deliberate ferocity of the Government as it plied the instruments of despotism—condemnation without trial, long exile, torture and imprisonment—was successful in arresting and driving underground the liberal and Nihilist propaganda; and then followed a period of comparative quiet for the autocracy. Still, we cannot doubt that the seed found congenial soil in many outside the student population. Buried deep, it survived the numerous droughts of reaction, and brought forth its kind, mostly in secret places, propagated itself continually, and is to-day bearing its fruit in all classes of Russian society.

When diplomacy deprived Russia of the prizes of the inglorious campaign of 1877–1879; and sharp criticism of the inefficiency of the army and the incapacity of the Government was indulged in by the press, despite the embargo laid upon public opinion; and murmurs of discontent were heard from the proud Russian people, disappointed at not seeing the cradle of orthodoxy, Constantinople, restored to the ancient Church,—the unwisdom of Alexander II and his reactionary policy led to a recrudescence not merely of liberalism, but of Nihilism (as yet the instrument of a comparatively small band of desperate spirits) in its most deplorable form. It was now war to the knife. Assassination was organized. Society was dislocated. Anarchy stalked through the land. Panic seized the Government. Martial law was proclaimed over large tracts of the Empire. Legal procedure was superseded, and absolute power given to governors in the storm-centres. But punishment of the most severe character, by 'administrative order,' availed little. 'The most absolute Government in the world was checkmated by an inner ring who had made a pact with death.' The constitutional liberals demanded at least 'elementary safeguards for person and property, the discontinuance of banishment by "administrative order,"

the substitution of law for the arbitrary will of police officials.' General Melikov, holding that the battle with anarchy could only be gained by the goodwill of the Russian people, strove to persuade his imperial master to adopt milder measures, hoping to inoculate him with the idea of granting to Russia a constitution. This would draw the teeth of the Nihilists, and win back the esteem, now wellnigh forfeited, of those who had delighted to call him 'the Tsar-Liberator.' A scheme was laid before the autocrat early in 1881, of which he signified his approval in the form of a rescript. He then hesitated, and postponed the publication of the edict until March 12, on which day he again hesitated. On the next day, when he had resolved to promulgate it, the lonely, harassed emperor was assassinated. Thus perished a great monarch who saw the goal to which he ought to guide his people, but lacked strength and courage for the herculean task. His fate, to quote Mr. Villari, 'is a lesson to potentates who are apt to forget that unbending persistence in a course once entered upon is not less essential to success than purity of aim and unselfish regard for his subjects' welfare.'

Obscurantism triumphed, and the reign of his successor, Alexander III, the pupil of Pobiedonostsev, was to be on the whole reactionary. Honest, virtuous, not over-weighted with brains, he had little even of 'the vague liberalism' of his father. After displaying vacillation in reference to the vast project of reform which his father had sanctioned, he declared his resolve to maintain the autocratic power unsullied and to extirpate heinous agitation. He cashiered his father's ministers, and called to office men who were pledged to support him in the struggle with the universal anarchy. The extremest instruments of repression were again employed. 'The whole machinery of justice was superseded by a military dictatorship.' To breathe a liberal sentiment was a crime past forgiveness. From 10,000 to 12,000 persons, few of whom were Nihilists, were every year arrested, and many of them, loaded with chains, sent to Siberian prisons or mines, or condemned to eat out their hearts in

awful isolation on the shores of the Polar Sea. Order was restored, but the cruel character of irresponsible despotism was burnt into the soul of the intelligence of the Russian nation too deeply for the scars ever to be obliterated. And the Tsar himself, terror-haunted, was quite unfitted to conduct openly the affairs of State. In one thing he succeeded,—in the education of the people in anti-monarchicism. The disgraceful crusade against the Jews added to the unrest of the Empire, and made every coterie of Hebrews sympathizers with treason. The strangely varying moods of the Government—now in the direction of a more generous policy, as in the concessions amounting to many millions sterling granted to assist the peasantry in paying their land dues, or to provide food in famine years; now reverting to more stringent repression, as in closing the universities (in 1887, 1889, 1890), banishing prominent 'intellectuals,' and the subordination of every branch of the legislature to a single will—were mainly inspired by distrust of the people; with the twofold purpose of conciliating the vast agrarian class and making secure their loyalty, and holding in check the growing volume of liberal sentiment. The army was re-organized; frontier fortresses were built; the fleet strengthened, the trans-Siberian railway system projected; high protection duties were imposed with a view to developing the country's resources, and strengthening the gold reserves; factory legislation based on English models was begun; capital was attracted from foreign States. All this was done—and something more that was not calculated: there was created in the chief centres of industry a labour proletariat open to ideas of personal rights and liberties. But to this we shall return. Meanwhile Poland, 'stabbed to the heart in her social institutions, religion, language, and culture' by Alexander III, whose maxim was 'One Russia, one creed, one Tsar,' succumbed in an unequal struggle. The national spirit was apparently destroyed, but the inextinguishable embers of patriotism smouldered under the super-imposed weight of Russian despotism—and lately they have burst into flame. Steadily the Moscovite Empire

was advancing in Asia, bringing to heel primitive peoples, annexing vast territory, and pursuing its cherished purpose, in fulfilment of what it believed to be its destiny—'to break from ice-bound coasts and gain access to warmer waters on the Pacific shore.' In November 1894 death overtook Alexander III. The victim of a hateful tyranny, his life was one of unceasing endeavour to cope with domestic revolutionary forces of which he personally was in constant terror, and from which he secluded himself in his palaces, closely guarded by a triple cordon of soldiers and police. He failed to subdue the anarchical spirit which tormented his country. Indeed, under his stern repressive rule the doctrines he dreaded took firmer root. In his vast ambition to shape a huge world-power out of heterogeneous peoples, he sacrificed the opportunity which his father's reign brought to him of establishing the Empire on the rights and affections of his subjects.

Nicholas II from the first adopted as his own the policy which guided his predecessor—that of a military, world-grasping régime, unillumined by the loftiest aims. In January 1895 he made it clear that the Zemstvos must not be regarded as possessing the germ of representative government; that the Tsar intended to maintain unflinchingly the principle of autocracy. All classes, save the bureaucracy, had hoped for a different pronouncement; and their bitter disappointment was not greatly mollified by 'clemency manifestoes.' A decade of persecution and intermittent famine deepened the chagrin of his people, and stimulated the subterranean forces that threaten his throne. Posing as a leader of monarchs who are 'resolved to maintain the world's peace in a spirit of right and equity,' he has shown himself to be an unscrupulous lover of power in his attitude toward Manchuria. It may be that he is but the tool of a strong oligarchy; but in his treatment of enlightened public men who entertain liberal opinions, as well as in his dealings with anarchists, he has displayed none of the qualities that, in a great sovereign, constrain the admiration of the world.

Reference has been made to recent industrial and railway development, — and the railway and the new economic activities and ideas are among the forces that are undermining autocracy. The peasants of the famous black-earth zone, which is no longer able to bear its vast population, are indulging their instinct for colonization. Hundreds of thousands have left for the far East. Many also have moved into industrial towns where the introduction of foreign capital has stimulated trade. It will give some idea of the magnitude of the new enterprises when we state that prior to the war £19,000,000 was invested in steel-works alone. In 1901, joint stock companies declared dividends averaging more than 10 per cent. on an aggregate capital of £105,000,000. But extravagance in equipment, over-remuneration of officials, over-production, and mad speculation, culminated in a crisis in which many firms collapsed, with the usual results of scarcity of work and disaffection among the workmen. These rapidly increasing urban populations, drawn from the peasantry, are throwing off the slough of serfdom, and growing in importance year by year. Factory hands number about 2,000,000, and these with their families represent a population of 7,000,000. Add to these about 9,000,000 employed in trades, shops, etc., and we have an urban population of 16,000,000 of industrials. Friction of thought and feeling is sharpening the wits and creating public spirit and capacity for common action in relation to economic questions. The docile beast of burden is being erected into a man with ideals and aspirations. The Socialist propaganda find ready listeners. 'The factory,' says Mr. Villari, 'is a potent instrument of national evolution, and a moulder of character. It not only transforms the raw material into a finished product—it transforms men, inspiring with new ideas and driving them to new movements. The workman has a new feeling of human personality and dignity. He is more civilized and more self-reliant.' He is deeply imbued with the spirit of revolt, and the significance of this modern element in the nation's life cannot easily be over-rated. Labour leagues are fostering the socialistic

movement by collecting funds, secretly publishing manifestoes and incendiary literature, and creating out of improvised strike committees permanent organizations. The fact that thousands of workmen were arrested during the past five years for taking part in labour demonstrations does not make the proletariat the more friendly towards the Government. And they are missionaries to their own kin still bound to the soil. Many of them are employed in the towns during part of the year only, and periodically return to their homes in the country to work upon the land, and to sow widely progressive ideas.

That the peasantry, who constitute 90 per cent. of the population in Siberia and 70 per cent. in European Russia, and number 100,000,000 souls, are at last awaking is the universal testimony; and if ever a patient people were goaded to revolt by the conditions amid which they live, it is the agrarian subjects of the Tsar. For long the peasant stood aloof from the struggle for liberty. He is ignorant—thanks to the authorities, who have steadily discouraged education, which ever saps this bulwark of the autocracy. He is superstitious and but half-civilized. He is lazy and without initiative. He is hugely in debt. The amount owing to the Government on account of the arrears of land-redemption dues in 1903 was 112 millions of roubles. Above all, his poverty is chronic and crushing. To blame the climate for his poverty is futile. The causes are deeper. Adverse physical environments could have been overcome if the Government had applied to them the same attention and energy which it has devoted to 'nursing parasite industries,' and the subjugation of border nations; if it had promoted technical instruction, irrigation, afforestation, the improvement of cattle, and the use of modern agricultural machinery. But it is charged against the autocracy that by deliberate policy the peasant has been kept in subservience; that the Zemstvos have been disabled and placed under a ban whenever they zealously encouraged agricultural instruction and better methods of labour. The causes of the *mujik's* increasing and

hopeless indigence are many, as 'Stepniak' has shown in his *Russian Peasantry*, still the best book on the subject. There is the natural increase of population without corresponding increase in the land available; there is endless subdivision of property; there is the peasant's inability to make the best of what he has. The singular system of periodic redistribution of holdings operates against honest cultivation, —which in the long run is the only profitable cultivation. He has no capital, intellectual or material, and has to make his bricks without straw. His methods are obsolete. Then he is taxed to death, notwithstanding certain alleviations granted by the Government. 'In the period from 1890 to 1899 the peasants of East and Central Russia paid £41,000,000 in taxes.'[1] Half of this amount was paid back in the form of relief rendered necessary by famine. 'The annual total demanded from the peasantry for direct taxation and land-redemption payments is 173 million roubles, and the annual sum to be paid by each peasant household varies, according to the locality, from 11½ to 20 roubles (21*s.* 6*d.* to 40*s.*).'[2] There is, besides, the share of indirect taxation, a heavy burden, which falls to the peasant. It is calculated by Schwanebach, a reliable Russian economist, quoted by Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace, 'that the head of a peasant household, after deducting the grain required to feed his family, has to pay into the Imperial Treasury, according to the district in which he resides, from 20 to 100 per cent. of his agricultural revenue.' The excessive export of corn adds to the poverty. He is compelled to sell in order to pay his taxes,—though starvation stares him in the face. The whip of the tax-gatherer is ever held over him. And the war with Japan has further aggravated his distress. That hundreds of thousands of peasants should be compelled to leave home for the battle-fields of Manchuria is the occasion of much hardship. There are few to work the land; there is neither money nor bread for those who are left behind, and the hungry clamour in vain for help.

[1] Villari. [2] Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace.

The cost of human life is being resented by the masses, from which the troops are drawn. The parents, the blood of whose sons stain Manchurian fields in an unpopular war, long in vain for news from those who will never again scrawl a letter; the widows, surrounded by famishing children whose home was a scene of peace until the lottery of conscription robbed it of its stay and strength to send them far away to fall a prey to devouring war—these help to swell the volume of discontent. 'Nowhere in the world has the refusal of military service assumed such large proportions as it has taken among the humble peasantry of these vast prairies.' Truly 'the shadow of a great struggle is dark upon the land.' The interference with traffic is also a serious matter for the peasant. The railways, built mainly for strategic reasons, have been, apart from the question of their cost and the burden of debt imposed, a real boon to the rural community, but military exigencies since the outbreak of hostilities have arrested the development of certain agricultural industries (e.g. butter-making in Siberia), have brought about the economic severance of far-sundered parts of the Empire, and produced widespread inconvenience and loss. In March last, Mr. Villari tells us, 'no less than 180,000 wagon loads of grain were rotting in the stations, as there was no means of forwarding them to the coast,' while the people were starving. And thus the political education of the peasant, who was for long proof against the socialist propaganda, is being rapidly achieved by the war. As yet there is no sign of a mass-rising of the *mujik*, but unrest is everywhere, and panic-stricken nobles are hurrying their families into the towns from fear of disturbances.

The oligarchy appear to learn nothing. The determined enemies of all progress, they misinterpret the signs of the times; they probably seclude the Tsar behind veils of ignorance and prejudice; they disguise their self-interest under seeming devotion to national interests; and they sacrifice the whole people for the benefit of a small ruling class. 'The State,' if Mr. Perris is correct, 'now represents a thinly veiled anarchy maintained by force.' The patri-

archal conception of the Tsar is moribund, and the supposed concentration of power in the hands of the monarch has long ceased to correspond to the facts of Russian life. The Empire is governed by a handful of men, Ministers of State, and chief among them are M. Witte, an 'expert in monopoly and exploitation,' and M. Pobiedonostsev, Over-Procurator of the Holy Synod, an inquisitor with heart of ice and hand of steel, in the robes of an ecclesiastical chief shepherd. These men recognise no responsibility, and are 'a junta of outlaws depending on armed force.' This is no doubt an extreme way of saying what is not far from the truth. As to Plehve, who was assassinated by Saranov, a man into whose soul the iron had entered, he was a terrorist compared with whom, Mr. Perris says, 'Abdul Hamid is a bungling rustic in crime.' 'Gifted, experienced, unscrupulous, resolute,' at the head of a vast and highly drilled army of police and minor officials, he flouted all guarantees of fundamental personal rights through the legislature and the public press, until his name was execrated. He sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace expressly says that the Social Democrats were not responsible for his assassination.

'Laws enough there are in Russia,' one has said, 'but no law.' 'The punishments are capricious, and rarely correspond to the paper sentence, and the comparatively innocent are often more harshly treated than degraded criminals.'[1] Offences against Church and State are regarded as much more heinous than those against private persons. To manifest hostility to the existing régime and to criticize it adversely are very serious crimes. Abjuration of the orthodox faith and secession from the Church are punishable with loss of civil rights and exile to the far North-East. Until a few months ago, to be suspected of being a dissenter rendered the person concerned liable to be condemned, by the Consistory Courts of the Church, to life-long imprisonment and exile. All persons 'who shall intend to change the existing form

[1] Perris.

of Government' (so runs section 249 of the Penal Code to come into force in 1906), 'and all their associates, instigators, prompters, helpers, and concealers shall be deprived of all civil rights and put to death.' Among the criminals visited with long periods of penal servitude and exile for life are those who compose or circulate any document calculated to create disrespect for the Tsar, membership in a secret society, and leaving the Empire without permission. The powers given to governors and prefects to invade the domain of personal liberty render life almost insupportable. Not only are courts-martial held, without any right of appeal from their decisions arrived at in secret, but, as if these were found too slow, summary justice (!), at the instance of high-placed officials, without witnesses, without preliminary inquest, takes their place. But no uniform and consistent method of dragooning is followed.

The result of this insecurity and severity is to destroy respect for law, and to reinforce lawlessness. As early in the present reign as 1902, the *ukases* of Alexander III, which *de facto* suspend ordinary judicial procedure, and amount to giving unlimited authority to the oligarchy, were in force in twenty-four provinces of European Russia. This showed that the Tsar regarded the most active part of his people as engaged in criminal attempts against the existing régime; so that a state of siege was necessary to the maintenance of order.

Fragments only of criminal statistics are available, but from these we gather that in 1896 the number of persons sent to Sakhalien by 'administrative order' was 1,699. Muraviev stated last year that the political cases dealt with during the last decade had increased twenty-seven-fold. According to a report of the Ministry of Justice, 2,953 persons were arrested on suspicion during the first three months of 1903; that is, at the rate of over 11,000 a year. Of these 853 were sentenced administratively. The *gendarmerie*, under 'state of siege' powers, arrested and imprisoned over 2,000 more. Many thousands of workmen, students, and others were exiled without any inquiry

whatever. The wrongs that ripened revolt twenty-five years ago are now exceeded by more flagrant wrongs that would be incredible but for evidence like that presented in the volumes of Mr. Perris and Mr. Villari, to which we must refer our readers for fuller information. But what other result than general and profound indignation could be expected from the moral torture, inflicted on intelligent men, of secret inquisition, of solitary confinement with its monotony, isolation, and enforced silence, of the constant surveillance and the irksome petty restrictions that wear out the spirit? 'Since the war commenced,' writes an exile, 'the north of Russia has become the place of isolation for the "revolutionary microbe." There are now 70,000 of us in the four or five northern provinces. Our existence is dreadful.' Not a few of these have had nothing to do with the revolutionary movement, but it has been their misfortune to happen to be friends of persons arrested in the agitation. The new districts selected since the *ukase* of 1900 are the desert tundras and marshes of the Arctic circle, where the temperature is that of Central Greenland; where the exiles are badly clad, and doomed to live in the squalid shanties of the half-savage natives on the verge of starvation. 'Fifty per cent. of the exiles die raving mad.' Many of these men have never been tried, and they represent the educated classes as well as the town-workman and the *mujik*. The story of Sakhalien, now in the hands of the Japanese, reveals deeper, more obscene and disgusting horrors still, on which we dare not enter. Often the nervous system breaks down utterly, the victim is the prey of hallucination, and suicides are numerous; the misery is stereotyped in the faces of all but the noblest and strongest. Mr. Henry Norman visited in 1900 the prison at Irkutsk, where he found 1,024 persons crowded into a place meant to hold 700, and he avers that 'the faces of these men, from wild beast to vacant idiot, haunted me for days.'

It will be a relief to turn from this dismal record to point out briefly how the financial condition leads to an expansion of the revolt whose root is primarily political. And let us

quote from Mr. Villari's most instructive chapter on 'The Economic Situation': 'On the outbreak of the war the financial position was as follows: reserve from the "Free balance," 157,000,000 r.; reduction of ordinary expenditure, 148,000,000 r.; French 5 per cent. loan, 272,000,000: total, 586,000,000 roubles. In September an issue of Treasury bonds was made for 150,000,000 r., which brought the total, after deducting several items, to 717,000,000 r. In December 621,000,000 r. had been spent for ten months of the war. The expenditure had been at the rate of 40,000,000 r. per month during the first six months, but subsequently it rose to over 70,000,000 r. for the last five. That left 96,000,000 r. in January 1905. To this must be added the German loan of 500,000,000 marks, which actually brought in about 221,000,000 r., and in March an internal loan of 200,000,000 r. was issued, so that the total amount was 515,000,000 r., which should suffice to carry on the war for seven months longer. But apart from the fact that expenses are probably even higher, many items being omitted from the above estimate, and that they must go on increasing to make good the wastage in men and stores, the revenues are actually decreasing on account of the shock which the war is causing to trade and industry.' Such sources of income as the liquor traffic, the railways, and the customs show a falling off of profits. Taxed to the hilt, the people dread fresh taxation. The national debt had reached £750,000,000 in 1894. It is impossible to state what it has now risen to; and the 'reimbursement' which Japan demands will have to be added to it. The credit of Tsardom is shaken at home and abroad. Not that Russia's resources are in danger of being exhausted, but that, fearing the continuance of the blind anti-liberal struggle at home, of the disastrous war in Manchuria, and the policy of bluff which characterises the Government, creditors are beginning to realize that their safety as investors lies in the establishment of a more stable and popular rule. The huge sum of £272,000,000 owing to the Treasury—namely, on account of land-redemption dues, £136,000,000; of railways,

£54,000,000; of old war indemnities, £42,000,000—does not lighten the load which Russia's subjects have to bear. For it is largely of the nature of a bad debt. The peasantry are never likely to complete their payments; the loss on the railways was last year £13,500,000, and if we add the interest on the cost of construction, the deficit was £22,500,000. Further, the policy of high protectionism fostered by M. Witte; the attempt to make the country self-sufficing in raw materials, in manufactures, and in food supply, is at length producing innumerable bankruptcies, scarcity of labour in the towns, now teeming with unemployed workers, and an irresistible labour movement. Mr. Perris, in a highly luminous chapter on 'the tariff,' computes that the tariff costs the Russian people in imports and native productions considerably more than £100,000,000 yearly, or ten times as much as the direct taxes of the Empire; of which enormous sum three-quarters go into the pockets of private capitalists who are concerned only to make investments highly remunerative, and the remainder to the State to carry on a hated war for which there is nothing to compensate, not even the consolation of national pride in an occasional victory, and to make disaffection the more widespread.

M. Plehve sought by his cruelly coercive policy to limit the effects of the commercial and industrial measures of M. Witte, in so far as they tended, on the one hand, to create an intelligent proletariat, and, on the other, profound dissatisfaction. The relentless enemy of progress, he was perhaps further-sighted than his rival, but the result of his policy was the same. He evoked a monstrous spirit of revolt, the full significance of which was not seen until he was foully assassinated. Then the Tsar, who had supported him, under the influence of terror, called to power for a brief day Prince Sviatspolk-Mirsky, who strove to inaugurate a more humane régime. 'The lid was lifted from the seething cauldron of the national life.' Restrictions were removed from the press; prominent exiles were recalled; a new dawn rose suddenly on the feverish night. There was the inevit-

able awakening of popular forces, and, on the whole, a sober voicing of the mind of the nation. The leading Zemstvos met in St. Petersburg in November last, and demanded personal liberty, freedom of the press, of speech, and of worship, the removal of arbitrary police regulations, and, above all, popular and representative government, with the control of finance. The nation everywhere endorsed these demands. But futile was the awakening, for the Tsar and the oligarchy speedily recovered from the spasm of liberalism, discharged the Prince, and appointed in his place M. Buligin, who, it is to be feared, is of the same type as Plehve. The succeeding events are fresh in the mind. Resolutions in favour of liberal measures passed by town councils were regarded as treasonable. Prince Galitzin, the city captain of Moscow, and Prince Trubetsky, who in the Moscow Zemstvo, in words as respectful as they were clear, had advocated the summoning of a popular legislative assembly on the lines of Western nations, and in an interview with the Tsar had been bold enough to tell him that what was happening in the Empire was not 'a riot but a revolution,' were reprimanded. On December 15, at a council held in the Palace of Tzarskœ Selo, the more liberal functionaries, among whom was M. Witte, were defeated, and Pobiedonostsev and Muraviev triumphed. In a decree of the Senate, a few days later, Nicholas II set forth his untiring care for his country, and promised 'a series of great internal changes,' while, concurrently, his ministers were warning the Zemstvos' leaders and municipal councils that if they continued to discuss the needs of the people, and to foment discontent, they would fall under the displeasure of his Imperial Majesty, and that any hopes of 'a radical change' in the methods of governing their country were 'chimerical.' Here were duplicity and the false tongue and insolent menace. And now a conflagration more dangerous than the discontent of workmen and the *mujik* swept from one end of the land to another, threatening and in some sense effecting a revolution which no one would have anticipated a few short months before—a conflagration which caught in its

current the middle classes, the moderate party and the business classes, great in social influence and wealth. Nor did the feudal aristocracy, the *noblesse*, though attached to the person of the Tsar, escape the influence of the ideas that now pervaded Russian society. No doubt their loss of influence in recent years and their growing poverty incline them to welcome a change that might contain for them the promise of brighter days.

'Bloody Sunday,' with its tragic massacre of unarmed men, and its raid on peaceful citizens who strove to avert bloodshed, will not easily be blotted from the memory of Russians, and may yet exact frightful retribution. The deeds of that day are the acme of the stupendous imbecilities of the oligarchy, whose last prop fell as the intelligence of the crime spread from one rural community to another. Since then open anarchy, with sanguinary outbreaks in the towns of Poland and in the Caspian oil region, the alarming disturbances among the peasantry of Saratov, Mirsk, Pskov, Orel, and other places, the chaos in the commercial centres of the south, the disaffection in the navy, the riots accompanying mobilization, the paralysis of local administration, the dissolution by the Government of commissions on industrial reforms, the renewed activity of the revolutionary federations—all reveal the distressful state of unhappy Russia.

And there is little light on the horizon. The lurid revelation of the profound corruption of the official class fills thoughtful men with despair. Patriotism has failed to check the ravages of wicked greed. The large sums of money, received for the equipment of the hospitals, which have mysteriously disappeared, and the shameful abuses in connection with the Red Cross Society which have sent a thrill of disgust throughout the Empire, show the rottenness of the executive—of the herd of officials who are virtually irresponsible, being above the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts, and open only to prosecution by their superiors. Even Sir D. Mackenzie Wallace, the sanest and best informed writer on Russia, does not think there is any hope in the oligarchy. Unabated pretension, insolent bluff and brag,

take the place of any intelligent estimate of the seriousness of the crisis, of clear recognition of failure and wise adaptation of means to retrieve disaster and save the national honour. There appears to be no great Russian statesman, no man 'above the times,' unless M. Witte should prove to be such, 'to prepare and proportion instruments for the task,' to take the helm and wisely steer the ship of State to the harbour of Constitutional Government.

'It is to be feared,' says Mr. Villari in his wise, strong book, 'that Russia is in for a long period of trouble before she settles down peacefully as a Constitutional State on modern lines. Untouched by the great movements which have moulded the history of Europe during the last five centuries —the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French Revolution —she has to learn these three R's of political and intellectual development before she can evolve into a new nation. At the same time, she must find the solution of the many special problems by which she is beset, the economic problem, the social problem, the question of the alien nationalities, and, above all, the education of the masses.' Later he adds, in words that have been widely quoted: 'The English Revolution lasted from 1640 to 1689, that of France from 1789 to 1815 (or 1871), that of Italy from 1821 to 1870; it would not be surprising if even that of Russia lasted many years.'

ROBERT MACLEOD.

NOTE.

Since this article was written the war has happily been brought to a close, chiefly through the magnanimity of Japan, who in the flush of her triumph has, if we judge rightly, allowed considerations of humanity and civilization to moderate her just demands, waiving her claim of reimbursement of the expenses of the war, and consenting to a division of Sakhalien. Whether Russia will abandon her dreams of ice-free ports and preponderance in the Far East must remain uncertain until her domestic policy grows clearer. It is difficult to say what the effect of the peace is likely to be on the situation at home. There appears to be little perceptible abatement of social disorder. Rather would it seem that at last Russia

> In wrath her giant limbs upreared,
> Stamped with her strong foot, and said she would be free.

The signs of imminent revolution are everywhere. If an abiding and radical internal reform is to be achieved, may it be by bloodless means!

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

IT is not my intention in this brief article to touch on all the points that would have to be treated in any discussion that aimed at completeness. It is rather to throw into prominence some of the questions that are now engaging attention, and to form some estimate of the present position. It has been necessary to exclude much that deserves mention, and barely to hint at other things that it would have been worth while expounding in detail. The return to tradition of which Harnack spoke eight years ago in the famous preface to the first volume of his *Chronologie* has recently been anything but evident in the critical camp, so far as the Johannine problem is concerned. If there has been retreat from the late dates of the Tübingen school, that has made little difference to the critical verdict on authorship or historical character. On one crucial point, indeed, the present drift of criticism sets away decisively from tradition, where Baur and his school were content to follow it. New problems are being forced to the front and new lines of discussion are being opened up. Perhaps no part of the New Testament, with the exception of the Apocalypse, is now receiving such thorough, if not always fruitful, examination.

It is usual to begin with the external evidence. Passing by much, and Justin with especial reluctance, I come to Papias. It is now very commonly recognized by critics that the silence of Eusebius in no way proves that Papias did not refer to the Gospel as the work of the Apostle John. This has been admitted all the more readily since the discovery of a fragment has been supposed to bring the date of Papias' work to a period later than the reign of Hadrian. Harnack accordingly fixes it at A.D. 140–160, and if it was so late the value of its evidence would be very materially reduced.

This date, however, is very questionable. E. Schwartz[1] has recently argued that the reference to Hadrian's reign is not part of the quotation from Papias, and in this he is followed by Bousset.[2] But whereas Bousset does not believe that Papias knew the Fourth Gospel, Schwartz argues that not only did he know it and regard it as the work of the Apostle John, but (in agreement with many scholars) that he contrasted Matthew and Mark unfavourably with it. It was long ago suggested that Papias' reference to the lack of order in Mark's narrative was elicited by a comparison with the order in the Fourth Gospel. This argument is now carried further. Schwartz contends that both of the famous extracts from Papias on Mark and Matthew are to be explained as containing depreciatory contrasts with John.[3] Mark represents the preaching of Peter, but only at second hand and not in order, while the Hebrew original of Matthew's work was not in existence, so that his Gospel was accessible only in poor translations. In addition to this tacit contrast of Matthew and Mark with John, Papias made a statement as to the latter which contained the other side of the antithesis. This is to the effect that the Gospel of John was manifested and given to the Churches by John while he was still in the body. On Schwartz's interpretation this much ridiculed statement gets a suitable meaning. The point would be that while Mark wrote after Peter's death, and Matthew's Gospel was not accessible in its original language, the Fourth Gospel was communicated by the apostle himself in his own lifetime and given to the community for official use. If

[1] *Ueber den Tod der Söhne Zebedaei* (1904), p. 15.

[2] *Theologische Rundschau*, June 1905, p. 237.

[3] Papias, Schwartz argues, cannot have accepted the Gnostic principle that the written tradition was insufficient, so must have considered one Gospel to be free from the defects he found in Matthew and Mark. This cannot have been Luke, his judgement on that Gospel was probably such that Eusebius preferred not to reproduce it. So it must have been John. Schwartz shows his hyper-criticism in setting aside the statement as to Matthew as valueless. He refuses to adopt the usual view that the Logia mentioned as composed by Matthew was an Aramaic work, employed as a source for our First Gospel.

with most scholars we accept Eusebius' statement that Papias used the First Epistle of John, this would favour the view that he knew the Gospel.

Critics are also divided as to the use of the Gospel by Polycarp and Ignatius. I leave Polycarp aside, the evidence is inconclusive, but from his brief letter negative conclusions such as those of Pfleiderer[1] cannot safely be drawn. As to Ignatius he asserts[2] that in the whole of his genuine Epistles there is not a single sentence which points to dependence on the Gospel or Epistles of John. Had Ignatius known them he must have used them in his conflict with Docetism. On the other hand, Wernle,[3] while he agrees with Pfleiderer as to the bearing of the Ignatian letters on the problem of the apostle's residence in Asia, asserts that Ignatius had read the Johannine writings. So too Loisy[4] says that Ignatius must have known the Fourth Gospel a long time to be penetrated with its spirit to the degree we see. This is all the more significant since, while Pfleiderer adopts the later date for the Ignatian Epistles formerly assigned to them by Harnack (about A.D. 130), Wernle places them quite early in the second century, and Loisy towards A.D. 115. We thus come to the question just mentioned, whether the Apostle John was ever in Asia.[5] This question has already been examined at length by Dr. Adeney in this REVIEW, and I should content myself with referring to his article were it not that several discussions of it have recently appeared, and the number of those who here range themselves against tradition seems continually to grow. The Tübingen school naturally held firmly to tradition on this point, in face of the attacks of Lützelberger, Keim and Scholten, since it was an axiom for it that the Apostle John was the author of the Apocalypse, with its supposed bitter attack on Paul, and the

[1] *Das Urchristentum*, 2nd ed. (1902), vol. ii. pp. 411–13.

[2] Pp. 413, 414. [3] *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. ii. p. 275.

[4] *Le Quatrième Évangile*, 1903, p. 6.

[5] Among those who deny the residence of the Apostle John in Asia may be mentioned Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Schmiedel, Bousset, J. Weiss, Schwartz, von Soden, Wernle, Loisy, Bacon.

Apocalypse can have been written only by one who was intimately acquainted with the Seven Churches of Asia. Probably no one now believes that the Apocalypse contains an attack on Paul, nor has any one a special critical axe to grind in claiming the Apocalypse for the apostle. Accordingly the critical case gains nothing from the tradition of Asian residence, while this tradition is really awkward for it when it comes to deal with the Fourth Gospel. It is unnecessary to repeat the arguments which have seemed convincing to many scholars, including Weizsäcker and apparently Jülicher, in favour of the tradition. The arguments on the other side, however, merit a more detailed statement. The most important testimony for the residence of John in Asia is that of Irenaeus, who reminds his friend Florinus of the way in which in their youth they used to hear Polycarp, and how he would often speak to them about John and give them reminiscences of his intercourse with him. Irenaeus himself unquestionably attributed the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John (even Bousset grants this), and it can hardly be doubted that Polycarp's John was for him the apostle. It is argued that Irenaeus misunderstood Polycarp, and whereas the latter was referring to another John, Irenaeus took him to be referring to the apostle. Stress is laid on the youthfulness of Irenaeus, and it is urged that he was merely a hearer of Polycarp and not one of his familiar disciples. It is very difficult, however, in the face of Irenaeus' explicit words to accept this suggestion. He was probably not so young as Harnack tries to make out. But apart from that, his language makes it plain that Polycarp was in the habit of relating in detail John's discussions, and the discussions of others who had seen and heard Jesus, and in particular their narratives as to His life, teaching and work. Now this amount of detail makes it extremely improbable that the misunderstanding attributed to Irenaeus could have occurred, especially when we remember that many of the narratives themselves must have made it clear whether an apostle or one who stood in less intimate relation to Jesus was intended. Further, Irenaeus asserts the harmony of Polycarp's

relation of Christ's life and teaching with that of Scripture. It is not unreasonable to infer from this that Irenaeus was conscious that in the narratives Polycarp used to relate there was a Johannine as well as a Synoptic strain. And the accuracy of Irenaeus' statement is guaranteed by the circumstances. However unscrupulously he might overstate his points against those who were not in a position to check his assertions,[1] he cannot very well have afforded to do so when he was appealing to recollections shared by the very man whose views he was engaged in refuting. Even if it be granted that Irenaeus made a mistake when he said that Papias was a hearer of the Apostle John, this proves nothing as to the probability of a similar mistake in the case of Polycarp. He had very likely never seen Papias in his life, but he had known Polycarp intimately and had often listened to his reminiscences. The evidence of Polycrates, who lived in Ephesus about the same time, need be no more than referred to; but Justin a generation earlier, in ascribing the Apocalypse to the Apostle John, indirectly asserts his residence in Asia, and Justin himself had lived in Ephesus. Similarly Papias regarded the Apocalypse as a Johannine work.

On the other hand, it must be admitted that the arguments from the silence of certain writers is really strong. In spite of Polycarp's relations with John, this is less so in the case of his Epistle than in that of the Epistles of Ignatius. For while Polycarp's letter to the

[1] Accusations of deliberate deceitfulness on the part of Irenaeus and his predecessors have not been quite infrequent of late. Corssen describes Irenaeus's presbyters as 'a set of deceived deceivers' on the most favourable showing; since it is only too clear how much depended on making the date of Christ's death as late as possible (p. 109). Similarly Pfleiderer, though he leaves the question open whether 'the gross deception' should be imputed to Irenaeus or his informants (ii. p. 403). Kreyenbühl charges Irenaeus with fibbing (*Evang. d. Wahrheit*, i. p. 58). Wernle accuses the author of the Fourth Gospel of claiming to be a favourite disciple of Jesus, and says that none of the witnesses whom he quotes has the slightest historical probability (*Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. pp. 275–6).

Philippians naturally suggests the mention of Paul who had written to the same Church, there was no special reason why in this brief Epistle he should speak about John. The silence of Ignatius, however, is very strange. Pfleiderer says that the silence of one who, in time as well as locality, stood so near the Ephesian John of tradition, and had such urgent reason to appeal to him, is sufficient by itself to refute this tradition (II, pp. 413, 414). That he does not mention John in his letter to the Church at Ephesus does seem a serious difficulty, which I think that neither Drummond nor Gutjahr[1] estimate at its full weight. Yet even so grave a difficulty as this can hardly be suffered to outweigh the evidence on the other side.

The question as to the martyrdom of John in Palestine has lately elicited a great deal of discussion. We have two pieces of evidence to the fact that Papias said in his Exposition of the sayings of the Lord, that James and John were put to death by Jews. The passage runs as follows: 'Papias says in the second book that John the Theologian and James his brother were killed by Jews.' And as confirming this, we have the argument derived from the oracle in Mark, that James and John should drink of the cup that Jesus drank of and be baptized with His baptism. Without knowing of the Papias passage, Wellhausen had inferred from this passage in Mark that both John and James had been already martyred when the Gospel was written. In his note on Mark x. 39 he says: 'The prophecy of martyrdom refers not simply to James but also to John, and if half of it remained unfulfilled it would hardly have stood in the Gospel. Accordingly, a serious objection is raised against the reliability of the tradition that the Apostle John died a peaceful death at an advanced age.' Apparently Wellhausen does not regard the oracle as authentic, but as very old. Schwartz was stimulated by Wellhausen's note to publish a special

[1] *Die Glaubwürdigkeit des Irenäischen Zeugnisses über die Abfassung des vierten Kanonischen Evangeliums* 1904, a very thorough and careful piece of work by a Roman Catholic scholar.

discussion of the subject, to which allusion has already been made. He thinks that the oracle was very old, inasmuch as the later Gospels tone down the story, but he supposes it to have been called for by the martyrdom of the two apostles. From the reference to the seats, the one at the right hand and the other at the left, he infers that they must actually have been martyred at the same time, and that this claim cannot have been made for them unless they had been the first of the twelve to be martyred, and for some time remained the only martyrs. These results are stated as if the mere statement of them made them self-evident, and the difficulties in the way are very lightly brushed aside. Schwartz is not disturbed by the mention of John in Gal. ii. 9 as alive when Paul and Barnabas were recognized by the 'pillar' apostles, but argues that the John intended is John Mark. Naturally, this does not at all harmonize with the relative positions assigned to Paul and John Mark in the narrative of Acts. Schwartz has no hesitation in setting this aside, especially as the legendary character of the mission in Cyprus seems to him quite obvious, or in denying the identity of John Mark with the Mark of the Pauline Epistles. A further difficulty is that Acts is completely silent about the death of the Apostle John, and this is explained by Schwartz as due to deliberate suppression on account of the later tradition. Besides, how was it that John Mark, who was not one of the twelve nor yet a kinsman of Christ, came to possess so eminent a position in the Jerusalem Church as to rank with Peter and James the Lord's brother? The only answer that Schwartz is able to give is that he was the son of the Mary who permitted meetings of the Church in her house! It is scarcely probable that, weighted with these numerous improbabilities, Schwartz's theory that James and John perished at the same time will make many converts. Besides, there is a very serious difficulty created by the fact, as Schwartz considers it, that Papias recognized the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse as the work of the apostle. Is it likely that he supposed that John was put

to death by Herod Agrippa, and yet had already seen his vision in Patmos and written his Letters to the Seven Churches? Schwartz replies that Papias tested his traditions not with reference to their historical truth or probability, but their orthodox or heretical character. But surely he can hardly have been unconscious of the glaring improbability that would thus be created, especially as his familiarity with the conditions of the apostolic age must have been sufficient to assure him that the residence in Patmos could not possibly be placed so early. It is therefore extremely difficult to accept Schwartz's view that John was martyred at the same time as James. But even if we assume that the statement as it stands was really made by Papias,[1] we ought not to conclude too hastily that we must necessarily understand it of death in Palestine or before the destruction of Jerusalem. If the oracle is a prophecy after the event, then of course the event must have happened before the Gospel of Mark was written. But those who see in it a genuine prediction of Jesus are by no means driven to this conclusion. Martyrdom is the most natural interpretation to put on the words in themselves, but a martyrdom which stopped short of death might possibly satisfy the terms of the oracle. In any case there is the alternative, that if John was killed 'by Jews' (not by *the* Jews) his death took place in Asia, where, as we know from the story of the execution of Polycarp, the Jews were particularly active against the Christians. In spite of the confidence which many critics feel, the gravest doubts must arise as to whether Papias ever made the statement at all. For all scholars have said to the contrary, it is hard to believe that in the face of it the view that John died a peaceful death in Asia in extreme old age could ever have gained

[1] Schwartz actually thinks the description of John as *ὁ θεόλογος* belongs to Papias, and proves his familiarity with the Fourth Gospel, and belief in its apostolic authorship (pp. 6, 7). His arguments are flimsy. See on the other side, Bousset, *Theologische Rundschau*, June 1905, p. 227.

its universal currency. Irenaeus appeals to Papias as an authority, at the same time he betrays no shadow of misgiving that his opponents had at hand so awkward an argument with which to pulverize his statement. Eusebius similarly is quite unaware, so far as appears, that any such statement was made, and yet he read Papias thoroughly. That Eusebius deliberately suppressed the statement is hard to believe. He could not remove it from the pages of Papias if he wished, and his opposition to Papias' millenarianism might have made him welcome such an exhibition of Papias' capacity for blundering. We need not doubt that Papias must have said something which gave rise to the distorted statement that we at present possess, but what this statement was, whether it had originally reference to John the Baptist, as Zahn supposes, or whether, as Lightfoot and Harnack have suggested, something has dropped out of the text, will be known only when further evidence is discovered. But there is another piece of evidence, and that is found in the appendix to the Gospel. Its point is, that while Peter is to die a martyr's death, the beloved disciple is not. Whether the appendix was written by the author of the Gospel or not, it must have been written very early, and probably published at the same time as the Gospel, since we have no trace that the rest of the Gospel was ever in circulation without it. This chapter then gives us evidence, at least contemporary with Papias and probably earlier, that the beloved disciple did not die a martyr's death.

This brings us to the question of the beloved disciple. Critics of every school have been and are almost unanimous in identifying him with the Apostle John. Some, it is true, have considered him an ideal figure invented by the evangelist. This view, however, may be safely set aside. It would be hard to hold it in face of the phenomena of the Gospel. But it is really impossible, with any show of reason, to carry it through for the appendix. The author is obviously embarrassed by the necessity of clearing up a prevalent misunderstanding, to the effect that Jesus had promised that this

disciple should not die till His return. People do not speculate on the future of non-existent persons, and certainly if the evangelist had created the figure he would never have represented such a misunderstanding as arising, still less have felt himself under the compulsion of correcting it. It is plain that the writer is confronted by a real difficulty touching a real person, about whom a current expectation had been or was likely to be falsified. Assuming, then, that there was a beloved disciple, is any other identification than the usual one possible? Following in the steps of Delff, we have the theory propounded by Bousset in his valuable Commentary on the Apocalypse, 1896.[1] Bousset argues that there was a disciple of Jesus living in Asia to extreme old age, who bore the name of John, and is to be identified with the Presbyter John of Papias. This John was the beloved disciple, but he was not the apostle; he was an inhabitant of Jerusalem, and connected with the high-priestly family. Hence, as he was known to the High Priest, he was able to introduce Peter into his palace, and we understand why Polycrates speaks of him as wearing the high-priestly plate. This theory has some advantages: it accounts for the prominence given to Jerusalem in the Fourth Gospel, and removes some of the difficulties that have been felt as to the authorship of such a work by the Apostle John. In spite, however, of its attractiveness it is

[1] Bousset has since modified his position in a more negative direction (*Theologische Rundschau*, June and July 1905). He leaves the question open whether the Presbyter John had actually seen Jesus. He may have done so, but he may simply have belonged to the primitive Jerusalem Church, and have been called a 'disciple of the Lord' in that wider sense. He was not the author of the Fourth Gospel, which was written by one of his disciples some decades after his death. Apart from the date given for the day of Christ's death, we have no tradition in the Gospel superior to the Synoptic. The part assigned to the beloved disciple in the Gospel is of a fanciful character; indeed, on the general question as to the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel, he occupies pretty much the same position as other advanced critics (see the summary in his *Was wissen wir von Jesus*). It may be added that Holtzmann's successor, Dobschütz, puts forward a theory very similar to Bousset's as expounded in his Commentary (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, pp. 218 ff.).

exposed to considerable difficulty. It is possible to identify the beloved disciple with one of the 'two other of his disciples' mentioned in the twenty-first chapter (cf. i. 35) rather than with one of the sons of Zebedee (though on a fishing expedition in Galilee we do not expect the High Priest's friend from Jerusalem), but it is hardly to be believed that one who was not an apostle was present at the Last Supper, and was accorded the place of highest honour next to Jesus. Moreover, the close association with Peter points to the Apostle John, since the two are closely associated in the Acts of the Apostles. We come, then, to the conclusion that the almost universal view is correct, and that the beloved disciple was none other than the son of Zebedee. And putting this and the former conclusion together, we seem to be justified in asserting the correctness of the usual view, that the Apostle John lived to so extreme an old age that the saying was current about him that Jesus had promised that he would survive till the second coming. Further, if the beloved disciple was really the apostle, how did the Churches of Asia come to feel such interest in him as is displayed in the Fourth Gospel, if he had never been in contact with them? Harnack feels himself compelled to postulate a *visit* of the apostle to Ephesus, and to regard the Gospel, though written by the presbyter, as going back ultimately to the apostle.

But this brings us to a related point. In an extremely acute and suggestive study of the Monarchian Prologues to the Gospels published in Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Corssen found in the Leucian Acts of John the key to the Gospel. His discussion has attracted great attention, and Pfleiderer has accepted his results. In the Acts of John a Docetic view of Christ's person is taken. During the Crucifixion, Jesus appeared to the Apostle John on the Mount of Olives and explained to him that while for the crowd He was suffering in Jerusalem, John alone was deemed worthy of the revelation that the Crucifixion was an empty appearance. The Acts explained why John was the beloved disciple, a thing which the Gospel does not do. It was because of his celibacy. Corssen argues that the author

of the Leucian Acts did not know the Fourth Gospel, and that if there is dependence it is they that are the original. If the two works are, however, independent, then the Fourth Gospel is based on an earlier form of the tradition later embodied in the Acts. In order to attack the Docetic doctrine the Fourth Evangelist wrote a Gospel, vigorously asserting the fact of the Incarnation and real humanity of Christ. He took from the Docetists the John under whose name they had promulgated their doctrines and made him the guarantee for his own. But since caution was necessary, he did not openly say who the beloved disciple was, though he indicated that John was intended. This theory suffers under several disabilities. In the first place, it is very improbable that the Fourth Gospel can be so late as the Leucian Acts; the date of the latter is uncertain, but it is not probable that they are as early as 130, and it is highly improbable that the Fourth Gospel is so late. Of course this does not negative Corssen's view, for the Acts may embody earlier stories. Still, these have to be postulated. In the next place, Corssen seems to invert the relation between Christ's special affection for John and his celibacy. The representation is not that his celibacy was the *cause* of Christ's love (*Monarchianische Prologe*, p. 131), but the *effect* of it. If so the Acts do not account any more than the Gospel for the love entertained by Jesus for him. The Gospel gives no explanation, because none was needed; it was simply the statement of a fact. The extravagant importance attached to virginity, not only by the Gnostics but by others in the Early Church, as we see from the story of Paul and Thecla, comes out in the emphasis on the virginity of the beloved disciple. But how, on Corssen's view, did the story of his virginity arise at all? He himself rejects the suggestion that it had anything to do with Rev. xiv. 4. Pfleiderer, however, has seen in that the key to the story; he argues from this passage that the Prophet John to whom we owe the Apocalypse was not only a prophet but also an ascetic, and that the whole story which we find in the Leucian Acts and then in the Gospel of John about the beloved disciple has arisen in this way. The

Gnostics made the Virgin and Prophet John of the Apocalypse into the beloved disciple on account of his virginity, and then in virtue of this close relation to Jesus made him the recipient of esoteric revelations; thus they managed to secure his sanction for their own Gnostic doctrine. The author of the Fourth Gospel wrested their weapon from them and turned it against them, using for his own representation the great prestige which the name of John had thus acquired. The Prophet John may have been a celibate, that is pure assumption. But since in this very passage the Apocalypse represents the number of celibates who accompany the Lamb as 144,000, it seems not to have been such an exceptional virtue as to qualify for John's exceptional position. The usual view is not only far more obvious, but it has support from the position accorded to John by Jesus in the Synoptists, to say nothing of the prominent position that he enjoyed in the Primitive Church, as shown both by Galatians and the Acts of the Apostles.

Of course, the external evidence does not carry us to immediate Johannine authorship. It might be satisfied by mediate Johannine authorship. Just as the First Gospel is attributed to Matthew, though it can hardly be his work, but simply incorporates a work by him, so the Fourth Gospel might justifiably bear the name of John if it embodied a tradition of which he was the source.

I pass on to the testimony which the Gospel gives to its own authorship. In this connexion three passages are quoted. The first is the direct statement in the appendix concerning the beloved disciple: 'This is the disciple who witnesseth concerning these things and who wrote these things, and we know that his witness is true.' It seems to be clear that this verse cannot have been written by the beloved disciple himself. Perhaps we ought not to press the words 'who wrote these things' to mean definite composition by the beloved disciple; the meaning may simply be that he left written material on which the Gospel was based. If the verse can be taken at its face-value it is a highly important piece of contemporary evidence for the Johannine authorship.

On the other hand, the possibility cannot be excluded that the verse is an addition by a later hand, which contains simply an inference from the contents of the Gospel. It is strange that the verse should give a certificate of historical reliability. If the Gospel was written by an eye-witness, why should others, who presumably were not eye-witnesses (it has, to be sure, been suggested that they were) affirm the truthfulness of the record? If a certificate of this kind can add any authority, does it not seem to betray the consciousness that it was needed? Nevertheless I am inclined to see in it a genuine piece of information. The second passage is the famous verse xix. 35. This seems to some to be a definite claim on the part of the writer to be identical with the beloved disciple, to others it seems equally clear that the writer here distinguishes himself from the beloved disciple. The passage is certainly curiously constructed, 'And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his (*αὐτοῦ*) witness is true: and he (*ἐκεῖνος*) knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe.' The most obvious view of these much controverted words in themselves is that the author refers to the beloved disciple as a third person distinct from himself, and as his authority for the narrative. But why should the writer, who did not see the event, attest the truth of the statement made by an eye-witness? Still more, why should he go on to attest that this eye-witness knows that he is telling the truth? Only the informant himself can know whether he knows or not. Are we, then, to take refuge in the other view that the writer is indirectly referring to himself as an eye-witness? This also is peculiar. After his explicit statement that his witness is true, why add that he knows that he tells the truth, especially with the purpose of arousing confidence in the accuracy of his statement? If they could not believe his statement, were they any more likely to believe it when he told them that he knew that his statement was true? Accordingly, in spite of Wendt's dictum that this view is impossible, I agree with several recent scholars (Dechent, Zahn, E. A. Abbott, Jannaris) that *αὐτοῦ* and *ἐκεῖνος* do not refer to the same person, but that *ἐκεῖνος* means the exalted Christ. 'And he that

hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and HE knoweth that he saith true, that ye may believe.' We thus get a worthy sense for the passage. From his own human testimony to the wonder of the blood and water the writer adds a reference to Christ's consciousness of its truth, thus satisfying the canon of double testimony and rising in his effort to produce conviction from the witness of fallible man to the knowledge of the infallible Christ. Accordingly this passage cannot be quoted either as a claim of the author for himself or to prove a distinction between the author and the eye-witness, since either sense may be imposed on the passage. It does, however, definitely contain the claim that the authority on which the statement rests was that of an eye-witness, whether identical with the author of the Gospel or not.[1] The third passage is i. 14, 'And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory.' This seems to me a claim on the part of the writer to be a direct eye-witness. I grant that the words 'we beheld his glory' by themselves might be interpreted in a spiritual sense. That, however, is not the natural sense of the words in this context; where the writer is affirming the fact of the physical incarnation it is difficult to believe that he immediately goes on to speak of spiritual perception. The physical fact is physically perceived, for we must not forget that it was a main point with him to refute the Docetism that was threatening to rob the Church of its faith in Christ's true humanity. Nevertheless, I willingly admit that the spiritual interpretation is quite possible, though not the one favoured by the context. The matter, however, is changed when we turn from the Gospel to the Epistle. There the claim is very definitely made on the part of the writer to have submitted the real humanity of the Word to physical tests. It is scarcely possible to speak more explicitly of physical perception than he does in the opening verses, of a physical fact attested by sight, hearing, and touch. The whole point of the passage is

[1] Blass has a long discussion of the passage, which he thinks may have been disarranged. See his note, *Evangelium Secundum Johannem* (1902), pp. liii.–lvi.

broken if this is not the case, since the special heresy which the writer is controverting is the doctrine that Jesus had not come in the flesh. Accordingly when Harnack, because he rightly holds that Gospel and Epistle were written by the same author, is driven to the desperate enterprise of explaining the passage in the First Epistle of spiritual perception because he cannot believe that the author of the Fourth Gospel can have claimed to be an eye-witness, we may justifiably see in that fact a solid reason for the view that the author of the Fourth Gospel does make such a claim. Of course the case would be different if those critics are right who assign the Gospel and the Epistle to different authors.

Is this direct claim supported by the phenomena of the Gospel itself? The defenders of the traditional view have always laid much stress on the numerous marks of first-hand knowledge in the Gospel. Several of the points for which they have contended need scarcely be discussed. That the writer was of Jewish nationality is now almost universally admitted, the proofs to the contrary being wholly insufficient to outweigh the evidence on the other side. Familiarity with Palestine and Palestinian customs would also be readily granted by many, the attempts to prove geographical inaccuracy having been generally though not universally given up. Some still urge the phrase 'High Priest that year' as proving that the author imagined the high-priesthood to be a yearly office, and therefore as outweighing all evidence that the writer was a Palestinian. But if fatal to Palestinian residence, it would be almost as fatal to Jewish nationality, yet the latter is granted by some who press the phrase as decisive against the former. Really, as Keim urged, the phrase is deliberately chosen, and embodies no such incredible blunder. 'High Priest that fateful year' is what the words really mean. The proof that the author was an eye-witness, however, is a very different matter. Much of the argument here does not carry us so far as its supporters believe. In the first place, vivid touches or a whole flood of accurate reminiscences do not prove apostolic authorship. This is perfectly clear from the Gospel of Mark. All that

the graphic character of the narrative proves is that it embodies the tradition of an eye-witness, not that the eye-witness himself had compiled the narrative. Now, if the Second Gospel cannot be proved by these features to be the work of Peter, we cannot prove the Fourth Gospel by similar argument to be the work of John. In fact, direct apostolic authorship is not the real point to be maintained, it is rather that the Gospel should be proved to incorporate a reliable historic tradition. And all the numerous arguments which are to be found in such copiousness in our commentaries and special discussions do not when pressed to the utmost really carry us further than that. The strongest argument for direct apostolic authorship is the claim in i. 14. This claim is corroborated by the internal evidence that has been held to prove apostolic authorship, but of itself this does not suffice to establish it.

The question arises, however, whether we ought not to interpret it differently, as allegory rather than fact. This mode of treatment may be seen worked out in detail in such Commentaries as those of Holtzmann or Loisy, or in several of the special discussions of the Gospel. The English reader will find a whole series of examples in E. A. Abbott's article on 'Gospels' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. But a similar view has been taken by several adherents of the traditional view, who, while they have asserted the historicity of the events narrated, have nevertheless imagined that the events have an allegorical significance. It is probably true that the writer has selected his material with this in view, as the connexion between narrative and teaching strongly suggests. For example, the feeding of the five thousand leads to the discourse on the Bread of Life, the healing of the blind man presents Jesus as the Light of the World, the raising of Lazarus teaches that Jesus is the Resurrection and the Life, the coming out of blood and water from His side is not only a positive refutation of Docetism, but symbolizes that Jesus had come not with water only, but with water and blood. But the attempt to carry through allegory everywhere leads to very strange results. When one reads the interpretation

of the story of the woman of Samaria one is forcibly reminded of the Tübingen interpretation of Euodia and Syntyche, a striking example of the possibilities of theory divorced from common sense. The woman of Samaria is, of course, the half-heathen Samaritan community. She has had five husbands, that means the five heathen gods mentioned in 2 Kings xvii. as worshipped by the Samaritans. Her present irregular lover is Yahweh, whom she illegitimately worships. It is a pity for this interpretation, which may be found in numerous commentaries and discussions, that these gods were seven and not five, that they were worshipped simultaneously and not successively; and it is hardly likely that idolatry should be represented as marriage, when its usual symbol is adultery, or that the author should have represented Yahweh under so offensive a figure. Holtzmann, in fact, in view of this difficulty supposes that by the irregular lover Simon Magus must be meant; but it would be very odd to place a man in line with deities; and was Samaria's connexion with him less legitimate than with them? Readers with any literary tact will feel that the story of the woman of Samaria is admirably told, full of life and movement, and even with touches of humour. The request for water, the woman's surprise, the attempt of Jesus to lead her to a sense of need, her crass misunderstanding, the probing of her conscience by the reminder of her past, the woman's ready-witted diverting of the conversation from the embarrassingly personal channel to questions of Theology, the feminine exaggeration in iv. 29, all follow naturally. Yet of this scene so admirably managed, Réville can say, and Pfleiderer can quote his words with approval, 'Taken literally this scene is as absurd as that of the marriage of Cana.'

On the allegorical interpretation what are we to make of many features in the narrative,—that Jesus was weary, that it was Jacob's well, that the place was Sychar, that the woman came at a certain hour, that Jesus had nothing to draw with, that the woman left her water-pot, that His disciples marvelled that He talked with a woman? The allegorist misses

his mark if the allegory is not transparent, yet what symbolical meaning can be attached to these trivial details? If it is a real history that the author means to tell, whether truth or fiction they fall naturally into their places. If they are allegories it is hard to find a suitable meaning for them. Wrede does much more justice to the literary quality of the narrative; he says that the movement of the dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman is incomparably finer than that with Nicodemus.[1] Similarly one might treat the story of the man born blind, or the incident of the feeding of the five thousand. And so we might accumulate a large number of points which speak against the allegorical interpretation. Think of the numerous trivialities in the Gospel, the reference to points of time to which significance cannot without violence be attached, or to distances. Why does the allegorist tell us that the boat was about twenty-five or thirty furlongs from the shore, which looks like the rough calculation of one who was actually there; or why that Bethany was about fifteen furlongs from Jerusalem? Why should he trouble to tell us that there were six water-pots of stone, and again give a rough estimate of their size, that they held two or three firkins apiece? What allegory lies concealed behind the lad at the miracle of the feeding, or the fact that his stock consisted of barley loaves? Why should the eyes of the blind man be anointed with clay? Why should we be told that Lazarus was buried in a cave? What is the object of saying at one time that Jesus spoke in the treasury, and on another occasion that it was in Solomon's porch, with the added touch that it was winter? What is the meaning of the fire of charcoal at the scene of Peter's denial? Why the curious new and insignificant names such as Cana and Ephraim and Malchus? Why the objectless visit to Capernaum mentioned in ii. 12, or the many other details that are not patient of a symbolical interpretation, which any reader of the Gospel may collect in abundance for himself? The cool stream of common

[1] *Charakter und Tendenz des Johannesevangeliums* (1903), p. 21.

sense which John Spencer poured on those who found deep religious mysteries in the Levitical rites would not come amiss to those critics who in this matter also 'embrace a cloud instead of Juno.' One may readily admit that an author who wrote under Rabbinical and Alexandrian influences might employ allegory to an extent that to us would seem strange, yet numerous specimens that may be culled anywhere in Holtzmann or Loisy, Abbott or Pfleiderer awaken no confidence. Take, for example, Abbott's treatment of the healing of the sick man at the pool. The sick man stands for sinful Israel, the thirty-eight years he waits for the troubling of the water are the thirty-eight years of wandering; the intermittent pool stands for the intermittent purification of the law, the five porches are the five senses of unredeemed humanity (Schmiedel thinks they represent the five books of Moses). Peter swims for two hundred cubits, a number which, according to Philo, represents repentance.

Much of the narrative, however, is suspected to have arisen under the influence of definite theological preconceptions, or from the exigencies of theological controversy. This explains the transference of Christ's ministry from Galilee to Judea, since it was fitting that the Messiah should do His work in the capital and not in the provinces. This also accounts for the transformation of the story of the baptism, since it was not fitting that the incarnate Logos should be represented as receiving His baptism and the call to His work at the hands of John. Moreover, John loses the significance he possesses in the Synoptists, and is reduced merely to the position of a witness to Jesus. The date of the Crucifixion is altered, so that the death of Jesus may coincide with the slaughter of the paschal Lamb. The self-revelation of Jesus as Messiah is made at the beginning of the ministry rather than kept a secret till towards its close. The developed Christology of the author which originated with Paul has become the main theme of Jesus' own speeches. The obstinate debates with the Jews of the author's own day have been carried back to His lifetime. Incidents which seemed to compromise the divine dignity of

the Incarnate Logos have been removed, such as the agony at Gethsemane, or the cry of desertion on the cross. The miracles are here not simply selected for their symbolism, but are presented on a more exaggerated scale than in the Synoptists; they are less the outcome of compassion than designed to exhibit the glory of Jesus. The author carefully guards Jesus against any yielding to the suggestions of others; hence if He does what has been suggested to Him, He first refuses and then acts on His own initiative. The homely and pithy discourses of the Synoptic Jesus, lit up by parable and packing the deepest meaning into lucid and pregnant aphorisms, have given place in John to mystical and monotonous harangues in which theme and style and manner are altogether different.

It must, of course, be recognized that there is a good deal of weight in this characterization of the Gospel. Yet it is quite possible to suspect the writer of exaggeration, of conscious or unconscious transformation, when what we really have to do with is selection from a peculiar point of view. Much here, however, depends on one's theological standpoint. Those for whom the Christology of the Fourth Gospel is untrue, and who consider that Paul started the Church down the fatal slope of mythology by his doctrine of the divinity of Christ, will naturally find it very difficult, if not impossible, to believe that one who had personally known Jesus should speak of Him as the author does in his prologue, still more that he should represent Jesus as speaking of Himself as He does in the Gospel. On the other hand, those who believe that the Logos doctrine is true will feel much readier to admit that Jesus may have spoken of Himself in such language as the Fourth Gospel puts into His mouth. We have to remember that the Synoptists themselves contain numerous sayings of Jesus which, while they do not bear the stamp of the Johannine vocabulary, express substantially the Johannine Christology. The same instinct which rejects the sayings in the Fourth Gospel tends also to reject such sayings in the Synoptics. Yet the authenticity of some of these cannot be successfully

challenged. The saying which places the Son above the angels is guaranteed as authentic by the confession of the Son's ignorance, which certainly never could have been invented. Moreover, it is a highly significant fact that the Christology of Paul created no controversy such as raged fiercely about his doctrine of the Law. The Synoptic sayings, it is true, do not contain the doctrine of pre-existence, yet even if we do not base anything on the supposition that the pre-existence of the Messiah was already a doctrine in some Jewish schools, we may remember with Weizsäcker that we find no trace of opposition to this doctrine on the part of the older apostles when preached by Paul. In view of the marked similarity in style between the speeches of Jesus and the Baptist, the style of the author himself and that of the First Epistle, there should be no hesitation in recognizing that the form in which the discourses are cast is due largely to the Evangelist himself, who has stamped everything with his own idiosyncrasies; though here, too, it is easy to overstate the case. Yet as Matthew Arnold pointed out long ago, when we look into the speeches we find a large number of sayings of the same pithy aphoristic character as those contained in the Synoptic Gospels. A Jewish writer would naturally adopt direct speech where a Greek would use indirect, yet one would not mean any more than the other to be taken as giving a verbatim report, but to be expressing largely in his own language the gist of what the speaker said. The subjective element in the report is probably larger than the average reader would imagine. It is quite unnecessary to go over the oft-trodden ground of the differences between the Synoptists and our Gospel. So far as regards the length of the ministry, the visits to Jerusalem, the date of the Crucifixion,[1] the arguments seem to me to favour the

[1] Several recent writers prefer the Synoptic to the Johannine date, e.g. Schmiedel, Pfleiderer, and Loisy. On the other hand, the Johannine date is rightly preferred by Schürer, Wendt, Bousset and others, and this is important as showing that what looks like transparent symbol may nevertheless be plain historical fact.

correctness of the Johannine representation. Even the placing of the cleansing of the temple at the beginning rather than at the end of Christ's ministry, which seems a particularly vulnerable side of the Johannine tradition, may be defended on plausible grounds. The Synoptic account is favoured by the fact that it precipitates the crisis. Of course, if Jesus paid one visit only to Jerusalem during His ministry that date must be right. On the other hand, if He really visited it more than once, is it not more likely that He should come into collision with the desecration, that must often have pained Him before His baptism, on the first occasion it confronted Him after He became conscious of His vocation? The Synoptic narrative suggests that matters moved with astonishing rapidity. If the Johannine narrative implies that Jesus intimated His death and resurrection in the discussion that ensued, it would no doubt be natural to see in this the evidence for its original connexion with the passion visit. That, however, is by no means necessary. In John it is the stupendous miracle at Bethany which precipitates the crisis. The silence of the Synoptists is a real difficulty, which may be mitigated but has never been satisfactorily explained. It is true that they give very little Judean incident, yet Luke knows about Martha and Mary. It is also true that they relate narratives of the raising of the dead, and our modern grading of wonders must not be carried back to them. Yet the fact that the Jews regarded the spirit of the dead man as hovering about his body till the third day after death, and as then going to Sheol, suggests that they would have seen in the resurrection of Lazarus when he had been dead four days something much more striking than in the raising of Jairus' daughter, or of the young man at Nain. On the other hand, the confidence with which the omission by the Synoptists is paraded as completely discrediting the historical character of the Fourth Gospel is, in view of their one-sided character and their attitude to miracles in general, a violent exaggeration. See *e.g.* Wernle, *Die Quellen des Lebens Jesu*, 1904, p. 24.

If the present discussion seems hesitating and tentative,

it is because I cannot share the confidence of the extremists on one side or the other. Apart from the direct claim of i. 14, I should be quite content with asserting mediate rather than direct Johannine authorship, and this position would have the advantage of avoiding some difficulties to which the traditional view is exposed. So far as I feel able to reach any positive conclusion it would be as follows. The Apostle John came to Ephesus late in the sixties, lived there till towards the close of the first century, and gathered about him a band of disciples to whom he was in the habit of imparting his reminiscences of the life of Jesus. He lived in an intellectual atmosphere wholly different from that familiar to him in Palestine, and, if not for himself, at least for his disciples, was forced to take up a definite attitude towards it. Within the Church the Docetic heresy was working havoc, and without it there was an unfriendly empire and a bitterly hostile Judaism. Possibly too he may have had to do with followers of John the Baptist, who pitted their prophet against the prophet of Nazareth.[1] There was also the Alexandrian Philosophy, and, penetrating everything, the subtle influence of Greek thought. Over against this world which lay in the evil one the apostle stood firm in the consciousness that he was in possession of the absolute truth. For this truth he fought directly in his Epistle, indirectly in his Gospel. The latter work had primarily an apologetic interest; it was not so much, as he himself tells us, to give information about Jesus, as to create the belief that Jesus was the Son of God, thus bringing his readers to eternal life. The Synoptic Gospels, in part or wholly, were already known to him; it was not necessary to go over their ground again, unless it served his purpose specially to do so. At the same

[1] This has been argued with great originality and acuteness, but also with much violent exegesis, by Baldensperger in his *Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 1898. His views have met with little acceptance, though the brilliance and suggestiveness of his discussion have been amply recognized. Pfleiderer thinks he has made out his point for the first three chapters of the Gospel. On the other hand, see Jülicher and Loisy, also an article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. xx., 1901, Part I., by Professor C. W. Rishell.

time, he was able to rectify their limitations The selection of his material, however, is dominated in the main by the situation with which he is confronted. He seeks to set Christianity in a favourable light before the empire; the Kingdom of Jesus is not of this world, and Pilate would gladly have acquitted Him. Against the Docetists he insists on the reality of the Incarnation. His Logos becomes flesh, eats and drinks, sits weary by the well, groans in spirit, falters at the prospect of the Passion. From His pierced side comes forth blood and water, His risen body bears the print of the nails and the wound in the side. The Greeks come to Jesus, and the prologue strikes with the doctrine of the Logos the key for the whole Gospel. The author's sharpest polemic is directed against the Jews, who are shown as persistently opposing Jesus; and from quite early in His ministry planning His death. He plies them with the argument from the Old Testament, from the witness of John the Baptist, from the miracles of Jesus. If they do not receive this accumulated testimony it is because they are children of the devil and have no true knowledge of God. If he had to meet the claims made for the Baptist by his followers, he did so by putting the Baptist in his right place, as not the Light Himself, but witnessing to the Light. There is, however, no trace of any tendency to disparage the Baptist; upon his testimony to Jesus, the Evangelist lays the greatest stress.

The apologetic and largely polemical purpose of the Gospel accounts for much that strikes one as peculiar. That the conditions reacted on the Evangelist's representation of the life and teaching of Jesus, that subsequent meditation may have mingled with the report, that the stages of historical movement have not been distinguished in all their original sharpness, is no cause for wonder. But we should make a great mistake if we imagined that the Gospel was merely a romance of the Logos, freely invented as a vehicle of ideas. It embodies a large number of most precious reminiscences, though the interest which has dictated their preservation was theological and apologetic rather than historical.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

CHRISTIAN MYSTICISM.

Christian Mysticism. Bampton Lectures for 1899. By W. R. INGE, M.A. (London: Methuen & Co. 1899.)

Light, Life, and Love: Selections from the German Mystics. By W. R. INGE, M.A. (Methuen & Co.)

The Inner Way: Sermons of John Tauler. By A. W. HUTTON, M.A. (Methuen & Co.)

Mystical Wisdom. By ELEANOR C. GREGORY. (Methuen & Co.)

Jacob Behmen's Supersensual Life. By BERNARD HOLLAND. (Methuen & Co.)

Ruysbroek and the Mystics. By M. MAETERLINCK. (Hodder & Stoughton.)

Theologia Germanica. Translated by SUSANNA WINKWORTH. (Macmillan & Co.)

Three Friends of God; Trees Planted by the River; The Quiet in the Land. By Mrs. FRANCES BEVAN. (Nisbet & Co.)

Infoldings and Unfoldings of the Divine Genius in Nature and Man. By JOHN PULSFORD. (London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co.).

THE revival of interest in mysticism, evidenced by an extensive literature, of which specimens are named above, is one of the pleasing signs of the times. It is in keeping with the idealist reaction in philosophy now in full swing, and proves that spiritual religion has attraction and power in our days. There can be no doubt that, whatever the defects and mistakes of mysticism, its influence on the whole has been on the side of what is most spiritual in religion.

While there has never been a separate church or com-

munity of mystics, there has never been a church or age without them. In days of lifeless formalism, sterile orthodoxy, and abounding worldliness they have been witnesses to religion as an inner divine life in man. They are known by their ways of quiet contemplation, their breathings after divine communion, their sinking of the individual and self in the divine life. The affinity of man with God is their starting-point, union with God their goal. Even to the best of the school the subjective side of Christianity—the new birth and inner life of the Spirit—is more than the objective work of atonement and redemption; Christ in us is more than Christ for us. Here we touch upon the most serious defect of the entire movement. Other defects, although real, are often exaggerated. The love of ecstasy and vision, the trend to theosophy and pantheism, are after all occasional, not normal. Jacob Behmen was perhaps more theosophist than mystic, but there is only one Jacob Behmen. The pantheistic tendency is almost as rare, and is more in words than fact. True mysticism holds a moral, not an essential, union with God; it never amounts to sameness of being or essence. The truth of the divine immanence, so much in evidence in our day, is the very heart of mysticism. God in nature, and chiefly in man, is its quest. If we would find God we must seek Him not without but within, we must sink into the depths of our own being.

The truths which mysticism emphasizes in a one-sided way may be said to be the soul of religion—personal likeness to and fellowship with God; the elements which it neglects are the body of religion. Still, for this earthly life the soul and the body need each other. Certainly we prefer the spiritual to the intellectual and ecclesiastical one-sidedness; but neither is good. The mystic is largely independent of Church and Scripture, of creed and rite. He is in direct touch with God. He owns no other dependence. A noble and yet a perilous theory, too daring and ethereal 'for sinful man beneath the sky.'

It is less easy to distinguish mystical teaching from the experimental side of religion. Many know no difference.

All insistence on the possibility of personal assurance and fellowship with the divine is ruled out as pure imagination. The experimental religion of Puritans, Methodists, and Pietists is classed with the theorizings of Behmen and Law. But this is surely a mistake. Thomas à Kempis and Tersteegen are not mystics in the true sense. They simply isolate one side of New Testament piety—the personal, subjective side. When thus isolated, this aspect may bulk too largely; yet it must enter into Christian life, if that life is to form part of human experience at all.

We are not surprised to find a close connexion between mysticism and Plato's teaching. It is a remarkable providence that the two master-minds of the ancient world exercised such immense influence on Christian thought. Aristotle and Plato were all but canonized saints in the mediaeval Church—one in the field of dogmatic thought, the other in that of mystic feeling. Undoubtedly, they were used by Providence to prepare the way of Christian faith, and that not merely on the formal and speculative side. The substance of many of their thoughts has become the inheritance of Christendom. There is close affinity between much of Plato's high thinking—the praise of virtue for its own sake, divine ideas as the types of all existing things, the passion for intellectual beauty and symmetry—and the leading thoughts of the best mystics. The New-Platonism of Alexandria in the third century A.D. powerfully influenced mystic thought. Our own Cambridge Platonists of the seventeenth century went back to Plotinus and Proclus for much of their finest inspiration; and in doing so they followed the example of the best of the early Fathers, who were not above learning from the wisdom of the pre-Christian world. Before them also Philo, the Jewish Alexandrian sage, had spoken of Plato as a Moses in Greek dress. Judaism, like every other religion, had its roll of esoteric thinkers. Goethe calls mysticism 'the scholastic of the heart, the dialectic of the feelings.'

We must notice briefly the roots of mysticism in Scripture—scarcely in the Old Testament, to which God's

transcendence, His distinctness from creation, is the fundamental truth. In the Psalms, indeed, subjective religion finds noble expression (xxxvi. 9, lxxiii. 25). The doctrine of the divine image in man also is rich in suggestion. But as a whole the Old Testament dwells on the objective side of religion. It is in the New Testament that the other side finds full development. The ideas of poverty of spirit, self-renunciation and cross-bearing, the kingdom of God within, the vanity of worldly good, saving the life by losing it—all prominent in the Synoptic teaching—are among the primary mystic doctrines. St. John is rightly regarded as the apostle of this school. The prologue of his Gospel, with its creative 'Word,' who is the life and light of men, is the text of endless exposition. The impersonal reason of Philo and Greek speculation here becomes personal life and active will. In him, as in its source, was life. The life, light, and love, which constantly recur in John's Gospel and Epistle, are watchwords of mysticism.[1] With St. John eternal life always stands for salvation, and this life is found in the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ. The new birth of God and the Spirit is a central idea both of the apostle and all mystics. Begotten of God, born of God and the Spirit of God, child of God, is John's description of the saved. The Johannine symbols—the vine and branches, the bread and water of life—are favourite terms with mystics. The mutual indwelling of God and the believing soul is taken chiefly from John: 'I in them, and Thou in Me.' 'Abide in Me, and I in you.' Yet St. Paul is no less truly a mystic than St. John—a plain indication where the heart of Christianity lies. Christ in the believer, the believer in Christ, is the very kernel of Pauline piety. The believer lives, prays, loves in Christ: 'I can do all things in Christ.' The difference between the two teachings is that in Paul the inward and subjective figures as one of several elements, in John it is the central and essential.

The first name that meets us outside Scripture is

[1] See the booklet named above.

Dionysius the Areopagite. The name of Paul's Athenian convert was given by an unknown writer of the fifth century to a mystical, apocalyptic treatise, which exercised extraordinary influence throughout the Middle Ages—a mystical counterpart to Peter Lombard's dogmatic text-book. The Pseudo-Dionysius developed into the more elaborate system of the monk Maximus in the seventh century, which is a repertory of mystical doctrine, and this again into the full-blown pantheistic mysticism of the profound John Scotus Erigena of the ninth century.[1] Dionysius is steeped in New-Platonist abstractions. God is pure being, and yet above being and reason; everything may be both affirmed and denied of Him; all being is good. Purification, illumination, perfection, are the three stages to absorption in God.

The great mystics of mediaeval days are to us little more than names—Bernard, Richard and Hugh of St. Victor, Bonaventura, Gerson. They inherited and expounded the thoughts of earlier days on a great scale and in noble language.[2] Bernard, the sweet psalmist of 'Jesus, the very thought of Thee,' and the interpreter of the Canticles, with his concrete imagery, is the very antithesis of Erigena—all aflame with divine love. The two Victors are noble teachers. Hugo says, 'The way to ascend to God is to descend into thyself.' Richard writes, 'The ascent is through self above self,' i.e. forgetting the things that are behind. 'Let him that is athirst to see God clean his mirror, let him make his own spirit bright.' 'By mental ecstasy man is led out of himself, and contemplates truth, not through a mirror darkly but in simple truth.' How is self-illusion to be guarded against? 'The transfigured Christ must be accompanied by Moses and Elias,' i.e. visions must be attested by the Word. Albertus Magnus writes, 'When St. John says that God is a Spirit, and that He must be worshipped in spirit, he means that the mind must be cleared of all images. When thou prayest shut the doors of thy senses, keep them barred and

[1] Neander, *Church History*, vol. v. p. 234.

[2] A splendid specimen from Hugh is given by Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 331.

bolted against all phantoms and images. . . . Nothing pleases God more than a mind free from all occupations and distractions. Such a mind is in a manner transferred into God, for it can think of nothing, and understand nothing, and love nothing, but God: other creatures and itself it sees only in God.'

We may now notice the mystics of different countries. There was a great outburst of mysticism in Germany in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—a preparation, in a sense, for the Reformation.[1] Although its leaders remained in fellowship with the Church, their teaching moved in a path of its own. Their only concern was with the soul's inner life. Luther was greatly under their influence. The master of the school was Eckhart; the scholars, John Ruysbroek, Henry Suso, Tauler, and the author of the *Theologia Germanica*. It is noteworthy that these men wrote in German, another precursor of Reformation times. Eckhart was a pioneer in speculations of a kind now familiar to us. He distinguishes, like others of the school, between the Godhead and God, as Dr. Fairbairn does in a well-known work.[2] The Godhead is God undeveloped into the triune God; the Son is the uttered thought of the Father, the Spirit the mutual love of both. Like Augustine, he makes the Son say, 'I am come as a Word from the heart, as a ray from the sun, as heat from the fire, as fragrance from the flower, as a stream from a perennial fountain.' Some of his teaching incurred the suspicion of pantheism, and brought him into disfavour with the authorities. His view of divine immanence finds peculiar expression. In every man there is a divine spark, which is the uncreated 'ground of the soul,' and is one with God, the spark being the reason and conscience. The idea often recurs in later writers. 'The eye,' he says, 'with which I see God is the same as that with which He sees me.' The divine spark in man is ever tending back to its source in the Godhead. Yet Eckhart constantly asserts

---

[1] See Ullmann's *Reformers before the Reformation*. 2 vols.

[2] *Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 385.

man's distinct personality. His teaching has also a strongly expressed practical side. He prefers Martha to Mary—a strange comparison for a mystic: 'You need not go into a desert and fast; a crowd is often more lonely than a wilderness, and small things harder to do than great.' 'What is the good of the dead bones of saints?' 'If your will is right, you cannot go wrong.' 'There is nothing evil but the evil will, of which sin is the appearance.' Purgatory, heaven, and hell are states, not places. Christ must be born in us—a subjective re-incarnation. 'God begets His Son in me.'

Eckhart's pupils had a more popular style. John of Ruysbroek, who is being interpreted to us by Maeterlinck, divides the Christian life into three stages—the active with its appropriate virtues of humility, love, and righteousness, the inner life of divine illumination, and the contemplative of absorption in God: 'In this highest stage the soul is united to God without means; it sinks into the vast abyss of the Godhead.' 'So far as distinction of persons goes, there is no more God or creature.' Yet we must be conscious of ourselves in God and in ourselves. Ruysbroek is ruthless in his denunciation of the worldly spirit in churchmen of every rank. Henry Suso, with his rigid austerities, his visions and devotion to the Eternal Wisdom, of which he professes himself the 'humble servitor,' is an attractive figure.[1] His autobiography reads like another Augustine's *Confessions*. John Tauler was a mighty preacher.[2] While he popularizes Eckhart he disclaims pantheism, and has a deeper sense of sin. He pictures the three stages of the soul's ascent to God in similar terms: 'It is not the work of a day or year.' 'Before it can come to pass, nature must endure many a death outward and inward.' The final stage of perfection is even described as 'deification,' a phrase commonly used by Athanasius in the fourth century—whether in the same sense is uncertain. Ruysbroek says, 'All men who

[1] See Mrs. Bevan's delightful volumes.

[2] *The Inner Way*, named before.

are exalted above their creatureliness into a contemplative life are one with this divine glory, yea, are that glory.' In the 'abyss' there is no distinction of divine and human persons, but only the one essence. Tauler bids us 'put out into the deep and let down our nets'; but his deep is in the heart, not in the intellect: 'My children, you should not ask about these high problems; for no teacher can teach what he has not lived through himself.' There is much practical teaching: 'You are as holy as you truly will to be.' 'With the will one may do everything.' 'Sloth often makes men fain to be excused from their work and set to contemplation.' 'Works of love are more acceptable to God than lofty contemplation.' 'One can spin, another can make shoes; and all these are gifts of the Holy Ghost. I tell you, if I were not a priest, I should esteem it a great gift to be able to make shoes, and would try to make them so well as to be a pattern to all.' Henry More calls the *Theologia Germanica* a golden little treatise. Luther puts it next to the Scriptures and Augustine. Its fifty-four brief chapters give us the quintessence of the whole mystic movement: 'So long as a man seeketh his own highest good because it is his, he will never find it.' 'He who would know before he believes, never cometh to true knowledge.' 'Nothing burneth in hell but self-will.' The soul has two eyes: with the right it sees into eternity, with the left it sees time and temporal things. In order that the right eye may see, the left must be closed. The essence of sin is self-will, of righteousness self-renunciation.

Spain adds a brief chapter to the history of the school. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, Molinos, are among the chief names (sixteenth century). The germs of the Reformation had been extirpated. The Inquisition had done its work thoroughly. Dr. Inge says, 'It took only twelve years to destroy Protestantism in Spain; and the Holy Office was equally successful in binding mysticism hand and foot.' St. Theresa narrowly escaped imprisonment. She is the saint both of divine raptures and practical work. She was unquestionably a great teacher of prayer, of which she makes

four kinds. These she illustrates by four methods of watering a garden: by water drawn from a well, a wheel, a flowing stream, rain from heaven. The first is spoken prayer, the second is when God is so near that there is no need of speech, the third when God prompts and the soul is all but at rest, in the fourth the soul is quiescent and receptive. Here we have the quietism which became a reproach of the Spanish and French schools. A prayer of a Jewish Rabbi runs, 'O Lord, grant that I may do Thy will as if it were my will, that Thou mayest do my will as if it were Thy will.' A Spaniard is nothing if not extreme, and St. John of the Cross went to fanatical lengths in self-maceration and crusading against Protestantism. Nature must not be governed, but suppressed: 'Whosoever he be that forsaketh not all—all, intellect, reason, memory—all that is divinest in our nature, cannot be My disciple.' 'O sweetest love of God, too little known; he who has found Thee is at rest; let everything go, O God, that we may rest in Thee. Everywhere with Thee, O God, everywhere all things with Thee; as I wish, O my love, all for Thee, nothing for me; nothing for me, all for Thee. All sweetness and delight for Thee, none for me; all bitterness and trouble for me, none for Thee. O my God, how sweet to me Thy presence, who art the supreme Good.' Molinos, a Spanish priest of the seventeenth century, was a pronounced Quietist.[1] He speaks of three silences—from words, from desires, and from thoughts; the last the highest: 'In the last the mind is a blank, and God alone speaks to the soul.' There are two ways to divine knowledge—the outer way of meditation and study, and the inner way of perfect resignation and complete annihilation of self-will. In substance Molinos does not go beyond Thomas à Kempis. He died in prison.

The same cloud of quietism broods over the French school of the seventeenth century, of which Fénelon and Madame Guyon are chief ornaments. One of Fénelon's

---

[1] *Golden Thoughts from the Spiritual Guide of Molinos.* With Preface by J. H. Shorthouse. (Glasgow: Bryce & Son.)

controversies with Bossuet was on disinterested love. Pure love, he says, is love from which all regard for self is absent. Self-love is not wrong, but it marks a lower state of grace: 'If God were to condemn the righteous man to hell, the righteous man would still love Him'—a strange hypothesis. 'We pray as much as we desire, and we desire as much as we love.' Pure contemplation, again, is defined as having no distinct image for its object. Fénelon does not expect love and contemplation of this strain to be often attained in this life. Quietism was probably a reaction against the mechanical repetitions of public prayers.

Two little-known English mystics are Walter Hilton and Juliana of Norwich, in the fourteenth century. The former's *Scale of Perfection* has been reprinted in our day. It repeats the teaching about contemplation and the prayer of quiet already described: 'Christ is lost like the coin in the parable, but where? In the house of thy heart. No need to run to Rome or Jerusalem to seek Him. He sleepeth in thy heart, as He did in the ship; awaken Him with the call of thy desire. Thou sleepest oftener to Him than He to thee.' There is a true and a false light—love of God and love of the world. We must pass through darkness to light: 'Flashes of light shine through the chinks of the walls of Jerusalem, but thou art not there yet.' Juliana, a Benedictine nun of Norwich, was much given to visions and revelations of Christ. She made much of mental prayer: 'Pray inwardly, though it has no savour to thee; for it is profitable, though thou feel not and see not, yea, though thou think thou canst not.' It is strange to see this untutored soul finding its way to the usual mystic pastures of contemplation and rapture. Many of her notions border on pantheism and quietism. Others reappear in Jacob Behmen—as the denial of wrath in God. Sin is said to be without substance. 'To me,' she said, 'was shown no harder hell than sin.'

Three centuries later we come upon the Society of Friends, with its strong protest against religious formalism of every kind. The doctrine of the inner light, waiting for the Spirit, the spiritual interpretation of the sacraments, the

absence of a separate ministry, represent a mild and gracious form of mysticism. George Fox, William Penn, Robert Barclay, Thomas Ellwood, Isaac Penington, John Woolman, are homely but memorable names in the history of religion. It is truly said that the Society has exercised an influence in the world of Christian ethics and philanthropy out of all proportion to its numbers.

The group of Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century ranks with the best representatives of the school.[1] Its chief names are Ralph Cudworth, Henry More, Benjamin Whichcote, John Smith, John Norris. The nickname 'Latitudinarian' applied to them detracts nothing from the glory they shed on English religion and learning. They were Platonists of the purest type. They use the old Alexandrian teachers with the ease which only sympathy and perfect mastery can give. They are utterly free from the weakness, obscurity, and puerility which often disfigure mystic writers. 'They were students of Plato and Plotinus more than of Dionysius and his successors.' It would be hard to find anything in literature loftier in tone and style than John Smith's *Select Discourses*. Reason and conscience speak in no uncertain tones. The affinity between man and God is gloriously illustrated. In the Cambridge school the ideal proposed by some in our day of a return to early Greek theology is to a great extent fulfilled. The Western development led by Augustine is left out of sight. In consequence the facts of sin and redemption receive scant justice. As an exhibition of one aspect of the Christian system the Cambridge teaching is admirable. If regarded as a complete exposition it is seriously defective. Here are a few sentences from John Smith: 'Reason in man being *lumen de lumine*, a light flowing from the Fountain and Father of lights, . . . was to enable man to work out of himself all those notions of God which are the true groundwork of love and obedience to God and conformity to Him.' 'He

[1] See vol. ii. of Tulloch's *Rational Theology in England in the Seventeenth Century*.

that made our souls in His own image and likeness can easily find a way into them. The word that God speaks, having found a way into the soul, imprints itself there as with the point of a diamond.' 'Divinity is a divine life rather than a divine science, to be understood rather by a spiritual sensation than by any verbal description.' Whichcote, who is full of the serenest wisdom, writes, 'Heaven is first a temper, then a place'; and Smith, 'Heaven is not a thing without us, nor is happiness anything distinct from a true conjunction of the mind with God.' 'Though we could suppose ourselves to be at truce with Heaven, and all divine displeasure laid asleep, yet would our own sins, if they continue unmortified, make an Aetna or Vesuvius within us.'

Another name remains to be mentioned—that of William Law, in the eighteenth century. In him Jacob Behmen, the Silesian shoemaker of the previous century, speaks to us. The matter of Law's mystical teaching is taken from Behmen, only the English dress is original. Behmen is the chief Protestant mystic and theosophist—one-fourth the first, three-fourths the second. His theosophy, which essays to sound the depths of the Godhead, we must pass by. Not even Law's nervous, lucid pen can make it intelligible to the uninitiated. Yet there must be attraction in it, when it fascinates strong intellects like Law and Bishop Martensen.[1] We hope it is not unfair to represent this side of Behmen by a single sentence: 'I saw the being of all beings, the ground and the abyss, also the birth of the Holy Trinity, the origin and first state of the world and of all creatures. I saw in myself the three worlds—the divine or angelic world; the dark world, the original of nature; and the external world as a substance spoken forth out of the two spiritual worlds.' Here Behmen might be a second-century Gnostic risen again. John Wesley's verdict was, 'Sublime nonsense, inimitable bombast, fustian not to be paralleled.'

[1] Martensen's work on Behmen has appeared in English. Law's translation of Behmen's voluminous works is rare.

Much of the theosophy will be found reproduced in Law's *Spirit of Prayer* and *Spirit of Love*; and strange jargon it is. Even as to the other teaching, it sounds strange on the lips of an uncompromising High Churchman. Anger in God is fiercely denied. All semblance of objective atonement and propitiation is ignored. Regeneration is the whole of salvation. Justification in the Protestant sense is explained away: 'Christ given for us is Christ given into us. He is in no other sense our full, perfect, and sufficient atonement than as His nature and spirit are born and formed in us.' 'Neither reason nor Scripture will allow us to bring wrath into God Himself as a temper of His mind, who is only infinite, unalterable, overflowing love.' 'Wrath is atoned when sin is extinguished.' The William Law of the *Serious Call* and *Christian Perfection* is another man. Behmen is seen to more advantage in his *Way to Christ* in four parts: True Repentance, True Resignation, Regeneration, The Supersensual Life.[1] Dr. Whyte speaks of this work as 'a production of the very greatest depth and strength.' For the rest, it is wonderful to find an uneducated peasant moving freely in regions supposed to be accessible only to a Milton or Dante.

To Law heaven and hell are states, not places: 'The soul, when it departs from the body, needeth not to go far; for where the body is, there is heaven and hell.' The moral life is governed by law, nothing is arbitrary. He even says, 'There is nothing that is supernatural in the whole system of our redemption. Every part of it has its ground in the workings and powers of nature, and all our redemption is only nature set right, or made to be that which it ought to be. There is nothing that is supernatural but God alone.' 'Right and wrong, good and evil, true and false, happiness and misery, are as unchangeable in nature as time and space.' 'Love has no by-ends, wills nothing but its own increase; everything is as oil to its flame. The spirit of love does not want to be rewarded, honoured, or esteemed;

[1] Published in 1894 by G. Moreton, Canterbury.

its only desire is to propagate itself, and become the blessing and happiness of everything that wants it.'

These illustrations may serve to explain the secret of a movement which, with all its aberrations, has exercised a beneficent influence on the history of the Church of Christ. The mystics treat of the deepest things of the human soul and Christian experience. They come with no external authority. They are justified or condemned by the message they bring. Their appeal is especially to those who aspire to the perfect Christian life, and the appeal is not without response. Mysticism has done much in counteracting low ideals, in stimulating the best instincts of Christian souls. It has helped to make many great saints. 'Man cannot live by bread alone.' Bread is good and necessary. Forms and rites are helpful and necessary in religion; but they are only means to an end, and they are useful in so far as they serve the end, leading us from the seen and temporal to the unseen and eternal, which is the true home of the spirit. In keeping ever to the front the spiritual content of Christianity we are rendering the best service to religion and our fellow-men.

JOHN S. BANKS.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND BABYLON.

The Laws of Moses and the Code of Hammurabi. By STANLEY A. COOK, M.A. (A. & C. Black. 1903.)

Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies. By A. H. SAYCE, LL.D., D.D. (Religious Tract Society. 1904.)

Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, and Letters. By C. H. W. JOHNS, M.A. (T. & T. Clark. 1904.)

The Early Narratives of Genesis. By HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, D.D. (Macmillan & Co. 1892.)

Articles in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. Extra Volume. (T. & T. Clark. 1904.)

IT is hardly possible for us even to imagine what would have been our conception of the Christian religion if the New Testament alone had been known to us and not the Old. Suppose that up to, say, fifty years ago our knowledge of the preparatory history of religion on the soil of Palestine for twelve or thirteen centuries before Christ had been confined to a few hints and legends to which nobody but archæologists had thought it necessary to give much heed. Suppose that in quite recent years some documents of Old Testament history had come for the first time to light, say the history of Moses and the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites, or one or two of the stories of the early monarchy. Suppose, further, that in addition to the new light these discoveries would have thrown upon the New Testament, we were still confidently expecting that at any time other and even more valuable documents might be discovered. Suppose that only yesterday the Book of Leviticus had come to be known, and we were still waiting for the Book of Psalms, of whose contents we as yet knew

little certainly and definitely. It is difficult to imagine such a position. But one thing is quite certain, and that is that in such a case our previous conceptions of the Christian religion would be undergoing very considerable readjustment, and we should be welcoming that enrichment of the mind which a wider outlook always brings.

What is actually happening to-day is so far parallel to this imaginary position as to be, not identical certainly, but at least analogous. Until a few years ago we took very little note of any preparation for the gospel which was not comprised in the Old Testament books. We traced the beginnings of religion, always in one nation alone, back as far as Abraham, but very little if any farther. Abraham was the founder of the Hebrew people, and it was in the story of the Hebrew people that God had prepared the way for Christianity. It is true that the early chapters of Genesis invited us to believe that God's hand was in history before the times of Abraham and outside the history of the Hebrews; but these chapters were but a small portion of the Book of Genesis and an almost insignificant portion of the whole Bible. The whole interest of the stories of Creation, of Babel, and of the Flood, lay for us in the conception that throughout these events God was preparing one nation, and one only, to be the recipient and the vehicle of His revelation. Occasionally we had views and glimpses of great world-powers before Abraham and outside Hebrew history; we even knew in a half-vague and half-perplexed way that these other races too had their versions of the old stories of Creation and the Flood; but it never occurred to us that anything was to be gained for religion by a study of the non-Hebrew races; and a great many good and even thoughtful people were content with the hypothesis that whatever in other nations may have resembled the Hebrew story must have been in some way derived from the Hebrews themselves and from the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament.

So recently as 1891 it was said by a writer, so little conservative of old conceptions as Dr. Driver, that 'no

external evidence worthy of credit exists' for the determination of the age and authorship of the books of the Old Testament.[1] That would hardly be said to-day by Dr. Driver or by any other competent observer of events and their significance. Documents quite outside the Old Testament are now seen to modify very considerably the evidence for the determination of the age and of the authorship of, at all events, the books of the Pentateuch. And these outside documents profoundly modify our conceptions of things even more important than the dates and authorship of books. What, then, is it that has been happening in recent years? What are the documents which have come to light?

Already in 1887 a notable discovery had been made at Tel El-Amarna, in Egypt, of some tablets of burnt clay written in Palestine a hundred years before the Exodus, and written in the cuneiform characters of Babylon. From these it appears that at that period, even in Palestine, the Babylonian language was the language of diplomacy and international intercourse. Attention was called by this discovery to the close relationship during many centuries of Palestine and Babylon, and the fact began to stand out more clearly than before that when Israel at length came into contact with the tribes of Palestine it came into contact with a civilization and a form of government which was distinctly Babylonian.

To the interest in Babylon thus quickened there succeeded a vastly more important impetus at the end of 1901 in the discovery at Susa (the Shushan of the Book of Esther) of a great block of polished black marble, measuring 8 feet by 6 feet, or thereabout, inscribed on both sides with cuneiform characters and containing rather more words (8,000) than are contained in this article. When the words were deciphered and translated they were found to be a code of laws promulgated by the great Babylonian king, Hammurabi, who is, almost certainly, the Amraphel of Gen. xiv., and therefore contemporary with Abraham.

[1] *Literature of the Old Testament*, 2nd edition, p. xxxv.

That was sufficiently startling, but even more astonishing was the discovery that the code bore a most distinct and striking likeness to the code of laws in Exod. xx. 22–xxiii. 33. Moreover, the block was found to be not a copy, but actually the original document; and—one picturesque detail more—the inscription begins with a sculptured bas-relief representing Hammurabi receiving his code of laws from the Sun-god, very much as Moses is represented in Exodus as receiving the Commandments from Jehovah amid thunderings and lightnings upon Mount Sinai, and inscribed (yet another coincidence) upon tables of stone. By the discovery of this code of Hammurabi, less than four years ago, the door was opened upon a prospect of matters relative to Old Testament history and religion hitherto almost unsuspected and wellnigh bewildering in the variety and intensity of its interest. The fascination is of the same kind as that which would have occurred on the discovery of the Book of Exodus if we had previously known only the New Testament.

It will at once be seen that the interest of this newly discovered document centres primarily around two questions. First, what is the extent and the character of the coincidences and of the differences between the Hammurabi code and the code in Exodus? And, second, what is the historical relation between the Babylonian and Hebrew races which will account for both the coincidences and the differences? When these two questions have been answered, other and even more important questions will present themselves. We shall have to inquire, for instance, to what extent it will be necessary to enlarge our conception of the historical preparation for Christianity. And, again, what is the conception of inspiration which will satisfactorily account for the parallelism of the code of Hammurabi and the code in Exodus? The answers to questions like these will necessarily be tentative at first and probably for a good while to come. We must be content to proceed deliberately in a matter of so much importance; and in the meantime we must be careful not to embarrass and embitter the search

for ultimate truth by premature and ill-founded imputations of dangerous tendency and sinister aims on the part of those who search. There must, on the one hand, be freedom to inquire, and even to frame hypotheses which may seem novel and revolutionary; and there must, on the other hand, be freedom to maintain, without suspicion of intellectual poverty, that the new theories may be unsatisfactory and the old positions sound. Galileo has been found to be right in spite of the Inquisition, and yet the Inquisition may have been a wholesome if rigorous correction for some less careful investigators in physical and other science.

But we are anticipating. Let us come back to the question of the parallelism between the documents. Here, at all events, we are on ground where it is not necessary to frame theories, but only to glean and garner facts. And, first, let us remind ourselves of a few historical facts of preliminary importance. Let us clearly and steadily recognize that 'beyond the mountains there are also people.' It is certain that neither civilization nor religion had its origin in Moses and the Exodus. The horizon is farther away than even the times of Abraham. Hammurabi, who was contemporary with Abraham, did but codify laws which were already in existence before his time. We have, in fact, to recognize a busy, complex, and, in many respects, highly moral life existing in Babylon at least a thousand years before the time of Moses; a life which in the time of Hammurabi was such that Cook declares that 'in Babylonia and Assyria the tablets have brought us face to face with a highly developed religion and with a perfectly organized military state; there was a regular postal exchange, intercommunication was unbroken, and mercantile and commercial enterprise was in full swing.'[1] Johns also says that 'a right-thinking citizen of a modern city would probably feel more at home in ancient Babylon than in mediaeval Europe'; and he goes on to say that 'rarely in the history of antiquity can we find so much of which we heartily approve, so little to

[1] *Laws of Moses and Code of Hammurabi*, p. 92.

condemn. The primitive virtues, which we flatter ourselves that we have retained, are far more in evidence than those primitive vices which we know are not extinct among us. The average Babylonian strikes us as a just, good man, no wild savage, but a law-abiding citizen, a faithful husband, good father, kind son, firm friend, industrious trader, or careful man of business. We know from other sources that he was no contemptible warrior, no mean architect or engineer. He might be an excellent artist, modelling in clay, carving rocks, and painting walls. His engraving of seals was superb. His literary work was of high order. His scientific attainments were considerable.'[1] Hammurabi appears, indeed, to have been a father of his people, and we may regard him as a sort of King Alfred if we bear in mind that Babylonia was far more advanced in the days of Hammurabi than England was in the days of Alfred. His reign marks the recovery of Babylonian independence, and the extension of a united empire westward to the shores of the Mediterranean.

The coincidences of Babylonian and Hebrew documents may be conveniently regarded in the three departments of legend, religion, and law. The coincidences of legend was well known before the discovery of the Hammurabi code, and has been luminously expounded by Ryle in his *Early Narratives of Genesis*, and by other scholars. The newly discovered document is a code of laws, and contributes nothing to our knowledge of legends. Nevertheless the resemblance of the Babylonian cosmogonies to the Hebrew narratives in Genesis is too striking to be passed over without a remark. And the contrasts are still more significant than the resemblances, in that they point always to a more sober and dignified conception of God on the part of the Hebrews. But we need not here go over again the ground which has been thoroughly explored.

With regard to religion we are not yet able to institute a detailed comparison between Babylon and the Hebrews. Mr. Johns in his latest book, the *Laws, Contracts, and Letters*,

[1] *Laws, Contracts, and Letters*, p. viii.

has but little, indeed almost nothing, to tell us in this department. In one single chapter he states what is known about the functions and organization of the temple in Babylonia, and notes the honours paid to the priesthood; but the chapter is almost exclusively concerned with the secular administration of the temple affairs. The Babylonian ritual code has yet to be discovered. Still we are not absolutely without information; and what we do know of Babylonian religion, gathered from religious documents already brought to light, indicates a closer parallel in this department than even in the civil code. Professor Morris Jastrow maintains[1] that an understanding of the Hebrew religion is impossible without a constant consideration of the religion and culture that were developed in the Euphrates valley. We shall look with eagerness for the work which Professor Friedrich Delitzsch is preparing on the epics, psalms, and religious texts of Babylon and Assyria. In the meantime we already know enough to enable us to say that some of the hymns and psalms and prayers of the old Babylonians are such as to suggest that they are only one step behind the parallel literature of the Old Testament.

It is when we come to the department of law that the most detailed and interesting comparison becomes possible now that the Hammurabi code has been thoroughly studied and collated. Let us begin our investigation here by reminding ourselves of the character and contents of the document or documents comprised in Exod. xx. 22–xxiii. 33, and known as the Book of the Covenant, with the Book of Judgements (Exod. xxi. 1–xxiii. 9) inserted within it; for it is this document which at even the first glance is seen to be very closely related to the Hammurabi code. It will be noticed at once that the enactments in the Book of Judgements are hypothetical in form: 'If any man shall transgress in this or that fashion, then this or that penalty shall follow.' It is further to be observed that the whole document is apparently intended for the regulation of the life of

[1] Hastings' *Dictionary*, art. 'Religion of Babylonia,' vol. v.

a simple, agricultural people, much occupied with oxen, asses, and sheep. It was a community which had made some little progress in civilization, for the code imposes laws which restrict the unregulated action of the individual. But the community for which the code was devised was nevertheless relatively archaic; for the *lex talionis* still holds a prominent place, the ceremonial is rudimentary, the religious institutions are still in an early stage of development, and God is regarded as the immediate source of judgement. Hence this document is generally believed to be the oldest code of Hebrew law.

The points of coincidence and of divergence between the Hebrew code and the Hammurabi code are so numerous and so manifold that it is impossible here to do more than indicate some notable instances. It was not until a later date that the code of Hammurabi was known as 'The Judgements of Righteousness, which Hammurabi, the great king, set up'; but even so, the phrase reminds the reader at once of the 'Judgements' of the code in Exodus. There is a tendency, not very marked, in both Hammurabi and Exodus to group the laws into fives and tens. The most prominent example of this is the Decalogue, in two tables of five; but other examples, less easily discoverable, are to be found in both codes. Again, in both the structure of the laws follows the hypothetical scheme—'If this happens, then that shall follow.' Both systems agree in legislating for the regulation of personal and individual rights in an agricultural community. The laws in both relate to the holding of slaves, to the ownership of cattle, to thefts, to trespass, to injuries, to damaged crops, to debts and debtors, to adultery and incest. The penalties in both are similar, and startle the modern reader by the ease with which it seems to have been possible under either to incur the penalty of death. The law of retaliation occurs in each, and in each it is compensation rather than punishment which is aimed at. Under the two heads of customs and enactments, Mr. Johns gives (in Hastings' *Dictionary*) a detailed examination of the matter common to the codes, which may profitably be

consulted. If the religious element which appears in the Hebrew legislation is absent from the Babylonian, this absence is due, not to lack of religious restraints and sanctions in Babylonian legislation, but to the fact that only their civil code is yet fully known to us. Nevertheless we know already that the ethical spirit of the Babylonian people was very high. Their code provides for rights of women as well as of men, seeks to protect the weak, and takes motives into consideration. Some of its provisions are barbarously cruel, no doubt; but in this, again, the Babylonian legislation does but agree with some enactments in the Pentateuch, and, indeed, with some not very ancient laws of England. Witches, for instance, and debtors were as cruelly dealt with in England in the eighteenth century A.D. as they were in Israel in the tenth century B.C. or in Babylon in the twenty-fourth.

That noteworthy differences between the Babylonian and Hebrew codes do also exist is undeniable, and is only what might be expected in the nature of the case. Hammurabi legislated for conditions of society rather more complicated than those of the race of peasants whom the Book of the Covenant had in view. In Hammurabi, class distinctions are well defined which do not appear at all in the Hebrew code, for the sufficient reason that no such distinctions existed in Israel. Many of the differences may satisfactorily be accounted for by the hypothesis of adaptation in the Hebrew code. Mr. Johns points out several instances of conscious variation of this sort, where the Hebrew code selects, or supplements, or revises, or even amends the older code. Professor Sayce is still more insistent in emphasizing these points of difference. His view of the case is that just as Hammurabi did not originate but only collected and codified the Babylonian law, so Moses, at a later date, codified already existing laws and adapted them to the state of the Hebrew community. He admits that the similarities between the two codes are striking, but maintains that the contrasts are far greater and more striking than the agreements. Hammurabi legislated for the city, Moses for the desert; the Hammurabi code presupposes a settled state,

the Mosaic a tribal confederacy of nomads not yet become a state, a confederacy in which the individual is still allowed to avenge himself. In Hammurabi he finds the keynote to be the security of property in a great trading community and the provision for testamentary inheritance, whereas in Moses life itself was a man's chief property, and there is no trace of inheritance by testament. Professor Sayce must momentarily have forgotten that 'Thou shalt not steal' is one of the Ten Commandments, for we can hardly imagine that he, of all people, would consent to the argument of some other scholars who assign the Decalogue to a period much later than that of Moses. When he goes on to urge that whereas Hammurabi legislates for surgeons, Moses knows nothing of them, he is again on ground manifestly insecure, for surgeons are as much needed by nomads as by citizens, and the argument from silence is always precarious.

It remains to be pointed out that the parallelism between the Babylonian and Hebrew law is to be traced in Genesis as well as in Exodus. The purchase of the cave of Machpelah is now found to have been a distinctly Babylonian transaction between Abraham, who had arrived from Babylonia, and the Canaanitish tribes who were by that time under Babylonian rule. So also the relationship of Sarah, Hagar, and Abraham, and again of Rachel, Bilhah, and Jacob, is in strict accordance with the Babylonian code. Moreover, the adoption by Abraham of his steward, Eliezer, as his heir is explained by reference to Hammurabi's code. Professor Sayce was amongst the earliest to recognize that the law underlying the patriarchal times is Babylonian law.

Nothing further needs be added here to show the existence of a very close relation between the Hebrew and the earlier Babylonian legends, religion, and legislation. Whether the relation be that of agreement or of conscious variation, the influence of one upon the other appears to admit of no doubt. The parallelism is too obvious to be ignored. It is true that Kautzsch[1] has written an exhaustive treatise on

[1] In Hastings' *Dictionary*, vol. v.

the religion of Israel, in which he wellnigh ignores the existence of Babylon. Probably he is the only living scholar who since 1901–2 would undertake to perform a feat like that. The coincidences between the two literatures and legislations are so close as to make it almost impossible to imagine a separate and independent origin for each. One might almost as well attempt to write a history of the United States without reference to England. No doubt there are some coincidences which might be accounted for well enough by regarding them as common to mankind. It is hardly necessary to explain the *lex talionis*, for example, or the tendency to individual revenge, by collating either code with the other. These are instincts which are common to the race of men. If these were all the parallels between the thought and usage of the two peoples, there would be nothing further to investigate or say. The fact, however, is that the parallelism is in reality far too manifold and intimate to be dismissed in this fashion. Influence in one direction or another there must have been.

But, it may be objected, is there any need to postulate lateral influence in either direction? Is not the common Semitic origin of the two nations a sufficient explanation of the existence of matter common to both? The answer must be that it is not. Even Mr. Cook, who attaches the greatest value to the common origin theory, has to supplement it by assigning some elements in the Hebrew books to the period of Exilic contact with the Babylonians. If Genesis were the only book under comparison, the suggested explanation might be regarded as sufficient; but when the code in Exodus comes to be compared, it becomes quite impossible to believe that its manifold and intimate verbal and other coincidences with Hammurabi are due only, or even mainly, to a common source in the far-off past. Streams separated during a long course since their origin would surely show a wider divergence than is seen in Exodus and Hammurabi.

In which direction, then, did the influence proceed? Plainly, either the Hebrews borrowed from the Babylonians,

or the Babylonians from the Hebrews. The latter suggestion is not so improbable as some would deem it. The theory which has been accepted so long that it is now known as the Traditional theory, is that in the historical development of religion the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament have always been central. From them, as from a central sun, has radiated all the light that has been found in nations other than the Hebrew. If legends, coincident with the narratives of Genesis, have been found so far afield as New Zealand or the South Seas, their existence there has been explained as showing how universally pervasive has been the light from the Scriptures. And if these legends have been found to exist centuries before the earliest date assigned for the writing of the Pentateuch, then they have been regarded as a sort of divine pre-adumbration of the sacred writings, a primitive revelation of God to the earliest progenitors of the race of men. It is a devout and respectable theory, and one by no means to be derided. Indeed, it may yet happen that the latter half of it, the pre-adumbration hypothesis, may in the end come to be regarded as not very wide of the mark. At all events, we are not yet so well established in the newer theories as to be in a position to disdain the older. A revelation from God is no doubt the central source of all religious knowledge from the beginning. But to hold that the revelation in the Old Testament Scriptures was from the earliest beginning that central source of revelation, is to hold a theory which demands a more robust and unquestioning faith than is required by any of the newer theories. Our fathers, who maintained this view in days when knowledge was not yet increased as it is in our times, would themselves have been ready to modify, if not to relinquish, it if they had lived till now. They did not know, they could not know, how inadequate and impossible it was. Streams do not flow uphill, and the Hebrew Scriptures do not account for the existence of parallel documents centuries before these Scriptures were, on any hypothesis, written.

It was therefore the Babylonian who influenced the Hebrew, and not the Hebrew the Babylonian. A further

question remains which s not so easily answered. In what way and at what period did the contact between the two races occur? How and when did Babylonian legend and law and religion come into Hebrew history? There are evidently four possible points of contact. There is, first, the fact that Abraham, the progenitor of the Hebrews, was himself a Babylonian, and must undeniably have brought into the Hebrew race some traditions of his Eastern ancestry; this we may call the Primitive source. There is, second, the fact that Moses must have come into contact with Babylonian lore in his early days in Egypt, where it was well known; and, whether Moses did or did not write the Pentateuch, he at all events counts for much in the making of the Hebrew people; this may conveniently be referred to as the Mosaic source. In the third place is the fact that when the tribes of Israel came into possession of Palestine, they came into contact there with native tribes who were and had long been under the rule and influence of Babylon; this may be cited as the Palestinian source. And, fourthly, there is the period of the Exile, when most certainly and most sorrowfully Hebrew life and thought were once again closely in contact with Babylon; this is the Exilic source. No tenable theory of the origin and development of Hebrew ideas can afford to ignore any one of these four points of contact with Babylon. The question of the date and authorship of the Pentateuch can no longer be studied with exclusive reference to the internal and philological evidence which the books themselves present. Henceforth the external and historical conditions must have full consideration, and due weight must be allowed to all Babylonian and Assyrian documents recently brought to light or yet to be discovered. If the Pentateuch was written wholly by Moses, then, of course, it may and will contain some primitive elements which passed over with Abraham; but the absence of later additions and interpolations arising out of subsequent intercourse with Palestinian tribes and out of the Exile will have to be explained. On the other hand, if the Pentateuch was compiled in Exilic or post-Exilic times, it is quite possible, and

indeed almost inevitable, that it will be found to contain matter dating from or arising out of the three previous occasions of contact with Babylon, the Palestinian, the Mosaic, and the Primitive. Which of these four sources, or what combination of them, has given rise to the Babylonian elements in the Pentateuch? That is the problem which is now being studied.

At present the solutions are almost as numerous and as varied as the investigators. Sayce has always maintained the Mosaic authorship of the books, and he maintains it, since 1901, more enthusiastically than ever. Professor Johnston, of Johns Hopkins University, contends for the Palestinian as the essential point of contact. Johns pleads for both the Palestinian and the Exilic sources, and would have them recognized as primary. Mr. Cook finds that Israel was little influenced by Babylon in any other way than by their common Semitic origin, and he also holds that the Pentateuch was compiled in times not earlier than the Exile. These four views are capable of endless minor modifications, but they are broadly typical nevertheless; and all but the first of them exclude the Mosaic authorship.

To which of these four views, or to what combination of them, does the evidence at present available tend? In considering this question it is necessary to remember that the evidence is not yet to be regarded as complete, and therefore no conclusion at which we may now arrive will be final. All that we can expect in the present state of knowledge will be but a contribution towards a final decision, for which we must be content to wait with an open mind.

In regard to the Primitive connexion of the Hebrew race with the Babylonian there is now very little discussion. All are agreed that the stories of Creation, the Fall, the tower of Babel, and the Flood are based upon traditions which the Israelites inherited in common with other branches of the great Semitic family which comprised both them and the Babylonians. The Bible story of the career of the Israelites is but an episode in the history of the Northern Semitic communities. These communities were, besides the

Israelites, the Babylonians and Assyrians, the Aramæans and the Canaanites. The common origin of these communities is of the utmost significance throughout Old Testament history. It is not only that Abraham, the progenitor of the Hebrews, was of Babylon, but it is also to be steadily borne in mind that the Canaanitish tribes whom the Israelites encountered in Palestine were their own kinsmen. Even if we were to admit the extremely precarious hypothesis that Abraham was a mythical and not a real character, it would make no difference to our present contention. Mythical or actual, he was at all events Babylonian. The history of these Northern Semites is one great series of events co-operating towards the making and discipline of Israel. It may be regarded as certain that when more has been discovered than is at present known about the ritual of the Babylonian temples, this will be found to be an increasingly important factor in the consideration of the Hebrew religious codes; even as already the Babylonian legal codes are modifying our conceptions of the legal codes of the Hebrews. As to this Primitive source of Old Testament lore there is little, if any, difference of opinion among scholars. It is a piece of actual and recognized history, and must be allowed as much weight as it can carry.

It is when we come to the Mosaic period that differences of opinion become acute. The burning question at present is whether the contact of Moses with Babylonian learning in Egypt, coupled with the inherited influence from the Primitive source, is sufficient support for the belief that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. Is it necessary, or is it not necessary, to postulate later Palestinian and Exilic influence in order to account satisfactorily for what we actually find in these books of the Pentateuch? That question seems to be no nearer settlement now than it was when Kuenen and Wellhausen first submitted it to a perplexed and astonished world more than twenty years ago. At the beginning of 1902, scholars had come to acquiesce in the postulate of a much later date than the time of Moses for the compilation and, indeed, the authorship of these books. Since 1902,

however, that is to say, since the discovery of the code of Hammurabi, the settlement of the question has again become as remote as it was when first propounded. Sayce, it is true, never had any doubt about the Mosaic authorship. He never at any time regarded the question as an open one. Now, of course, he is more radiantly sure than ever that Moses not only possibly could, but actually did, write the Pentateuch. Without hastily agreeing with him, it must certainly be admitted that the Mosaic authorship is the less unlikely now that we know that a code of laws like those in Exodus was actually in existence in his day and long before. It may be still that he did not write the books, but it is no longer quite easy to hold that he could not.

The Palestinian contribution of Babylonian influence to Hebrew life does not seem to be of the foremost importance in the judgement of the scholars. There are certainly traces of it in the Old Testament. It is probable that the Creation story had been known in Israel long before the Exile, and may have been communicated to them in Palestine. For the rest, both Professor Sayce and Mr. Cook contend that Babylonian influence, both in the Palestinian period and in the Exile, has been exaggerated. Mr. Cook, indeed, maintains that early Israelitish law shows no sign of Babylonian terminology. That is an extreme position to take. Yet even Mr. Johns holds that we need not trouble ourselves overmuch with the question of Palestinian influence. That influence was, he says, at most indirect.

Very much the same may be said about the Exilic period. It is a good thing to learn from an enemy, but not an easy thing. Both in the Palestinian period and in the Exile, the Babylonians were the enemies of Israel. In neither case would it be natural to suppose that Israel would readily adopt Babylonian usages of law or religion in those periods. The legend of Rahab and the Dragon, referred to in Isa. li. 9, may very likely have been communicated to the Hebrews during the Exile. But the memory of Abraham and Ur must have been a much more cherished possession of the captives than anything they heard for the first time in exile.

Nevertheless Mr. Cook allows more weight to the Babylonian influence in the Exile than in any other period. The Exilic age, he says, cannot have failed to make the Jews thoroughly acquainted with the working of the Babylonian code, and it is from this period that indications of it become ever more unmistakable. He even goes so far as to say that Gen. xiv., the one point at which Genesis discovers any knowledge of Babylonian historical events, was a fictitious product of the Exilic age. That view was not uncommon before 1902; since that year it has become less common. Yet the fact that Mr. Cook holds it still is notable; for Mr. Cook is one of the first authorities on the Hammurabi code and its influence in Hebrew history.

Thus we find Professor Sayce and Mr. Cook standing at two opposite positions. Both have the Hammurabi code in view. One, Dr. Sayce, is more convinced than ever that Moses knew all about the Hammurabi code and did but re-edit it for the Hebrews; he maintains that the legislation in the Pentateuch could only have arisen in the nomad stage of the people's history; and he commits himself to the manifestly unprovable statement that no writer could have imagined or invented, or would even have learned, the Genesis patriarchal laws in Palestine. The other, Mr. Cook, holds that even up to the time of the Exile there had been but little direct influence of Babylon in Hebrew life; that tradition was common to both but quite separately developed; and that the Pentateuch was not only of late but also of quite or almost independent origin. And Mr. Johns too believes that there was no borrowing, at any rate till post-Exilic times, and that the likenesses are due to racial affinity and common Semitic life.

Anything like a definite conclusion from such incompatible premisses is not possible. The most that can at present be done is the observation of a general tendency in current criticism towards a conclusion more or less indefinite. It is clear, however, that the old view—what may be called the Hebraeocentric view—of the development of religion must, on any showing, be given up, if, indeed, it ever was

seriously held. It does not, of course, follow that this or that modern restatement of sacred history must in consequence be adopted. During twenty years the rearrangement of the Old Testament documents, and the consequent restatement of Hebrew history, which makes the law to be of later date than the prophets, and maintains that the records of early history were not written till a late date, was growing in general acceptance. No better testimony to the candour of the search for truth could be adduced than the fact that men have been willing to give up an old and apparently natural arrangement and understanding of the history for one that is not only novel but also immeasurably more difficult to conceive and to teach. To teach that early Hebrew history was not only written at a late date, but was also written from the point of view of an early historian by the artificial project of the writer's thought and ideas backward into earlier times, and the studious adoption by him of a point of view which was not his own, is to make the impartation of Scripture history inconceivably difficult for modern and Western teachers and learners. Yet even devoutly conservative readers of the Bible have shown themselves to be willing to undertake this burden if it should be found to be necessary. Whether it will or will not be ultimately found necessary is just the question that remains to be answered. It is undeniable that the critical restatement of history which we have now been contemplating has been based almost exclusively upon internal evidence of the documents themselves. The argument has been to a very large extent philological and even subjective. Now, however, archaeology is providing external evidence, and the argument becomes historical rather than philological and literary. It is not too much to say that, since 1902, archaeology has been slowly wresting the ground away from such criticism as is merely literary. If the Babylonian religious code, when it comes to be as well known as the Babylonian civil code, should be found to coincide in the same way as the civil code coincides with the Hebrew books, then the position of the higher criticism will become very precarious. It will be

wellnigh impossible to maintain that the Hebrew books could not have been written in the time of Moses, if it be discovered that religious as well as civil codes of a similar character were actually in existence long before that time. In the case we are anticipating as possible there would still be difficulties of interpretation. Chief among those difficulties would be the apparent ignoring of the Pentateuch during the early monarchy in Israel. But the minimum of difficulty would be with the archaeological restatement, and the maximum with the literary. Our Bibles would become once more consecutive history. The position of the Pentateuch would not be that of a document originating in monarchical or Exilic times, with earlier documents embedded in its structure. On the contrary, the Pentateuch would resume its old position, and would be regarded as Mosaic and Primitive in its origin, and as having later documents inserted and added in succeeding generations. This would be the old position, but it would be enriched with a new atmosphere and relationship. The evolution of a divine revelation and law would no longer be held to have originated with Moses, nor even to have had its starting-point in Abraham. We shall come to see that just as the Christian dispensation had its hidden roots embedded deep in the soil of Old Testament history, so the Old Testament dispensation itself was an outgrowth of a still earlier dispensation, if we may so describe it, in the history of Babylon. Surely it is a remarkable and most significant fact that notwithstanding the wondrous early history of the Babylonians, they developed no richer and diviner stage of growth; in a word, they did not lead up to the Christ except through the subsequent history of the Jews. The stream of divine revelation began to be permanently diverted from Babylonian into Hebrew history in the person of Abraham. Thenceforth Babylon counts for little in the history of religious evolution, but the Jews are more and more.

One question more. Is it legitimate to speak of a divine revelation to the Babylonians? Is it permissible to ascribe to them a special divine influence over and above the general

guidance of God in all nations? For answer to that let us look steadily at the facts of the case. Here, in early Babylonian documents, we have certainly a civil code, and probably a religious organization, much more closely parallel with the Old Testament than the Old Testament is parallel with the New. We do not deny inspiration to the Old Testament, notwithstanding that it is unequal to the New. Still less can we deny a measure of divine influence to the Babylonian preparation for the Old Testament. The extent of the Old Testament canon, the question as to which books were to be included in it and which excluded, was not decided by direct intervention of the Holy Ghost; it was decided by the devout intuition of the Church itself in early times. What is to hinder the same devout intuition from having effect again in our own day? The Babylonian documents were never rejected in the formation of the canon of Holy Scripture; they were simply not known when the canon was being determined. On what sound principle can we recognize the breath of God in Hebrew literature, and refuse to recognize it in the obviously preparatory documents of Babylon? 'Is God the God of the Jews only, and not of the Gentiles?' We shall never appreciate the significance of history unless we are prepared to recognize in it a divine preparation for the kingdom of Heaven. What would not St. Paul have given for a sight of the code of Hammurabi? To recognize a divine element in Babylonian documents is not to dilute the doctrine of inspiration, but to enlarge its sphere. Surely, if God 'left not Himself without witness' among the pagans of Lycaonia, it is impossible to imagine that the Babylonians were bereft of His special presence and guidance, and conceived their splendid ideals quite apart from His inspiration. The preparation for Christ did not begin with Moses, nor was it delayed till Abraham. That is the one thing of which we are already sure and for which we give abundant thanks to 'the God of the spirits of all flesh.'

HENRY T. HOOPER.

SIR M. E. GRANT DUFF'S REMINISCENCES.

Notes from a Diary. By the Right Hon. Sir Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, G.C.S.I., F.R.S. Fourteen Vols. 1897–1905. (John Murray.)

DE QUINCEY'S division of literature into the literature of knowledge and the literature of power has always appeared to us, as indeed at times it glimmeringly appeared to De Quincey himself, to be singularly defective. There is such a thing as the literature of entertainment, for instance, whose function is neither to 'teach' nor to 'move,' but simply to please. And of all the forms which this lighter kind of literature has taken in recent years there is none perhaps which affords so great a variety of interest and amusement as the literature of personal reminiscence. From this point of view, the fourteen volumes of *Notes from a Diary* by Sir M. E. Grant Duff easily take their place as the most variously delightsome of the *memorabilia* of the Victorian age. They cover the half-century from the opening of the first Exhibition in 1851 to the accession of King Edward VII, and are made up of jottings grave and gay, mingled with unconscious, or, at all events, with 'unpremeditated art.' In most of the volumes, the writer is careful to remind us that he has studiously avoided in them the chief interests of his life, politics and administration, and limited himself to the lighter and the brighter side of his innumerable recollections. Outside his duties as Member of Parliament, as Under-Secretary for India and for the Colonies, and as Governor of Madras, he has found abundant diversion in travelling, visiting, entertaining, and in the pursuit of his botanical, archaeological, and literary hobbies. As Sainte-Beuve says of La Bruyère, he has occupied a front seat at the spectacle

of the life of his time, and in these vastly entertaining volumes he has set down the pleasant things that he has heard and seen. In accordance with the maxim of Renan which he adopts as a motto, he has allowed the disagreeable things to sink into oblivion. His own opinions on men and affairs have, for the most part, been consigned to the weightier books and pamphlets that he has given to the world. In these lighter volumes he has gathered together the literary *bric-à-brac* of a lifetime—stories, *bons mots*, bits from books, curious facts and incidents, riddles, malaprops, conundrums,—the 'unconsidered trifles' he has picked up on his way. Like Archbishop Williams, of whom he tells us, 'he read the best, heard the best, conferred with the best; excribed, committed to memory, disputed; and had some work continually on the loom.' And now this latest section of his work stands alongside those of Pepys, and Evelyn, and Burton, and Boswell, 'like a lucky-tub into which you never dip without bringing up a prize.'

A more delightful work to dip into could hardly be conceived. In proof, and as a foretaste of what is to follow, suppose we take a couple of paragraphs almost at random :—'Colonel St. Leger, who dined here to-day, told me that his mother-in-law once bought a most charming lap-dog on the Pont Neuf. When she took it home, the little creature, to her extreme horror, proceeded to run up the curtains. It was a large rat carefully dressed up. I had heard a similar story of a lady in Dresden, but was glad to hear that this case had actually occurred within the narrator's knowledge. So I was the other day to find that the famous story of the New Zealand chief, who being informed that he could not be received as a Christian while he had two wives, got out of the difficulty by eating one of them, was no fiction. Bishop Selwyn told Sir George Bowen that it was he to whom the promising convert applied, stating what he had done.'—'July 29, 1876. Riding Wild Hyacinth in Rotten Row, I joined Lowe, who was riding the rather vicious white horse which he calls the Constitutional Opposition, and in intimate conversation with another gentleman. We rode

together for some time, talking of all sorts of things. At length the third rode away, and Lowe, turning to me, said: "Have you the least idea who that is? It is some peer or other, but I can't imagine who." "Are you serious?" I replied. "Never more serious in my life—who is it?" "Well, he was your colleague for more than five years—it is Lord Spencer." So much for the disadvantages of being more than half blind. We went on talking, and he told me that his father had been one day on a river bank with Paley, when his mind was occupied with the composition of the *Horae Paulinae*. The Archdeacon was struggling with a fine fish, which his friend helped him to land. In his delight he patted his fat sides, saying: "Whether in the body or out of the body, I know not: God knoweth."'

It is not enough for our purpose, however, merely to dip into the volumes: we desire to illustrate in a more methodical manner the wealth of entertainment to be found in them. At the risk, therefore, of turning what is like a garden, full of living plants and flowers, into what we fear may resemble an herbarium, we shall select, and classify so far as that is possible, some specimens from each variety of its attractions and delights. The author has not indulged in the perilous practice of recording conversations, partly from that instinctive taste which, as Lowell says, is 'the conscience of polite society,' but chiefly because 'very few even of the most agreeable are worth recording as a whole.' An exception is made in the case of a conversation with Jenny Lind, whom Sir Mountstuart, on one occasion, took down to dinner. 'Whom do you consider,' I said, 'the first of all musicians?' 'Do you mean of our time or of all time? 'Of all time.' 'Unquestionably Bach. His B Minor Mass is the greatest of all musical compositions.' 'A German singing-master, whom I used to know,' I remarked, 'was in the habit of saying, "Bach ist kein Bach. Er ist ein Meer."' [Bach is not a brook: he is a sea.] She assented. 'Was he a Catholic,' I asked, 'or a Protestant?' 'Oh! a Protestant,' was the characteristic answer. 'No Catholic could have been so deep.' 'And whom do you put next to him?'

'Mozart, as great on the stage as Bach in religious music.' 'Well, and in our own times, whom do you put first?' 'I think Schumann.' 'He is dead, is he not?' 'Yes, he died in a madhouse; music is a terrible strain upon the mind and the nerves.' 'You think he was greater than Mendelssohn?' 'Yes, Mendelssohn was a great intelligence, but he had not so much heart, and he had not the—what do you call it—"*Funke*" in German.'

Not much amusement is to be got out of an Indian governorship, and the two volumes devoted by our diarist to his experiences in Madras are not the most exhilarating of the series. Still, as he observes, 'one who likes to be diverted need not be absolutely famished.' One day, for instance, he found on his table a petition from some market-people at Trichinopoly who were dissatisfied over some small matter, addressed to 'The Almighty God, Care of The Right Honourable Mountstuart E. Grant Duff, Governor of Madras.' In another place he speaks of a letter from Miss Sorabji, who has just seen an inscription over a baker's shop in Poona: 'Best English Loafer to His Excellency.' Happily, also, he had access, occasionally, to examination papers, those rich repositories of unconscious and sometimes of conscious humour. In answer to the question, 'Who was Cardinal Wolsey?' one Hindu student replied, that he was 'an editor of a paper named the *North Briton*'; another, that he was 'Bishop of York, but died in disentry in a church on his way to be blockheaded'; and yet another, that he 'was said to be the spiritual guide of the Methodists.' About the same time, the English mail arrives—the great event in his Indian experiences—bringing a letter from Sir Frederick Pollock, who 'mentions that a young man at Oxford replied to the question, "What is a final cause?" "It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back."' To which may be added a London story of an earlier time:—'April 23, 1874. George Boyle, who is in town examining the candidates for commissions, told me that wishing to give a youth who seemed likely to be plucked a last chance, he said to him, "Come now, can you tell me

anything about Alexander the Great?" "Yes, sir," he replied; "he was educated at Aristotle."'

The more serious of our readers, who like not merely to be diverted, but to find instruction mingled with amusement in their lighter reading, need not avoid these lively reminiscences on that account; for this diverting Diary is besprinkled with most interesting facts. They might learn from it, e.g., that all our greyhounds and deerhounds are descended from dogs which were brought into Europe by the Crusaders; that Blucher did not say that 'London would be an admirable place to plunder,' but, 'looking from the top of St. Paul's, or rather I believe of the Monument, on the mean houses south of the river, he exclaimed, "Was für Plunder!" What rubbish!'; that the brain of an adult hippopotamus dissected at the Zoo weighed 'only about a pound and a half, and was not much larger than a man's clenched fist'; &c. &c. Some would be interested in the fact that 'fifty million persons perished in the Taeping Rebellion'; others in the statement that 'Lord Lawrence told Henry Cowper that he once lost the Koh-i-noor. When search was made, it was found in an old cigar-box beside his bed, where it had lain for some weeks.' Lady readers would treasure up the information that 'Murray told us that there was an English poet for whom no fount of type sufficed, a necessary preliminary to reprinting his works being largely to reinforce the "l's" and "v's." This was Tennyson, and the cause was the constant recurrence of the word "love" in his writings.' The more classical among them might like to add to their cat-lore the fact, given on the authority of Professor Steenstrup, of Copenhagen, that the cat of the Greeks and Romans 'was certainly no cat, but a weasel. . . . Our common cat appears first in the Middle Ages, but nothing is known of its origin. The Egyptian cat was a true cat, allied to our wild cat. An eminent English man of science once told me that the Persian cat was descended from our wild cat, *Felis catus*, but Steenstrup denies this, saying that its descent is still a mystery.' Nor need even the ladies be too greatly disconcerted if, in the midst of their researches for

these curious facts, they stumble on what 'Mrs. Beaumont quoted' as 'an amusing specimen of feline amenity. Two young ladies were discussing the proper colours of the devil, one maintaining that they were black and yellow, the other something else. At length one of them closed the conversation by the remark, "I think you will *find* that I am right, dear!"'

Nothing odd or humorous comes amiss to our 'minute philosopher' intent upon the entertainment of his friends. Slips of the tongue, slips of the pen, conundrums, epitaphs, and puns, abound. 'Thirty miles as the cock crows,' replied a Hindu when asked how far it was to such a place. 'Lubbock tells me of a stormy meeting in the West Indies, which was described by a newspaper as having been adjourned "*sine deo*"!' 'Why is a Kaffir woman like a prophet?' 'Because she has little on her in her own country.' 'What is the sweetest thing in bonnets?' This was asked of a young girl: the answer, therefore, was comparatively innocuous—'Your face.' 'Why do most marriages take place in winter?' 'Because at that season women want muffs, and men comforters.' The best pun, perhaps, is that attributed to Mr. John Murray, grandfather of the present head of the house. 'A friend of his, who was a teetotaler, had inherited an immense cellar of wine. He thought it wrong to drink it, wrong to sell it, absurd to throw it away, and asked Murray what he ought to do. "You cannot do better," was the reply, "than to transfer your wine cellar to your bookseller."' Two of the epitaphs are new to us—one of the doggerel rhyming kind:

> Readers, approach, but not with your hats on,
> For under this stone lies interred Bailie Watson.

The other is by 'a husband on a wife to whom he was not as much attached as he desired the world to believe: "Tears cannot restore her; therefore I weep."' To which may be added a couple of malaprops and a curious mistake by one of the Maharajahs of Travancore. 'Trevelyan told the story of a clergyman who, complaining to his congregation

of their coldness, admitted that there was just a spark of life among them, and added: "O Lord, water that spark!"' 'Sir Thomas Wade made me laugh by the reply made to him when he was a young officer in China by a Scotch private who had fired, when on outpost duty, at an imaginary enemy, and was about to fire again: "I would have you to consider, sir, that we are here in a very *precautious* situation."' The mistake of the Maharajah was a very amusing one. He was very fond of jujubes, and 'seeing it announced that a large consignment of *jupons* had arrived at Madras, he jumped to the conclusion that they belonged to the same category, and became the owner of I know not how many dozen steel crinolines.'

But for the space required by our examples of the 'good things' in the shape of sayings and stories, of which Sir Mountstuart has made a speciality, it would be easy, from his four thousand pages, to gather a whole herd of 'bulls' into our own. A few of the tamer ones must suffice. 'Speaking at Dublin Castle of the expenditure now going on in the distressed districts, Father Healy observed characteristically: "If it hadn't been for this famine, we should have been starved intoirely."' 'Mr. Eliot mentioned that he had heard an orator in a Balliol Debating Club, when denouncing pessimism, speak of those who think of man as "a vain shadow which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven." He had been present, too, when an Irishman at the Union alluded to "those currents of opinion which grease the wheels of time."' 'I mentioned to Thorold Rogers an absurd sentence quoted in the *Nineteenth Century* from the speech of some German socialist: "The chariots of revolution roll on, gnashing their teeth as they go." "I have heard as good as that from a bishop," said he. "I once heard —— say in a sermon: 'Many persons have one eye on heaven, while with the other they are listening to the gossip of earth.'"'

From so excellent a family man, moving about for two or three generations among the families of his friends, we are not surprised to receive considerable additions to our

golden treasury of children's sayings. In making our selection, *Place aux filles!* Judged by the samples of their wit and wisdom here preserved, boys did not shine when Queen Victoria reigned. The little girls were bright and thoughtful then as now. 'Mother.—"Are you a good little girl to-day?" "No, mamma, not weddy dood, not weddy bad—just a comferable little girl."' 'A lady who dined with us told me that her youngest daughter, who professes to be neither clever nor pretty, says: "I am, you know, only the Amen of the family."' At the funeral of the Duke of Wellington, 'as the riderless horse with the boots slung across it was being led down St. James's Street, Mr. Brookfield's little daughter said, "Mamma, when we die, shall we also be turned into boots?"' 'Miss Soffiers Cocks told me a story of a little girl whose mother had said to her, "I think you ought to leave off something in Lent: what shall it be? Do you think you could leave off sugar?" "No," replied the child thoughtfully, "I don't think I could leave off sugar: how would soap do?"'

If a proverb may be said to embody the wisdom of many and the wit of one, Sir Mountstuart's *bons mots* may be said to represent the wit of many and the wisdom of one. His wisdom is shown in selection. He has not fallen into the error of most collectors of good things, who, according to Chamfort, 'resemble those who eat cherries or oysters, who begin by choosing the best, and end by eating them all.' And he has been as generous as he was wise in preserving so many of the best for future use. What could be better, e.g., than the remark of Lady Marion Alford, who, in speaking of Bismarck and his biographer, said, 'A good man needs no Busch'; unless it be the saying of Sir Frederick Pollock, who, on the appearance of *Truth*, in 1877, remarked that the new paper was 'another but not a better *World*'; or the 'wholly unjust but amusing remark' of Thompson, the Master of Trinity, that '—— devoted all the time he could spare from the adornment of his person to the systematic neglect of his duties'; or the observation of the King of Sweden on the economic loyalty of his people: 'They

want,' said he, 'to have a sovereign, but a sovereign for a sixpence'? Equally good is the saying of the late Mrs. Bishop, who, during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, seeing the placid and portly Duchess of Westminster at the French Embassy, sitting between Schouvaloff and Musurus Pacha, remarked that 'she looked like a statue of Peace and Plenty between the hostile armies.'

Besides the *bons mots* proper, there are scattered over the volumes many miscellaneous sayings wise and witty, odd and humorous, pungent and severe. In sampling such a medley, one's chief difficulty is the rather pleasant one of selection and arrangement. There is also a minor difficulty not unattended with danger. Many of the sayings are in the form of jokes, and, unhappily, every one is not always in the mood for seeing a joke. Sir Francis Doyle, e.g., was dining at the Duke of Devonshire's in 1879, when the conversation turned on the oddity of American names. '"Fancy such a name as Birdseye," remarked some one at table. "Birdseye," I said, "is surely as good as Cavendish any day." Not a creature smiled. They all thought I meant to insult them.' Still, in writing, as in reading, dining, and indeed doing anything, or even nothing, one is obliged to take some risk in this imperfect world; we, therefore, venture to set down the sayings we have chosen, jokes and all. Once more, *Place aux dames!* 'Lady Malmesbury told me that somebody once asked her mother the colour of the dress she was wearing. "It is called *flamme de Vésuve*," she replied.' To which the obvious but Hibernian answer was: 'You make a very pretty crater.' To Lady Alwyne Compton we owe the saying that she quotes about a certain lady: 'Flattery is her battery': Lady Russell declared that 'There is no aristocracy so intolerant as the aristocracy of health'; and a Miss Stephens, speaking in a letter of a common friend, says finely: 'He may be narrow, but he always reminds me of the monk who, when some one made that remark to him, said: "Yes, I have but one window; still, that looks towards heaven."' Many of the sayings are anonymous. Amongst the best of

these is the one about the man who said of another that 'he was not a very good sort of man, but a very good man of a very bad sort'; and several of those beginning with the formula, 'Who was it said?' or introduced with a dash. 'Who was it said that the proper place at which to establish a university for women was Bletchley? Because it is equidistant from Oxford and Cambridge, and none of the fast mails stop there.' 'June 18, 1889. In the afternoon to see ——. I asked her how she would express in a single sentence the relations between man and woman as they have been from the beginning, and as they will be to the end. "Woman," she replied, "was made after man, and has been after him ever since."' A few with names may be appended as a solace to those readers who are always tantalised by anonymity. A very deaf M.P. was doing his best to catch with his ear-trumpet the words of an extremely dull speech. 'Just look at that foolish man,' said Robert Lowe, 'throwing away his natural advantages.' 'Lubbock's name being mentioned in connection with the County Council, Harrison told me that when it was proposed to throw some new work upon him, Acton had said, "No, no; he has quite enough to do with his ants and other relations."' 'Bowen said that he once had a dog whose favourite amusement was chasing his own tail, which he would do for ten minutes together. One day when he was going through this performance Jowett said to his master: "What is your dog about?" "Studying metaphysics," was the reply.' '1865. Venables' unorthodox translation of *quod semper, quod ubique, et ab omnibus*: "That which in the year 325, in the insignificant little town of Nicaea, was carried by the vote of a single bishop."'

As a connoisseur in anecdote, Sir Mountstuart excels himself even as a collector of conundrums and *bons mots*. The Diary swarms with stories new and old, and almost uniformly excellent. Selection now becomes a burden, an *embarras de choix*. Turning first to those with a biblical flavour, or depending for their point on some biblical reference or allusion, we note the care displayed in preserv-

ing only those which are unexceptionable. At all events, those most averse to stories of this kind need not resolve to skip the few examples we shall give. Bishop Walsham How once heard a preacher say, 'Do not, my friends, let the world rob us of that which it can neither give nor take away.' 'Bishop Magee told us that a lady in Gloucestershire was reading the Old Testament to an old woman who lived at the Lodge. The passage she chanced on was that which speaks of Solomon's seven hundred wives. Presently the old woman said: "Had Solomon really seven hundred wives?" "Oh yes, Mary; it is so stated in the Bible." "Lor, mum," rejoined the other, "what privileges them early Christians had!"' During the Cretan troubles, Lord Salisbury, dining at 'The Club' so often mentioned in the Diary, quoted from a lady the apposite remark, 'The Cretans may be evil beasts, but the Powers are certainly slow-bellies.' 'Henry Smith told us that Ross, one of the Fellows of Wadham, had affected to be much annoyed because the old Warden had given a sermon he had preached to some of the other Fellows, but not to him. He complained to the Warden in the words of the brother of the Prodigal Son: "Lo, these many years do I serve thee, neither transgressed I at any time thy commandment, yet thou never gavest *me* a sermon that I might make merry with my friends."'

Nor need the most sensitive shrink from the stories told at the expense of the clergy. With evident gusto, but with pleasing irony, we are told of a notorious Ritualist who, 'when he was only ten years old, seeing his sister come down with a new dress on, cried bitterly because he could not be a girl and wear a new dress too.' With not less zest is the story told of Father Gallwey, who 'once found himself surrounded by a number of ladies struggling for priority round his confessional; he put out his head and said: "I can't have this disturbance. Let all those who have come to confess mortal sins come forward—I will take them first."' Everybody has heard by this time the story of the duchess and the canons. 'The late Duchess

of Teck found herself one day sitting between Canon Teignmouth Shore and another dignitary of the same rank. "Your Royal Highness," said the former, "must find yourself in a rather alarming position—

> Canon to right of you,
> Canon to left of you,
> Volleys and thunders."

"Well," was the reply, "this is the very first time I have been connected with the Light Brigade."' But not every one has heard of the open-air preacher who, when denouncing Sabbath-breaking on Malvern Hill, inquired, 'At the great day of judgment, when heaven and earth shall melt in devouring fire, what will become of the donkey-boys of Malvern?' And, though somewhat old, the story of Dean Goulburn and the Jew, as told by Lord Coleridge, will, to most, be new. It must be told in full. 'Dr. Goulburn, when he was asked to baptize a Jew who wished very much to marry a High Church girl, was met by the objection of the difference in their faith. The Jew gradually accepted all Christian doctrines, but could not swallow the personality of the devil. In this the Dean saw a difficulty. "For," said he, "it seems to me that when I ask you whether you renounce the devil and all his works, you may not find it easy to say 'Yes,' if you don't believe there is any devil." The Jew saw the force of the observation, and thought that he might have to give up his young lady, whereupon Goulburn, who is a good-natured man, proposed to consult Dr. Tait, the then Bishop of London. He did so, and the Bishop, after listening to the whole story, said: "Where do you find the Christian faith summarized?" "I suppose," replied his visitor, "in the three Creeds." "Do you see anything in them about the personality of the devil?" "No, now you mention it, I don't." "I think, then, if I were you, I would baptize him." Goulburn took his leave, glad to be relieved of responsibility, but as he was going out of the room his diocesan called after him: "I say, Goulburn, Goulburn!" Goulburn turned back. "I

earnestly hope, you know, that he *will* come to believe in a personal devil."'

The other professions (excepting the medical) escape with comparative impunity. References to the army are singularly few, but those that we have noted are as apposite and as true to-day as at the time they were made. Speaking in 1876, our diarist observes that 'It is clear that the service is becoming rapidly divided into two classes—the vigorous young men, on the one hand, and the elders, backed by the idlers, on the other.' Still earlier—in 1868—one of his story-tellers met Childers and Cardwell walking together. 'We are going,' said Cardwell, 'to alter the arrangement of the War Office, and get rid of the Duke of Cambridge.' But, as the *Spectator* recently observed, 'the Duke long survived the man who would have "reformed" him out of his post, and they are still busy "altering the arrangements of the War Office."' The most amusing military story relates to an officer not many years ago who 'was too fond of wine, and who at last attracted the unfavourable notice of the authorities and was put upon his trial. Among the witnesses called for the defence was his soldier servant, who deposed that upon a particular evening he had come in quite sober. On cross-examination the man was asked whether his master had said anything to him after he came in. "Yes," he replied; "he told me to call him early." "To call him early," said the President; "why was that? he had not to go to parade next morning. Did he give any reason?" "Yes," answered the witness, "he said that he was to be Queen of the May."' Both Bench and Bar are gently dealt with, the only stories worth repeating being the one in illustration of 'the law's delay,' in which we are told of a lawyer who was 'engaged in a case by no means yet finished, which had begun in the days of William Rufus'; and the other about an Indian judge 'whose method of deciding cases was beautifully simple. He used, when the time to give his judgement came, to count the flies on the punkah. If the number was even, he gave it for the plaintiff; if odd, for the defendant.' When

the doctors come upon the scene, however, then the anecdotes begin to sting. 'Killing stags in Scotland—change of occupation, you know,' said 'a well-known London doctor, asked what he had been doing in the vacation.' To Mr. Frederick Leveson Gower we owe the story of 'an old woman who, on being asked if she had seen the doctor, replied: "No, but he has promised to send his accomplice."' Here is one to the credit of the Faculty: 'I am not dangerously ill, am I?' said the patient. 'No,' replied the doctor, 'you are not dangerously ill; but you are dangerously old.' And the one about the Scotch Professor of Medicine who was in the habit of making his announcements on a blackboard, and who one day informed his class that he had been appointed physician to the Queen, hackneyed as it is, is too good to be lost. It was not long before one of his students had written underneath, 'God save the Queen!'

With respect to Queen Victoria there are numerous interesting notes, but, as most of these have entered into current literature, we pass them by reluctantly in favour of a less familiar glimpse or two of our now reigning King and Queen. When Queen Alexandra, then Princess of Wales, went to Berlin, 'the old Emperor presented Bismarck to her. . . . In the evening, Lady, then Mrs., Walker said to the Chancellor: "Well, isn't she charming?" "She is," he replied, "not only a very charming, but also a very prudent little lady."' The story told about the King has reference to his student days, and is a splendid illustration of his courage and his faith. It is best given in Sir Mountstuart's own words:—'March 24, 1878. At High Elms, Lyon Playfair, among others, being of the party. Apropos of the Algerian conjurers, who apply hot metal to their bodies without suffering, he explained to us that, if only the metal is sufficiently hot, this can be done with perfect security; and told an amusing story of how, when the Prince of Wales was studying under him in Edinburgh, he had, after taking the precaution to make him wash his hands in ammonia, to get rid of any grease that might be on them, said: "Now,

sir, if you have faith in science, you will plunge your right hand into that cauldron of boiling lead, and ladle it out into the cold water which is standing by." "Are you serious?" asked the pupil. "Perfectly," was the reply. "If you tell me to do it, I will," said the Prince. "I do tell you," rejoined Playfair, and the Prince immediately ladled out the burning liquid with perfect impunity.'

Of the anecdotes relating to English statesmen of the period, perhaps the least threadbare are the following:—At a dinner in connection with the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, Sir Robert Peel, according to Mr. Cardwell, who was present, declared that 'railways would be excellent for use with horses, but that locomotives would be far too dangerous.' Speaking in reply to Disraeli in a speech on free trade, Cobden convulsed the House with a piece of unconscious humour, and stood for some moments unable to conceive what had made the members scream with laughter. In order to explain some point, he had said: 'Now I will give an illustration of what I mean. Here is my honourable friend the member for Durham sitting by me. He is a spinner of long yarns of a low quality.' 'Lady O'Hagan told us that Lord Spencer's last public appearance in Ireland was at some distribution of prizes. The gentleman who made the principal speech on the occasion was full of cordiality, saying to the Lord Lieutenant, "We all hope to see you back again—you and the work of Art that sits by your side." She mentioned also the excellent name which the Irish had given to the pair—the Red Cross Knight and Spenser's Fairy Queen.' Sir Mountstuart relates that Mr. Gladstone had said to him of Mr. John Morley in 1879: 'I know no man with whom I agree so little in opinion, for whom I have so much sympathy.' In 1881 Lord Houghton met Gladstone, who said to him, 'I haven't seen you for ages. I lead the life of a dog'; to which Houghton replied, 'Yes, of a St. Bernard, the saviour of men.' And from the diary for May 20, 1889, we have the most suggestive and pathetic note: 'Dined at Grillon's. Arthur Mills drew my attention to the entry of 13th April, 1885. On that evening

Gladstone dined alone, emphasizing the fact by entering the lines:

> Amongst the faithless, faithful only he.

And:

> The mind is its own place, and in itself
> Can make a heaven of hell—a hell of heaven.'

Of Gladstone's great opponent many striking and amusing anecdotes are told. 'A week or two ago he met Arthur Russell coming out of Lady Derby's house in St. James's Square, and turning with him walked along Pall Mall. Some one looking out of the Athenaeum window saw the couple, and Arthur Russell was afterwards asked whether he had really walked along Pall Mall with the Tory Premier. He mentioned this to Disraeli, who said, "I trust you did not deny me; the cock would have crowed if you had."' In the middle of dinner, during the crisis when war with Russia seemed imminent, a great lady, nicknamed the Queen of the Jingoes, said to Lord Beaconsfield, 'What are you waiting for?' 'I am waiting,' he replied, 'for mutton and potatoes.' 'How do you like this place?' asked Lord Aberdare on meeting Disraeli coming out of the House of Lords for the first time after he had become Lord Beaconsfield. 'Well,' was the reply, 'I feel that I am dead, but in the Elysian fields.' Two other stories are recorded with an evident relish. 'Talked at the Athenaeum with Maine. He told me that some time ago Lord Beaconsfield called in a homœopathic doctor. "Why on earth should the Premier trust himself in the hands of that quack?" asked some one of Sir William Gull. "Similia similibus curantur" was the allopath's reply.' 'Some one—I think Venables—mentioned that after the Berlin Treaty there was a great celebration in a highly Conservative borough. Amongst other attractions was a large transparency in which Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury stood together, with the motto "Peace with Honour" under them. An old woman came up to the sitting member, and said: "If you please, sir, will you tell me which is Peace?" Peace was a notorious murderer much talked about at the time.' Lastly, in this

category, an incident is recorded in which several statesmen take part that is so diverting that it must neither be omitted nor curtailed. 'Lord James of Hereford told us that in early life he had known a highly eccentric clergyman of the name of Baker, some of whose manuscript sermons he had seen. The reverend gentleman had furnished these with marginal notes directing himself how they were to be delivered. Opposite pages in which emotion would have been out of place he wrote, "Steady, Baker," but opposite his peroration, "Go it, Baker." This, James had told to Harcourt. During the Home Rule battles, when those members of the old Liberal party who did, and those who did not, go with Gladstone sat all mixed up together, he was denouncing Harcourt in good set phrase, while the latter, in a stage whisper, kept saying, "Steady, Baker," "Go it, Baker," and Gladstone, utterly mystified, went on asking, "Who is Baker—who is Baker?"'

Our penultimate paragraph had been reserved for a number of miscellaneous anecdotes which could not easily be fitted in elsewhere; but 'Steady, Baker,' is the word as we approach the limits of our space. It would be unpardonable, however, were we to withhold from the persevering reader who has followed us so far the best that we have marked. For instance, 'Mohl told me that in 1848 he had heard Louis Blanc say to the crowd which pressed round him as he was getting into his carriage: "I hope the time will come when we shall all have our carriages." Some one called out: "And who will drive me?"' Then we have an account of a typical lecture by Ruskin. 'The subject was Sandro Botticelli. The lecturer began by a few words about that painter. Presently, however, he said: "Before I can make you understand Sandro Botticelli, you must understand Fra Angelico and the monastic system of the Middle Ages," but ere long he exclaimed, "Yet what is the good of talking to you about Fra Angelico and the monastic system of the Middle Ages? All your sons have latch-keys"; and the rest of the discourse was devoted to that subject.' 'On Hallam coming down to be godfather to

Tennyson's eldest boy, the historian asked, "What is to be the child's name?" "Hallam," answered the poet. "I don't like surnames for Christian names," said the other; "why not call him Alfred?" "What if he were to turn out a fool?" was the reply.'

Renan once told Sir Mountstuart and Sir John Lubbock that a Capuchin had said to a friend of his: 'He has done many evil things, your friend Renan, many evil things, but he has spoken well of St. Francis, and St. Francis will arrange all that.' Speaking of the signs of vitality, Sir Andrew Clark observed that 'as long as the individuality remains there is great hope of life.' He then proceeded to give 'an instance of his having been able to predict that a lady, who had the day before been in imminent danger, would certainly recover, the moment he saw that she had had her hair dressed, and had put a red bow on.' Bishop Stubbs, in looking over some school accounts came across the entry, 'Occasional Monitor.' 'What does that mean?' he asked, and then himself supplied the rather naughty answer: 'I see—the Nonconformist Conscience.' The same distinguished prelate was once starting from Chester, when the station-master said to him: 'How many articles are there, my lord?' 'Thirty-nine,' was the reply. 'I can only find sixteen.' 'Then you are a Dissenter,' said the bishop.

A great deal more might, of course, be written about these entertaining volumes; nor is it difficult, as we have shown, to multiply quotations from them. They are purposely confined, as we have intimated, to the sunnier side of life; but they are not on that account less readable, or less valuable as mirrors of the manners and the humours of the time. Should any be disposed to cavil at the trivialities with which they are bestrewn, it might be well for them to be reminded of the words of Dr. Johnson, who, when Boswell expressed a fear that he had put too many little things into his Journal, replied: 'Sir, there is nothing too little for so little a creature as man. It is by the study of little things that we attain the great art of having as little misery and as much happiness as possible.'

T. A. SEED.

THE STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY AND MITHRAISM.

Textes et Monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra. By FRANZ CUMONT. (Brussels. 1901. H. Lamertin. Large 8vo, 931 pages, with 507 illustrations.)

The Mysteries of Mithra. By FRANZ CUMONT. Translated from the 2nd Revised French Edition by T. J. M'Cormack. (Chicago. 1903. The Open Court Publishing Co. Really a translation of the *Introduction* or main conclusions of Cumont's large work, with 50 good illustrations and a map.)[1]

IF in or about the year 180 some seer of the Court of Marcus Aurelius had been informed by the Delphic oracle that within a century and a half the Empire would definitely adopt to the exclusion of all others a cult foreign in origin, and unconnected with the ancestral worships of Greece and Rome, the seer might have been at some loss to decide which of several claimants would obtain the prize. In one respect the news of the Oracle would cause him no astonishment. Thinking men had long since realized that the old paganism, with its vast pantheons of unrelated deities, its rituals oftentimes coarse, generally obscure and unintelligible through age, had become inadequate to express the new consciousness of unity which throbbed through the civic, intellectual, and religious life of the Empire. Everywhere men realized that religion must be universal, that parochialism in cult or creed was doomed. But the decision among rival creeds which should emerge

[1] An able summary of M. Cumont's large work is given in Dr. Dill's valuable and stimulating *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.* [London: Macmillan. 1904.] But the following pages are the result of an independent study of Cumont.

as the Catholic Church of the Empire would have been for our seer a matter of no small difficulty. In his heart he would deplore that the hopeless if glorious Stoicism of Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus could never appeal save to the disciplined few; that the hope of immortality proclaimed by Seneca and Plutarch was an insufficient foundation for the religion of the multitude; that a religion which could show no authority higher than the speculations of the philosopher would be powerless to subdue the passions of the nations, or hold in the Barbarians, who like a dark cloud already hovered round the northern fringe of the Empire. That patriotism—to translate into modern terms the official worship of Rome and its Caesar—could ever satisfy the deeper cravings of diverse races from Caledonia to Parthia would never dawn upon our seer in his wildest moments The worship was politically useful, especially for servile Asiatics and dependent Celts, but by thinking men was recognised as little more than an imperial symbol. Four claimants would be left for his suffrage: the worship of the Great Mother, of Isis and Serapis, of Mithra, and of Christ.

Without hesitation our seer would have decided that the victory of Christianity was the least likely. For Christianity the great thinkers and statesmen who ruled the world—Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Junius Rusticus, Fronto of Cirta and others—had nothing but contempt. Of the inner life of the Church they knew nothing; rumour had it that it was full of secret obscenity, and centred round the adoration either of an ass or a dead malefactor, as any one might see for himself who would read the recently published *Acts of Pilate*. What little the officials knew of its adherents, generally prisoners at the bar on the charge of *majestas*, would not incline them in its favour. To the Roman governor the Christian confessor would seem a strange compound of knave and fool: to be pitied because of his ecstasies, and strange chiliastic conceptions; to be branded with scorn because of his 'obstinacy'—the word which Marcus Aurelius uses,—his absurd other-world-mindedness,

his indifference to the duties of citizenship, and his bigoted denunciation of all who differed from him. Nor would the rulers be unaware that the Christians, though hated by all because of their exclusiveness, were yet divided among themselves by bitter feuds concerning the difference, as it would appear, of tweedledum and tweedledee. There were in Rome half a dozen different conventicles, each at feud with the other, though all alike the object of hatred and persecution. There were few large towns probably in which there was not some schism or secession, as we see from the grudging testimony of the *Acts of the Martyrs*. 'See how these Christians love one another' was probably either an obscene jest or a bitter sarcasm, which Tertullian turned to nobler purposes. That Christianity could be stamped out, as it deserved, might not for various causes be possible; that it could ever become the religion of the world, would have made Marcus Aurelius even more hopeless of the world, if that were possible, than the deep hopelessness which fills the sublime pages of his *Meditations*. Of the other three claimants, our seer would probably have decided that the prize would lie with Mithraism; his only hesitation would arise from remembering the hold of the worship of Isis upon the women of every country. But with a philosopher's indifference to the feminine, he would decide that Mithra, the worship of men, would triumph. Certainly Mithraism was the greatest rival which Christianity ever had to face, and, as Renan has assured us, but for the triumph of Christianity might have been the creed of Europe to-day. Our object in the following paper will be to note briefly how the two religions stood in comparison to each other in or about the year 180, when the worthless Emperor Commodus was formally initiated as a member of the Mithraic cult.

We shall do well to point out, by way of preface, certain resemblances between Christianity and Mithraism, of great historical importance. Both religions were of Eastern origin; in their roots of immemorial antiquity, though recently developing into new forms. Both religions had entered Europe much about the same time, the advantage

of a few years in the favour of Mithraism. Both religions possessed a strongly developed ecclesiastical organization, and emphasized the value of certain mysteries or sacraments. Both religions also were treated with absolute scorn and indifference by the historians, poets, and philosophers of the Empire. There is nothing in history more remarkable than the silence, broken only by rare outbursts of contempt, amidst which the Church grew into power. No observer, more keen-sighted than his fellows, pointed out the new force in the world destined to overthrow old cults, and the Empire itself. Silence on all religious phenomena was the fashion among the literary men of the second century, to the irreparable loss of history, sacred and secular; nor was the silence confined to Christianity. The strength of Mithraism is attested by thousands of inscriptions; a few mocking references in Lucian, second-hand remarks of Celsus and Porphyry, and two lost works by writers otherwise unknown, Eubulus and Pallas, exhaust the interest of the writers of the Empire in this strange creed. Our knowledge of Mithraism, if dependent on books alone, would be almost nil; but what literature failed to do the archaeologist has made clear and distinct, falling back on inscriptions, bas-reliefs, and ruins, a tithe only of what once existed before the destructions by Barbarians and Christian zealots. Our knowledge of Mithraism—the very word was unknown to an older generation—is one of many modern trophies of the spade.

The worship of Mithra, whose ancient name was never profaned by any translation into Latin or Greek, was one of the oldest cults of the Aryan race, in its origin identical, in the Vedas and Avestas for instance, with the worship of the sun. Adopted by the Persians, Mithra found a place in the Zoroastrian system, occupying a middle place between Ormuzd, who dwelt in eternal light, and Ahriman, whose sphere was darkness. In time Mithra became regarded as the viceroy on earth of the supreme deity enthroned above the stars, whose serene bliss no mortal cares could disturb. As his viceroy, Mithra was 'the Saviour,' the head of the celestial armies in their ceaseless combat with the Spirit

of Darkness, whose 'invincible' might—the adjective is almost inseparable—causes Ahriman himself in the depth of hell to tremble with fear. It is as the 'Saviour,' the conqueror of Ahriman or evil, that we always see Mithra represented in inscriptions from Scotland to Egypt, with his sword buried in the neck of a bull. In the submergence of national barriers which followed the downfall of the Persian and Macedonian Empires, Mithraism began the conquest first of Asia Minor then of Europe, penetrating to Italy in the days of Pompey, and obtaining a firm hold during the reign of Tiberius.

In Europe the growth of Mithraism, almost contemporary with that of Christianity, seems to have run pretty much the same course, reaching its climax in the third century. We find its first zone in the seaports; its first devotees were the aliens and Syrian slaves with which the commercial centres of Europe were crowded. Thus in Ostia, the port of Rome, there were at least four temples of Mithra; and the worship early established itself in the great ports of Pisa, Aquileia, Syracuse, and Palermo. In Rome, 'the caravansary of the universe,' Mithraism reared a temple even in the sacred Capitol itself. But a more interesting evidence of its strength lies in the fact revealed by De Rossi, that the oldest Church of St. Clement, the crypt of the present building, (originally in all probability an early Christian chapel of the aristocratic family which in the year 95 gave Domitilla and her husband the consul, the cousin of Domitian, to the Church, and to which as a freedman Clement of Rome may have belonged), seems at a later date to have lapsed into a Mithraic shrine. The well-known bas-reliefs of Mithra representing his birth from the rock may still be seen by the tourist cut into its walls.[1]

Of the apostles of Mithraism we are totally ignorant. No St. Paul, so far as we know, ever preached the faith before emperors and Areopagus, or journeyed over two con-

[1] See Cumont, *T. and M.* 202; and for the Church of St. Clement, Lightfoot, *Ep. Clem.*, or Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome.*

tinents to proclaim the new gospel. But Mithra possessed one potent missionary agency which Christianity lacked. The stronghold of the new creed lay in the army. Not without good reason was the name of *milites* given to a certain grade of its initiates. In the days of which we write the rank and file of the regular legions of the Roman army were for the most part stationary,—whence, in fact, their name (*stationarii*). They were not liable for service, save in their own native province. But the centurions, who, be it remembered, were always what we should call to-day non-commissioned officers,[1] were always on the move, as were also the foreign auxiliaries, largely of Eastern origin, with whom the cult originated. As they were quartered here and there throughout the world, centurions and auxiliaries erected their temples and devotional tablets, and spread abroad the gospel of their 'invincible Saviour.' From the army the worship was carried to the Court and the educated classes. Throughout the third century Mithra had his chaplains in the palace of Cæsar. Commodus was enrolled among his adepts; Diocletian and Galerius, the great enemies of Christianity, dedicated to Mithra many temples; while Aurelian and Julian the Apostate sought to make Mithraism, or a variation thereof, the official cult. The Court, in fact, found in its doctrines that support for the autocracy, which Christianity in its early and more democratic days always refused to give. But the worship was by no means confined to the army and Court. Mithra possessed a second line of missionaries in the foreign slaves of Eastern origin, the commonest article on the slave markets of Europe, who carried its cult to the obscurest corners of the Empire. An inscription at Nersae, in the heart of the Apennines, recounting how a slave, who had worked his way up into treasurer of the town, in the year 172 restored the temple of Mithra, is only one of many evidences of the activity of these servile missionaries.

The spread of Mithraism in the second century was

[1] This fact seems to us often forgotten in expositions of the New Testament.

extraordinary. Leaving out of account its Eastern home, we find its shrines in almost every part of Europe, especially on the lines of travel, the rivers and great roads, the stations of the army and the ports of the sea. But the reader who studies, even hastily, the excellent map in which Cumont illustrates the diffusion of the cult throughout the Empire, will see at a glance the source of its strength and the secret of its downfall, in spite of its wide diffusion. Leaving out Italy, where Mithraism flourished through the influence of the Court, the new religion was strongest on the frontiers, as indeed we might expect when we remember its fascination for the army. Dacia and Pannonia, for instance, the great outposts of the Empire, are full of his shrines; the spread of Mithraism in Pannonia, especially in the chain of Roman defences along the Danube, was the work of the auxiliaries of two legions, the second and fifteenth, whose recruiting ground was Cappadocia. In one camp no less than three Mithraeums have been discovered, one of which was enlarged by Diocletian to serve as a temple for the civilians. From the Danube the religion was carried to the two Germanies, probably by the eighth legion, in or about the year 70 A.D. Along the Rhine from Basel to Cologne, and especially in the district between the Main and the Neckar, the temples and inscriptions of Mithra are to be seen everywhere. In one village near Frankfort no less than three important Mithraeums have been successively exhumed. From this stronghold of the faith the triumphant march of Mithra may be traced by Cologne, Treves, and Boulogne, the station of the British fleet, to the great port of London. The sculptures which adorned this important temple were, however, not executed by local artists, but brought from Rome,—'brummagem sculpture,' as M. Cumont somewhat scornfully calls these wholesale manufactures, all after one design. From London the worship spread to the great camps of Caerleon, Chester, and York; while five guard-houses in the wall of Hadrian, as well as an outpost among the Cheviots, still show the shrines of the god. These remains may seem scanty, until the reader compares them with the still scantier

remains of Christianity. In the passes of the Alps, to return to the Continent, we find also abundant evidences of this religion of soldiers, especially along the great Roman highway of the Brenner, and the road from Aquileia to the Danube. At Trent a temple of Mithra, built near a cascade, looked down on the city of the Council, the vanquished on the victor Church.

When we turn from the frontiers to the inner provinces of the Empire we detect the secret of the ultimate weakness of Mithra. In the second century Mithraism was wider spread than Christianity, but Mithraism, unlike Christianity, had secured no hold whatever on the strongholds of Hellenism. The entire domain of Greek culture, as Harnack has pointed out in an appendix to his *Expansion of Christianity*, was closed to it, and no religion to which Greek culture was a closed door could hope to secure the allegiance of the world. In Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Asia Proper, Bithynia, Pamphylia, the isles of the Aegean, Egypt (save Alexandria), Southern Italy and Sicily — countries saturated with Hellenic influence, and whose civilization was built up on Hellenic foundations,—the shrines of Mithra are few and far between. Only in one region of Greek culture, apart from Northern Italy, do we find Mithraism at all strongly established, the valley of the Rhone. Here it seems to have been the work of Syrian merchants and slaves. From Lyons, Aix, Besançon, Arles, Narbonne, and Vienne the worship spread to the villages amid the mountains of Dauphiny and Savoy, where we find it still existing long after the triumph of Christianity.

We shall do well to pause for a moment that we may compare the spread of Christianity. The student must not be misled by the glowing rhetoric in which the Fathers recount the conquests of Christianity,—'places inaccessible to Rome have yielded to Christianity,' and the like. Chiliastic conceptions colour the whole of our early Christian literature, the Church believing that as soon as the gospel had been preached in every nation the end should come. As early as the year 95 we find Clement of Rome maintaining that

this condition had been fulfilled; while Ignatius (107), mistaking his hopes for facts, talks of 'bishops settled in the utmost corners of the earth.' Fortunately we are able to check the exaggeration of the Fathers by more certain evidence. Origen frankly confesses that there were many nations in which in his time the gospel had not yet been preached. In his controversy with Celsus he admits that in the Empire itself the Christians, at the close of the second century, 'were quite few in number.' Many converging lines of evidence, upon which we cannot now dwell, show that Origen was right.[1] The Christians throughout the Empire, counting in all the sects, did not, we think, in the year 180 A.D., form even one per cent. of the whole, though in Antioch and Rome the proportion was certainly higher; at Rome possibly fifteen thousand in a city of less than a million. Only in Asia Minor and Alexandria, where Hellenism had assumed a form which rendered it peculiarly susceptible to the new religion, were the Christians at all a numerous body. In Gaul as yet they scarcely existed. In Lyons, the largest city in the country, the seat of its commerce and legislature, the Church in the year 177 did not number one hundred souls all told; and these, with two or three exceptions, as we may learn from the list of its martyrs preserved by Gregory of Tours, alien Greeks. The impression as yet made on the surrounding Celts was slight. At Treves, next to Lyons the most important town in Gaul, the Church, even two hundred years later, needed but 'one little conventicle' to accommodate its numbers. Britain, Germany, Dacia, as Origen tells us, were as yet untouched by the new faith, while in Northern Italy, with the possible exception of Genoa, Christianity did not exist at all. Such great cities as Ravenna, Milan, and Aquileia, as we may see from their episcopal rolls, had not as yet the rudiments of a church. Even in Rome itself the Church was almost exclusively Greek, with Greek officers

[1] In a forthcoming work, as part of an attempt to estimate the extent of persecution, we shall give the data upon which we should estimate the Christian population of the Empire in the year 180. For a later date (325 A.D.) much help is given by vol. ii. of Harnack's *Expansion of Christianity*.

and, possibly, Greek ritual. But to pursue in further detail the evidence upon which we rest our belief would lead us too far afield. In the year 180 the advantage in extension, counting merely by adherents and territory covered, lay possibly with Mithraism. At any rate, Mithra had made more impression upon the Latin element in the Empire.

Hitherto we have spoken of Christianity and Mithraism as rivals in dispute, like Michael and the Devil, for the soul of the Empire. The idea, as we now see, needs qualifying. As a matter of fact, save in Italy they hardly touched the same populations. Where one was strong the other was almost non-existent. But while thus almost mutually exclusive, the advantage of geographical position lay with Christianity. Broadly speaking, the strength of Mithraism lay in the frontier provinces; the strength of Christianity in the great ganglionic centres of Greek commerce and culture. When the deluge came, Mithraism was swept away by the first barbarian onsets; the more securely seated Christianity imposed itself, along with some survivals of Greek culture, upon its conquerors. The purposes of God, in the long evolution of the Greek world, were at last fulfilled.

When we turn from mere numbers to estimate by quality, the advantage once more lies with Christianity. The idea that the strength of Christianity lay in the lower classes must go the way of many similar errors. Whatever may have been the case at Corinth, it was certainly not the fact, so far as we can judge from the existing evidence, in the Empire at large. On the vast slave population Christianity did not make a great impression, as we may see from the extant *Acts of the Martyrs*, where the slaves are always carefully distinguished. In the Church of Lyons, small as it was, we find physicians, merchants, even one nobleman; of slaves but one, the illustrious Blandina, who by the way had a Christian mistress. The same thing was true at Rome; where, as De Rossi and others have shown, we find not a few belonging to the upper ranks. In the main Christianity was chiefly the religion of the middle classes, especially the Greek commercial community and the Greek professional

class. In proportion to their numbers the social status[1] of the Christians was decidedly high. Especially was this true of the women. At the close of the second century the girls of high birth and wealth in the Church at Rome so far outnumbered the young men of similar rank that Pope Callistus in 220 made an arrangement of an illegal and disastrous character, to enable them to marry beneath their rank.

Mithraism, on the other hand, was the religion of a corrupt court, of vast numbers of Syrian slaves, of important officials in the civil service, and, most important of all, of the army. But the very fact which endeared it to the army was one secret of its weakness. Mithraism was a religion of men; no women were allowed to participate in its secret mysteries. They were condemned to a secondary place in the society of the faithful, the outer courts of the temple. In consequence Mithraism, for a heathen religion, was singularly pure. But a religion confined to men, or in which, as the outside condescension, women were allowed to join on sufferance, could never become the religion of humanity. Mithraism may have given to the army a spiritual strength and unity which enabled it the longer to resist the onset of the Barbarians. When the inevitable deluge came the soldiers were slain, but the women were spared to teach their new lords the religion of Jesus and His Virgin Mother.

We must not dwell too long on this question of extension. There are two or three other matters on which the reader may desire information. The theology of Mithraism, was its spread helpful to Christianity, or the reverse? We find it difficult to answer. Mithraism undoubtedly was part of that larger spiritual movement, upon which Dr. Dill lays much stress, which we see going on all round in the life of Europe in the second century, and which led to a remarkable growth throughout Europe of a social conscience. We see this

[1] But we must distinguish, I imagine, between *status* and *influence*. Mithraism seems to have had a great hold not only in the army but in the civil service, the lower ranks of which were full of the better class slaves and freedmen. The *influence* of Christianity was probably in the nature of things but slight, as the Christian was shut out by his Christianity from many posts.

awakened spiritual life in the guilds and charities, the constant efforts to benefit and endow education, to found orphanages and hospitals, to emancipate women, and to rescue the slave from the unlimited power of his lord, which form the nobler features of the legislation of the Antonines, sad persecutors though they were of the Church of Jesus. That this upward movement of thought and creed, of which Mithraism was the nobler expression, undoubtedly helped the ultimate triumph of Christianity seems to us a certainty; nay, who shall say that this upward movement was not the work or preparation of the Spirit fulfilling Himself in diverse ways? Mithraism also was a religion of hope,—no small advantage this in a world round which the thunder clouds were slowly gathering. We see this hopefulness in the constant theme of Mithraism, the slaughter by the Invincible One of the bull, the symbol of evil. In a marble group still preserved in the British Museum this optimism is carried still further: wheat and the vine spring from the bleeding wound. Mithra was the 'saviour,' the deliverer from the powers of evil, 'always awake, always alert,' who at the last shall bear the souls of the initiated through seven heavens of purgation to their long home of eternal light and beatitude without end. But for evil-doers Mithra was also the severe Judge. Mithraism, though not without its mystic side, emphasized the value of individual energy; it taught that the good dwelt in action. No other heathen religion laid larger emphasis upon the value of prayer and veneration, or preached more steadfastly an ideal that verged towards asceticism. Mithraism was also a religion of mutual fellowship; the worshippers called each other 'brothers,' their name for the initiate was 'father.' They believed that the faithful ones formed part of a sacred army, linked together by more than earthly bonds, whose business it was to uphold the Principle of Good in its struggle with Evil. In all this we may discern much that was helpful, nothing that would prove a hindrance to the triumph of Christianity. The worship was at any rate an improvement on the worn-out utilitarianism into which Roman religion had degenerated.

But there was, alas! as in most things in this world of good and evil, another side to the account. Mithraism was a curiously compound doctrine; the various elements it picked up in its long triumphant progress were never properly assimilated or harmonized. Thus Mithraism, though proclaiming the value of prayer, was intensely fatalistic, believing that the stars decided the destinies of all events, and filling Europe with an intense conviction in the value of all the errors and terrors of astrology, that baffled for a thousand years the efforts of the Church to eradicate. The Church, in fact, tired of the struggle, and left the matter to be dealt with by the rise of science. As regards their rites of initiation, the crowning privilege of the believer, we may dismiss at once all the tales of mutilation and murder, of dripping swords and flames, especially when we remember that tales even worse, a sacramental feast on newborn babes, bread used 'to sop up the blood,' dogs introduced as 'the pimps of incest,' were habitually believed about the Christians, even by men so well informed as the tutor of Marcus Aurelius. But we are of opinion that Tertullian and other apologists were right in looking upon the sacraments of Mithra as a great hindrance to the gospel; a diabolic parody, as they deemed, not knowing that these sacraments were as old as those of the Church. In one of the sculptures of Mithraism we can see the reconciliation of Mithra and the suppliant by means of a solemn agape; the cup is there, and the sacred bread is marked with a cross.[1] We cannot but think that the inevitable effect must have been to lower the value of the simple gospel rites for the heathen convert familiar, as he would put it, with the same thing in a wrong form; and thereby to minister to the tendency, already apparent in the Church, to turn the simplicity of early worship and sacraments into the elaborate and guarded ritual of later days. In the second century sacramentarian ideas were in the air not only in Mithraism, but in every other religion, and have left their mark to this day on the religion of Jesus.

[1] Cumont, *Introd.* 175.

This degradation of gospel sacraments is best illustrated by the most impressive rite of Mithraism, the *taurobolium*; one of those elements that Mithraism had picked up and adopted from other religions, in this case from the worship of the Great Mother. To the Fathers of the Church this seemed a travesty of the Cross; but in its origin it goes back to days long before Calvary. The rite took place, as a rule, in early spring, and was often prolonged for two or three days. Only seventeen years before the massacre of the Christians at Lyons (177) there had been a great *taurobolium* at this capital of Gaul, the records of which are still preserved for us. The ceremony was superintended by the magistrates, and attended by a vast crowd of people. With many solemn forms the consecrated bull was lifted on to a platform and slaughtered. Meanwhile the devotees were placed in a trench beneath, that they might bathe in the streams of blood and thus obtain strength and purification. The effect of this sacrament was supposed to last for twenty years without the need of renewal. The devotee who died in the interval could engrave on his tomb the record of his cleansing in the phrase, whose claims so stirred the wrath of the Christians, *renatus in aeternum*, 'born again to eternal life.' We may be certain that the widespread ritual of the *taurobolium* did not make it easier for the Christian to preach the atonement of Calvary; nor to escape the degradation of the Supreme Sacrifice into the coarsest 'blood theology.' Nor do we err in discerning in the *taurobolium*, and the popular beliefs of which it was an expression, one of the forces which led to the victory in the Church at an early date of the conception of the Mass. For if Christianity conquered the Roman world, it is also true that the Roman world to a large extent conquered both the theology and life of the Church.

We must bring our sketch of the struggle between Christianity and Mithraism to a close. Within one hundred and twenty years of the period of our survey, Christianity, the religion of a despised, persecuted minority, not one per cent. of the whole, had become the dominant religion of the

Empire, determined to stamp out all other rivals, if necessary, alas! by persecution, Mithraism included. This victory of Christianity is the greatest event in human history, assuredly not to be explained by any intelligent historian in the airy way in which it is dismissed by Mr. Maccabe as due to perfectly natural reasons, mainly political in nature. But the causes of the triumph of Christianity form too vast a subject upon which to enter at the end of an article. Suffice to say, in answer to Mr. Maccabe, that Constantine adopted Christianity as the religion of the Empire, because that astute politician discerned that for all practical purposes Christianity was already the only effective religion in the Empire, counting far more adherents than any of its rivals, especially in the centres of culture and population, the only religion which could infuse into the Empire new life. Constantine's adoption, though no doubt a remarkable event, is far less important than the real conquest of Christianity over foes without and heretics within, which led up to it. Into all this we cannot now enter. But not the least of the victories of Christianity was her triumph over Mithra, a triumph so complete that, like some religious Pompeii, the existence of the worship and its widespread ramifications was almost unknown until brought to light by the researches of modern savants.

H. B. WORKMAN.

Recent Literature.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.

Johannine Vocabulary. By Edwin A. Abbott. (A. & C. Black. 13*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Dr. Abbott is indefatigable. He has already issued four considerable volumes under the general title *Diatessarica*, to illustrate the Synoptic problem from various points of view. The present is the fifth instalment, whilst a sixth, on *Johannine Grammar*, which will deal more technically and in detail with the language of the Fourth Gospel, is well on its way. The labour implied in the preparation of the tables and lists contained in this one volume alone must have been considerable, whilst the fertility and ingenuity of Dr. Abbott's theories are known to all his readers. His immediate object is to compare the language of St. John with the Synoptists as a whole—'the Triple Tradition'—and with each singly. The conclusion which he claims to have established is that the allusions in the Fourth Gospel to the other three are more numerous than is commonly supposed, and that it often 'intervenes in order to clear up some obscurity or correct some misunderstanding.' The passages adduced also go to show that under the apparent simplicity of Johannine style a deeper art is concealed, and that closer examination of the Evangelist's diction reveals a variety of spiritual meanings and 'deeper conceptions of Christ's words, deeds, character, and nature.'

It is this last feature of the book which has most interested us. We are not greatly impressed, and are far indeed from being convinced, by many of Dr. Abbott's ingenious theorizings. He is often 'too clever by half.' He sets up a pyramid resting on its apex. His perception is more acute than his judgement is sound. But a close examination of our Lord's own words and of the way in which they have been reported by the several evangelists is always fruitful. In this Dr. Abbott often reminds us of a scholar with whom in most respects he is strongly to be contrasted—the

late Bishop Westcott. On the purely spiritual side there is much to be learned from Dr. Abbott, whilst we do not accept his premisses, distrust some of his methods, and have little faith in many of his conclusions. But his discussion of Johannine synonyms, e.g. the words for 'seeing,' 'hearing,' 'knowing,' 'coming,' and other simple but fruitful ideas, is most illuminating. Microscopic, it may no doubt be styled; but if examination under a lens of high power reveals new beauties in the structure of an organism, microscopic investigation proves both instructive and fruitful. We are inclined to say that this volume was well worth publishing were it only for the complete account it contains of the Johannine key-word 'believing.' Dr. Abbott devotes more than sixty full pages to a description of the shades of meaning given to πιστεύειν in the Fourth Gospel. He comes to the conclusion that 'believing' is to be regarded in different aspects—'not as a consummation or a goal, but as a number of different stages, by which different individuals pass, in accordance with their several individualities, toward the one centre, "Jesus the Christ, the Son of God," in whom they are to "have life."' Students have often noticed that whilst St. John rings the changes scores of times upon the verb 'believe,' he never once uses the noun 'faith.' We do not remember to have seen any attempt to explain this. Dr. Abbott's view substantially is that at the comparatively late date when the Fourth Gospel was written, 'faith' was a current term in danger of being conventionally, or even erroneously, understood, and that the writer's object was to show in the concrete what was actually meant by 'believing' Christ, or 'believing in Him,' or 'believing in His name.' We are not sure that the solution lies in this direction, but we have not done justice to Dr. Abbott's subtle and interesting investigation of examples by this brief and bald account of it.

Two long sections of the book are devoted to 'Johannine deviations from Synoptic vocabulary' and 'Synoptic deviations from Johannine vocabulary'—a very fruitful subject. The arguments based upon the exhaustive analysis here undertaken are of necessity cumulative, and readers will draw their own conclusions from Dr. Abbott's materials. So with words peculiar to John and Mark, John and Luke—John, Mark, and Matthew—and John, Matthew, and Luke. These minute linguistic inquiries may at first sight appear to be meticulous and useless. But it is only by slow, patient, underground work of this kind that such subtle points as the relation between the several lines of tradition concerning Christ can be determined. And where the subject is so sacred and

vital and the end so important, time and trouble should not be begrudged. Dr. Abbott spares neither. He deserves the thanks of all careful and earnest New Testament students for the work he is carrying through with such patience and perseverance. Those who cannot accept all his conclusions must admire his learning and his zeal, and they cannot help receiving profit from his company and guidance.

The Bible and Babylon. By Ed. König, D.D. Translated by Rev. W. T. Pilter. (Religious Tract Society. 2*s.*)

The New Testament and the Pentateuch. By C. F. Nösgen, D.D. Translated by Rev. C. H. Irwin. (Religious Tract Society. 2*s.*)

Old Testament Criticism in New Testament Light. By G. H. Rouse, M.A., D.D. (Religious Tract Society. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The replies put forward by conservatives or 'traditionalists' to the prevailing views of 'Higher Critics' of the Old Testament take various forms. Root-and-branch defenders of traditional opinions are comparatively few, and their polemics have not always been wisely conducted. The more sensible section of this school confine themselves to pointing out the difficulties in which the fashionable critical theories land their supporters, and protesting against the hasty acceptance of crude hypotheses. Sometimes the authority of the New Testament is invoked in order to shew the untenability of the views of Old Testament history and religion based upon Wellhausen's theories, sometimes the discoveries of archaeology have been pressed into the same service. There can be no question that 'criticism' needs to be criticized, and that truth will gain by the application of the most searching tests to the opinions which are now accepted by nearly all the leading Old Testament scholars. But writers who are inclined to challenge these opinions must be sure of their ground, or their well-meant protests will do more harm than good to their own cause.

Of the three volumes named above, two are translated from the German, and the third is the work of an able and accomplished missionary in Bengal. Professor Ed. König is well known to our readers as a staunch representative of the moderate or conservative school, whilst Dr. Nösgen is professor in Rostock and one of the editors of the *Theologisches Literaturblatt.* Professor König has little difficulty in replying to the extreme statements of Friedrich

Delitzsch in his *Babel und Bibel*, and showing that the recent excavations on the Euphrates 'do not perform the work of grave-digging for the prerogative of the Bible in the history of religion,' but that on the contrary modern research does not cause 'the transcendent import of the Bible to grow stronger and stronger.' König does not deny that the traditions and laws of the Hebrews were in many respects similar to the traditions and ideas of the nations around them. This has been made increasingly clear of late years, and the fact has long since ceased to cause any disquiet to the reverent student of the Bible. For the dominant principles of Biblical literature are entirely different from the Babylonian with which it has been closely compared, and it is these ruling religious principles which constitute the value and the marvel of the Old Testament Scriptures. The translator of Professor König's work has made some additions to it of his own, in the main justified by the original words of the author, but in some respects going unwisely beyond them.

Professor Nösgen's book is slight, but interesting. He seeks to show that all the teaching of the New Testament, and especially that of Christ, necessarily implies a view of Old Testament literature with which modern theories are quite inconsistent. In this we do not think he has been successful. He strains the arguments drawn from our Lord's references—as we think—beyond what they will legitimately bear. The passages which can be fairly quoted in support of his contention are comparatively few, and it may at once be admitted that the terms of reference to 'Moses' and 'the law and the prophets' are couched in the current language of the time, as it would be understood by those to whom Christ spoke. In no other words could He have spoken, and it is a dangerous precedent to assume that questions of authorship in Old Testament literature are to be determined for all time by the popular modes of speech necessarily employed by Jesus in order to make Himself intelligible to those whom He addressed. On the other hand, the author is on safer ground when he urges that the historicity and general trustworthiness of the Old Testament narratives may fairly be inferred from the use made of them by Christ and His Apostles. It does not follow from the fact that in Heb. iv. 7 the Book of Psalms is called 'David,' that therefore David wrote all the Psalms, or even the 95th, quoted by the writer of the Epistle. But it does follow from our Lord's use of the phrase 'the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob' that those who accept His authority are not at liberty to regard the patriarchs as mere mythical personages.

Mr. Rouse's book is longer and fuller than the other two. The author deals more at large with the subject of criticism. In a very candid way he recognizes that 'Higher Criticism is in itself a good thing,' whilst he pleads that the views it currently describes are in many respects '*uncritical*, based on subjective theories rather than on objective fact, and creating far greater difficulties than those which they were framed to meet.' He recognizes further that Christ, not the Bible, is the Rock of the Church, that there is a human side to the Bible as a collection of literary documents, that it must be interpreted rationally, that it is not intended to teach us science or history, and that honest and thorough criticism, in the sense of examination, can only do good. These sensible admissions make the author's protest against prevalent critical theories the more weighty, as showing that he is free from prejudices which prevent some 'orthodox' controversialists from fairly meeting their opponents on their own ground. We do not think, however, that Mr. Rouse has made good his chief contentions, e.g. the relation between the Levitical law and the prophets, the authorship of Psalm cx., his arguments in favour of the traditional view of a Isaiah, and the date and interpretation of the Book of Daniel as he understands it. But he has adduced considerations which must not be lost sight of. Many of these have indeed been already met by Canon Driver and others of the moderate critical school, whose views are quite as consistent with a reverent recognition of our Lord's authority as those held by Mr. Rouse.

We welcome all three volumes, whether we are prepared fully to accept the conclusions of the writers or no, because full and free discussion of these important questions forms our only means for reaching the truth, and the conflict has of late been quite one-sided. Conservative criticism appears to us to be doing good service rather by arresting hasty judgement and protesting against ill-digested hypotheses, than by attempting to shew that the whole structure of modern Old Testament criticism is baseless and unstable. What this generation needs is wise guidance in the work of distinguishing between what is sound and what is rash and untenable in the prevailing methods of historical and literary biblical criticism.

Outlines of Christian Apologetics. By H. Schultz. Translated by A. B. Nichols. (Macmillan & Co. *7s. 6d.* net.)

Professor Schultz of Göttingen is best known in this country by his *Alt-Testamentliche Theologie*, which has been translated into

English and has largely superseded Oehler for practical purposes. He occupies what may be described as a moderate position on questions of biblical criticism, combining as he does the acceptance of the main conclusions of modern critics with a fairly firm hold of the central doctrines of Christian faith. His tone on all biblical questions is candid, but always reverent, and his judgement is usually sound. Without accepting him as a safe guide in all respects, his readers may be sure of having the help of a scholar who is fully acquainted with the latest views and researches on all biblical questions, but who is not disposed hastily to accept novel theories, as if the newest and most 'advanced' were certain to be the best.

In this volume he enters upon a department of systematic theology. As the title indicates, outlines only are presented of lectures which the Professor has been in the habit of delivering, the material here printed being largely supplemented in oral delivery. Consequently the book is suitable rather for students than for the general reader in theology. But for a reader fairly acquainted with the subject it is more satisfactory to have the writer's views presented in condensed form. The matter contained in three hundred pages might easily be expanded into a volume three times the size. But given the *Grund-linien* of a master, the student can do the expanding for himself.

We have found Schultz' treatment of the important and timely subject of Apologetics to be clear, strong, and abundantly suggestive. In the three books into which his treatise is divided he seeks, (1) to defend the religious view of the world against all modern tendencies that would disown religion; (2) to display the working of religion in its main historical phenomena, ranging from primitive nature religions to those of Israel and Islam; and (3) to vindicate the claims of Christianity as the perfect embodiment of religion in its purest and best and final form. It is clear that so wide a field can only be covered in one volume of moderate compass by the use of a kind of literary shorthand, each section containing only the lines along which the author would work out his ideas, these being sketched, however, with a firm and masterly hand. For example, the vindication of Theism against modern pantheistic tendencies and the defence of the belief in a living personal God in full view of all the conclusions of modern physical science, is very able and helpful. But it is all contained in one section of six pages, and every sentence would need a somewhat full oral commentary if its

scope and significance were to be understood by an ordinary theological class. Dr. Schultz' attitude on miracles, moreover, is one that might easily be misapprehended by a hasty or half-educated reader. He not only admits, but powerfully defends, a belief in miracle as essential to pure Theism, but he defines miracle in a way which to some might seem to empty it of its chief significance. 'The system of nature is everywhere so arranged that the free purposeful activity of personalities can exhibit itself as a factor in it, not as something contrary to it or interrupting it.' This sentence indicates the author's general point of view, and another will show how he regards Christian miracles. 'The highest example that can be conceived in this realm is a human personality which, with its whole nature and experience, becomes the full and clear expression of God's will to men. It is then, for those who accept it, itself the historical revelation of God (λόγος σὰρξ γενόμενος), subject and object of the religion whose agent it is.'

Schultz shews himself decidedly critical of the traditional 'proofs' of the existence of God — cosmological, teleological, ontological and the rest. But it is the form only of these time-honoured arguments, with the high claim of 'proof' attaching to them, that he distrusts. The substance may still be maintained by the Theist, and the cogency of the reasoning within limits is not denied, provided that a complete demonstration of the existence of a Being such as the Christian intends by the term 'God' be not claimed as scientifically established. In these criticisms and conclusions Schultz does but represent the position of most enlightened Theists to-day. In theology, Schultz is substantially Ritschlian, or at least shows marked traces of Ritschlian influence. This appears throughout the volume, and most noticeably in the third part, where the claims of Christianity to be the perfect religion are discussed. The distrust of metaphysics and the unwillingness to rest Christianity upon an historical basis which are characteristic of the school are patent in Schultz' exposition. His surrender of historical sources becomes at times dangerous, but his vindication of Christianity as a spiritual religion carrying with it its own credentials is in parts very fine. The survey of non-Christian religions is too rapid to be of much use, but a teacher, or an advanced student, will know how to fill up the outlines that are here slightly but suggestively sketched.

On the whole it may be said that this volume was well worth translating, and the work has been carefully carried out by Professor

Nichols. If regarded not as a treatise, which it does not profess to be, but as indicating the lines along which a vindication of Christianity in its true essence may be conducted in full view of present-day non-Christian and anti-Christian tendencies, the book will prove of great service. It will be most useful to teachers who will treat Schultz in their own way—expanding, supplementing, and at times correcting this condensed expression of an able theologian's personal views on a subject of the first importance.

The Christian Ministry. By Lyman Abbott. (Constable & Co. 5*s.* net.)

Dr. Lyman Abbott, instead of asking why people do not go to church, thinks it more pertinent to ask, Why do any people ever go to church? In New York half the population above school age are accustomed to take part in some form of religious service every week. The question naturally arises, What do they seek in so attending churches and chapels, and do they obtain what they desire? The volume before us constitutes one more attempt to direct those whose business it is to minister to these multitudes in their spiritual hunger. The lectures it contains are miscellaneous in character, since the author has been called upon at various times to deal with the subject, and he has here thrown his materials somewhat promiscuously together. A good deal of repetition is consequently inevitable, and the reader must not expect a systematically ordered treatise such as the title might indicate. But in all probability Dr. Abbott's free and easy style will attract many readers who would be repelled by the more formal and methodical method of treatment; and whilst the lecturer is never dry, he contrives to embody much sound and excellent teaching on the ever fruitful topic of the Christian minister, his functions, his message and his qualifications.

The first chapter deals with the need of strong personal faith and deep conviction in the minister of the gospel. In the second, the lecturer gives some wise advice concerning politics in the pulpit—'Deal with all the public issues of your time, but deal with them exclusively in their relation to the kingdom of God. . . . So long as Savonarola proclaimed the great fundamental principles of truth and righteousness and justice he was a great power in Italy; when he undertook to become a political leader and frame the policies for the State, he lost his power.' The work of the Church surely is to direct and animate by the inculcation of broad principles, not to descend to the level of partisan politicians.

As Dr. Abbott says elsewhere, 'The cry, More money for hospitals and less for churches, is like the cry, More water for the reservoirs and less for the springs. . . . The Church is to be measured, not by the institutions it sustains, but by the inspiration it imparts.' Some excellent remarks are to be found in the third lecture on the authority of the ministry, the Hebrew prophets being taken as types and patterns. The chapter entitled 'The Minister as Priest' deals with the conduct of Christian worship. One chapter is devoted to the 'Social Message of the Ministry,' and the volume appropriately closes with two lectures on the Great Exemplar—the Ministry of Jesus Christ, His Methods and the Substance of His Teaching.

If Dr. Lyman Abbott's book be viewed as an attempt to deal comprehensively and adequately with the functions of the Christian ministry, it must be pronounced a failure. But if it be regarded as what it really is, a collection of genial addresses on subjects more or less directly connected with the minister's duties and qualifications, it will prove an interesting and not uninstructive guide. Dr. Abbott is himself a minister of great experience and ability, he writes with freshness and vivacity, and all his addresses are practical and keep clearly in view the great ends for which the ministry was instituted. 'If the Church does not interest itself in what concerns humanity, it cannot hope that humanity will interest itself in what concerns the Church.' Americans, even more than Englishmen, are impatient of teaching which is but remotely connected with workaday life; they listen eagerly for a message which comes home to 'men's business and bosoms.' Dr. Abbott is a teacher with such a message, and his words *ad clerum* do not fight with shadows or beat the air. Every minister anxious to do his work better will find something here to help him.

Dr. Abbott is not in all respects satisfactory as a guide. He generalizes rapidly, lays down the law freely, and is often either careless or lax in expression. For example he says in one place, 'The prophets do not think that they are inspired more than other men are inspired,' whereas the very idea of the prophet was that of a man in whose ear 'high God had breathed a secret thing.' Again he says, 'It is better to have a conviction of sins than a conviction of sin,' whereas a little thought will show how shallow is a perception of the evil of drunkenness, or of lust, or of anger compared with the penitence inspired in the heart of a man who is convinced that the several evils into which he is apt to fall spring from one deep tap-root of evil imbedded in his very nature. It

was not the heinousness of adultery and murder that troubled the writer of the 51st Psalm, so much as the evil heart from which issued the desires which led to these dark crimes. 'Behold Thou desirest truth in the inward parts; and in the hidden part Thou shalt make me to know wisdom.' Upon other slight blemishes which we had noted in this volume we need not dwell; it deserves a place by the side of the similar ones of Ward Beecher, Horton, Behrends and other Yale Lecturers on preaching. If we cannot class Dr. Lyman Abbott with R. W. Dale and Phillips Brooks, it is something to deserve a place in the ranks of those who are 'more honourable than the thirty, but attain not to the first three.' Americans and Englishmen have something to learn from one another on most subjects, and preaching is no exception to the rule.

The Witness to the Influence of Christ. By Rt. Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon. (Constable & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The 'Noble' Lectures delivered annually in Washington were instituted in 1898 in memory of Phillips Brooks. The Bishop of Ripon, who delivered them last year, is perhaps of all Anglican clergy in this country most in sympathy with the teaching and spirit of that great-hearted man and high-souled preacher. The subject chosen was just such as Brooks himself loved and was happy in expounding; it is, in fact, a kind of continuation of his 'Bohlen' Lectures on 'The Influence of Jesus,' delivered in 1879. Dr. Boyd Carpenter possesses much of the breadth of sympathy and power of facile exposition which characterized Bishop Brooks, but his style is vague and elusive, and neither the thoughts of the lectures themselves nor the mode of their presentation can be said to grip and impress the reader as the great American preacher seldom failed to do. But the subject of Christ's influence on the world is inexhaustible, and in its exposition there is room for every man to estimate it from his own point of view and present it in his own fashion.

The titles of some of the lectures will show the aspects of the subject which most commended themselves to Bishop Boyd Carpenter, viz., Christ as the Perfect Type of Consciousness, Christ as the Teacher of Principles, as the Law of the Soul, and as Verified in Experience. The first lecture describes the two aspects of the influence of Christ which the writer insists should always be borne in mind together—the outward and the inward, the historical fact

and the interior witness of personal experience. The outward historical fact of Christ's influence on the world cannot be gainsaid by any, and the inward experience is as indisputable to all who have themselves passed through it. In the conjunction of the two lies the invincible strength of Christian evidence as adapted to the needs of the present generation. Many recent volumes have been concerned with the Christ of history and of experience. Dr. Boyd Carpenter treats this great theme in a free, facile, and interesting way; but we imagine that many readers who have enjoyed following the exposition of a lecture would find it exceedingly difficult at the end to reproduce the substance of the argument. It is said, we know not with what truth, that the Bishop of Ripon speaks with great ease and grace after little or no previous written preparation. We could imagine that these lectures had been thus delivered by a natural orator from comparatively scanty outlines; and whilst they must have been pleasant to listen to, and are certainly pleasant and interesting to read, they fail to arrest the attention and their contents do not readily linger in the memory.

But the presentation here given of a great subject is in many of its features fine and impressive. The Bishop distinguishes in one place between principle, doctrine, and dogma. His own field is pre-eminently the exposition of broad principles. Details he instinctively eschews; or, in touching upon them, he does so briefly and lightly, as one who would rather fly in air or swim in water than plod diligently along the dull and solid earth. 'Dogmas,' he says, 'are often the winding-sheet of truth; they contain truth, it is true, but they too often strangle what they hold. But when we perceive the principle, we get back to the life of the dogma, we can revive the truth which lay buried there.' In this way he interprets the current watchword 'Back to Christ,' and from this point of view he unfolds the influence of Christ upon history and upon the individual heart, as the accepted ideal of humanity, as 'the sovereign type of religious consciousness in its complete and unbroken harmony with the Father in heaven,' and as in His life expressing the fundamental law of man's intellectual, moral, and spiritual development. The lecture on 'Christ the Law of the Soul' is perhaps the best in the volume, and it contains the germ of all sound Christian mysticism. We cannot reproduce it in outline, but the following paraphrase will give an idea of the line of exposition adopted. Christ as the law of the soul means that 'in Him is expressed that constant principle (of life through death) which is requisite for the full and final development of the spiritual nature of man.' We

commend the book on the whole as one certain to interest and benefit readers of various types. If the great Sun of Righteousness here portrayed is seen through a shimmering luminous haze, He is none the less to be seen, and His light is always the light of life. Or, to change the figure, if the Bishop of Ripon can but reflect that light from one facet, he does reflect it truly and helpfully, and his book deserves to be read widely on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Sacraments of the New Testament. By the Rev. David Purves, M.A. (Oliphant, Anderson, & Ferrier. 4*s*.)

The Life Everlasting. Studies on the Subject of the Future. By the Rev. David Purves, M.A. T. & T. Clark. 4*s*.)

Since the publication of these two works their author has received from his own University (Glasgow) the degree of D.D. He is the scholarly and devoted pastor of Elmwood Presbyterian Church, Belfast, and numbers amongst his congregation many of the leading Presbyterians of the city and Queen's College. His intellectual and moral kinships are with the band of thinkers and scholars, like Drs. Rainy, Bruce, Marcus Dods, and G. A. Smith, who have adorned the ministry of the United Free Church of Scotland. Hence both these books are distinguished by the combination of intellectual breadth and spiritual enthusiasm which has marked the work of the school their author belongs to. They possess, besides, a fine tone of Scottish religious sentiment which is his own special endowment. They are professedly for the use of the thoughtful hearer, and they are admirably adapted to the confirmation of faith and the edification of character; but they possess high value for the preacher, as they are excellent examples of the way in which their subjects may be treated, in the light of recent thought and investigation. The latter volume is especially valuable as a long step forward, in one important branch of theology at any rate, towards that restatement of Christian doctrine in the light of modern science, philosophy, criticism, poetry and art which every earnest Christian preacher who is also a thinker looks upon as one great desideratum of the time in which we live.

The first-mentioned is a handbook on the Sacraments. Its doctrinal position is that of orthodox Presbyterianism, of the Congregationalists who follow Dr. Dale, and of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. The crucial point of the efficacy of infant baptism is treated by Dr. Purves with a quite fearless application of the symbolism of the act, yet in such a way as to preserve in-

violate the Protestant position, and so as to make most effective use of that fine and wise saying of the Confession of Faith, 'The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered.' So with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the author's position of 'a real though spiritual presence of Christ' enables him to take advantage of the gain there is in accepting the high significance of the sacrament, in its doctrinal symbolism, in its Eucharistic character, and in the opportunity it gives for communion with the Lord and with His Church militant and triumphant. The teaching of the book throughout is high, but also broad and truly evangelical. We specially note the tender and beautiful concluding chapter on 'Communion for the First Time.'

The Life Everlasting is partly practical, but mainly expository and apologetic. In the expository portions of the book the difficult question of the teaching of the Old Testament with regard to immortality is treated with competent critical knowledge and deep sympathy, and the exposition of the language of Christ and St. Paul on the subject is full and satisfactory. The ethical significance of the Christian doctrine of resurrection is ably illustrated, and the chapters on immortality as the victory of faith, love and hope derive much of their interest and power from the use they make of the religious symbolism of the great art of Watts —so triumphant in its assurance of the divine meanings of life. Perhaps, however, the last chapters, on the Attitude of Science, the Verdict of Philosophy, and the Language of Poetry, possess the greatest charm and value of any in the book. Here probably the author delivers the special message of the spirit that is in him—the message of his own experience and culture. The chapter on science may be taken as an excellent complement to such a book as Dr. Osler's *Science and Immortality*, where hopefulness exists, indeed, but in a somewhat pale and melancholy form. Altogether this work has a place of its own, which it worthily fills. Many recent works, such as Salmond's *Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, M'Kendrick's *Science and Faith*, and *Man's Destiny*, by John Fiske, have dealt largely with the subject. Myers' *Human Personality*, and many statements in magazines and addresses (especially by Sir Oliver Lodge), have called attention to the possibility that new lines of argument of a quasi-scientific nature may assume increasing importance. Most significant of all, a silent modification has taken place in the thoughts of the generality even of Christian hearers upon this subject, and the pulpit does not speak with the old confident tone. There is a place for a work which considers all

these facts, especially for a work so sane, so thoroughly well informed, so full of the sentiment of life and religion, as this one is. It is not a large book; but its value and its opportuneness should secure for it a wide circulation.

The Unrealised Logic of Religion. By W. H. Fitchett, B.A., LL.D. (Charles H. Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

The thirty-fifth Fernley Lecture was delivered this year by a representative of Australian Methodism. Dr. Fitchett is well known in this country. His stirring volumes on *Deeds that Won the Empire* and kindred subjects have been enjoyed by many besides the boys in years for whom some of them were written. The literary value of Dr. Fitchett's work has been recognized by some of the best English critics, and its popularity is not to be understood as implying either shallowness or sensationalism. In this volume the author essays higher tasks. It is a contribution to Christian Apologetics of the best and most effective kind. Leaving on one side that aspect of the subject which he calls 'scheduled logic'—which makes the study of Christian evidences to be so often dull and jejune—Dr. Fitchett breaks up new ground by gathering and marshalling in force proofs of the truth of religion which lie closer to us than the formal arguments of the schools. They cannot be framed in syllogisms, they are 'incidental, infinitely various, apparently unrelated to each other. Literature and life grow richer in them every day.' Significant as they are, they cannot easily be described or their value estimated. They consist of hidden and unsuspected harmonies between the Christian religion and the laws of the universe on the one hand, and the facts of history and the experience of mankind on the other. And, as Dr. Fitchett pleads, what can be more cogent than these incidental, spontaneous, various and unexpected proofs, this 'unrealized logic of religion'? The method employed in this volume is like the applying of Paley's arguments in *Horae Paulinae* drawn from undesigned coincidences to the great and fruitful analogy worked out by Butler between Natural and Revealed Religion; only that Dr. Fitchett does not employ either the attorney-logic of Paley or the condensed and ponderous style of Butler to drive home his points. His writing is characterized by vivacity and energy: he is fertile, sometimes exuberant, in the use of illustration; he ransacks all fields, both of observation and of literature, to gather materials, yet never allows himself to be diverted from the great object before him. That object may be thus expressed in his own words, 'Is

there any logic known to the human reason like the logic found in the answer of the chambers of a lock to the wards of the key that opens it? If key and lock fit, the debate ends. And to a degree which is very imperfectly realized, at a thousand points and in a thousand ways, beyond expectation — sometimes even against expectation—this logic is arraying itself on the side of Christian faith.'

The argument ranges over a wide area, but in that lies one of the main elements of its strength. Just because it deals with what seem to be unrelated subjects and with widely separated points in history, science, and common life, Dr. Fitchett pleads that it cannot be erroneous. Without referring to Mr. Ballard's *Miracles of Unbelief*, he employs the cogent reasoning of that able book in his own way and from his own point of view. Thus he, like Mr. Ballard, seeks to show that, whilst faith has its difficulties, 'the incredibilities of unbelief, when tested at any point, are so vast that their mere scale constitutes a new argument for Christian belief.'

Having said so much concerning the general scope and aim of the lecture, we cannot follow its argument in detail. It is divided into six parts, which deal respectively with history, science, philosophy, literature, spiritual life, and common life. Some of the subordinate headings will indicate the way in which the main theme is worked out. The 'Logic of the Changed Calendar' deals with the impress left by Christ upon history. The 'Logic of the Missionary' points the obvious conclusion to be drawn from the history of Christian missions. The 'Irrelevant Logic of Size' meets the difficulties constantly felt through the contrast between the littleness of man and the vastness of the physical universe. The 'Logic of the Sunset' points out the lessons to be learned from the spiritual impressions produced on man by forms of physical beauty. The 'Logic of Ourselves' presses home the strong proofs of the personality of God that may be drawn from the personal constitution of man. The 'Logic of Unproved Negatives' extends and applies Butler's argument based upon probability as the guide of life to show the immense and unsurmountable difficulties of those who would undertake to establish a universal negative in the sphere of religion.

It will be seen from this general description that Dr. Fitchett has chosen a fruitful subject, and treated it in an able, original, and interesting way. No description, however, can reproduce the brightness of his pages. He is never dull. He never needlessly elaborates a single detail, nor does he lose himself in enumerating

a multiplicity of details. In other words, though he has chosen a large subject, he is sufficiently master of it to present its various parts so as to secure and retain the attention of his readers.

Dr. Fitchett exhibits, of course, the defects of his qualities. We do not care to dwell upon these, but it is obvious that no writer can be at the same time rapid, bright and effective enough to gain the ear of the multitude, and weighty, self-restrained and guarded enough to win the complete assent of the few. Dr. Fitchett is an optimist, *pur sang*. Difficulties in the application of his arguments hardly exist for him. He generalizes very rapidly, and always in his own favour. For example, he admits that Mohammedanism is a missionary religion, but adds that 'the evangelists of Islam use the logic of the sword-blade,' forgetting that in the first instance its victories were not gained *merely* by the sword—no religion ever was, or could be, so propagated—and that in the last century millions of converts to Islam have been won without any use of force. We know that there is a sufficient reply to this argument, and use the illustration only to show that Dr. Fitchett's rapid and popular sketch-work must be judged according to its own aims and merits. A bold outline on a screen which is to impress thousands cannot be elaborated with the minuteness of an etching. It is the rapid and impressive outline which is most needed for the multitude in the exposition and defence of Christianity. In this style of portraiture Dr. Fitchett is a master, and his Fernley Lecture will prove one of the most interesting, valuable and useful of a long and important series.

The Child and Religion. Eleven Essays by Professor H. Jones and others. Edited by Thomas Stephens, B.A. (Williams & Norgate. 5*s*.)

All the issues of human life are involved in the problem of the child. 'The world is renewed by the breath of school children,' but who is wise enough to manage the school in which they are being trained? If any one imagines that the question raised by the title of this book is easy to answer, it shows that he knows very little about religion and less about children. The writers of these essays are under no such delusion. Professor Henry Jones of Glasgow leads us into some of the deepest difficulties of human nature as he discusses 'The Child and Heredity'; Mr. Masterman opens up a whole field of social problems concerning 'The Child and its Environment'; and one knows not whether Dr. Trumbull Ladd, of

Yale University, or Mr. Tennant, the Hulsean Lecturer, has the more thorny subject to handle when the one expounds his views on 'The Child's Capacity for Religion' and the other discourses on 'The Child and Sin.' This, however, may be said. Though the eleven essays in this volume are as different from one another as they could well be, they all afford abundant food for thought, and most of them shed welcome light upon a problem that is always with us, one which in this generation has become more perplexing than ever.

How fundamental are the issues raised by this volume may be illustrated by the fact that Professor Henry Jones teaches that 'even tendencies to good or evil cannot come by inheritance.' Mr. Tennant holds that 'all children inherit the tendencies of the stock,' but that there is no reason to see in them 'any fault or corruption of nature, any sign of dislocation or derangement or deprivation' such as theologians term 'original sin,' whilst Dr. Cynddylan Jones and Dr. Horton uphold what we suppose we must call the old-fashioned doctrine of the necessity of conversion, the depravity of human nature and the need of its radical renewal. Another fundamental line of cleavage is indicated when divines of different Churches discuss the question of baptism and the mode of treating and training baptized children. Dr. George Hill represents the well-known Baptist position on this subject in all its thoroughness, though he states it in very reasonable and moderate fashion. But Paedo-baptists find it difficult to agree. Canon Hensley Henson is an excellent representative of broad and generous Anglicanism, and no one can accuse Dr. Horton of being a narrow or bigoted Congregationalist; but when the two come to discuss the religious training of children we find them poles asunder in the theories upon which such training should be based. Doubtless in practice the divergence would be much smaller, but Canon Henson is not far wrong when he says that 'if the fiction of apostolical succession were cleared out of the controversy' between Anglicans and Dissenters there would still remain a more formidable obstacle to agreement, arising from 'a radical difference of theory as to the relative importance of the individual and the society in the scheme of a rightly ordered Christian life.' Spectators marvel at the tenacity of the two parties in the national education question, and their unwillingness to compromise on the religious difficulty. But like the difference of an iota between Homo-ousion and Homoi-ousion, the apparently narrow rift may imply an impassable chasm of separation. The very word

'undenominationalism' which seems so harmless to one side infuriates the other. This is partly because to orthodox Nonconformists it means only the teaching of fundamental religious tenets upon which all Christians are agreed, whilst to Anglicans it means an indifference to all specific and definite Christian teaching. But the real difference lies deeper still. The theory of the Church, and indeed of religion, which characterizes the High Churchman of to-day, vitally affects his view of the position and training of the child from baptism onwards, and here the Free Churchman is a Dissenter indeed.

But we must not plunge into education controversies. The advantage of this volume is that without entering into them it shows why they exist and why the parties in them are so irreconcilable and often so bitter. It is interesting to turn to the theory of religious education held by Swedenborgians and Jews, as set forth in the two Essays by Mr. Thornton and Rabbi Green. Dr. Agar Beet in the last paper has a comparatively easy task in showing the value of the Bible in children's education. The whole volume is full of stimulating suggestion.

The Westminster Confession of Faith and the Articles of the Church of England. By James Donaldson, M.A., LL.D. (Longmans. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The question of subscription to creeds and articles and the obligations incurred by signatories has become one of immediate interest and practical importance. The *cause célèbre* of the Scottish Churches has stirred many ecclesiastical communities to see if their houses are legally in order. The silent but very significant modification in religious belief produced by the advance of science and other causes has set men asking whether those who subscribe to articles three centuries old and creeds a thousand years older really believe the religious formulae which in theory they accept. Principal Donaldson's inquiry into the legal, moral, and religious aspects of subscription on both sides of the Tweed is therefore very timely. It is hardly necessary to add that it is able and thorough. Our chief complaint concerning it is that it is too thorough in the Straffordian sense. Dr. Donaldson is evidently inclined to think that 'there is not a single priest in the Church of England who is entitled legally to hold a benefice,' and not many in any of the Scotch Churches who genuinely believe the Westminster Confession. But then he says several times that no

one can believe what he does not understand, and as no one can 'understand,' in his sense, the doctrine of the Trinity, we suppose that no one can be said to believe it. Hence all who subscribe a Christian creed are condemned *ipso facto* on the ground that they cannot and do not believe its fundamental doctrine of God. Dr. Donaldson's exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, moreover, turns largely upon the definitions of Tertullian, who, as is well known, was an eloquent and trenchant writer, but neither metaphysician nor theologian. Does any clergyman who accepts the Nicene Creed suppose for a moment that he is bound to hold Tertullian's opinion that the Deity is material, or his crude views of personality, or the theory of 'substance' which is here attributed to Athanasius and those who insisted on the watchword *Homo-ousion*? Dr. Donaldson appears to think that no one can now intelligently pray to 'Our Father, which art in heaven,' because it implies the belief 'that God resides in a region close above our visible sky, and that there are myriads of angels and other beings who have never sinned.' Nor must we pray, 'Give us this day our daily bread,' unless the petition be offered in a morning, whilst the words are always inappropriate in the lips of those whose 'daily food is assured for them by invested capital,' or even of the poor, who 'are generally sure of their food for a week on end at least'! Dr. Donaldson accordingly doubts whether 'a creed is of any use whatever for religious purposes,' and he would lay down as 'the formulae of admission to the Church of Christ' an acceptance of our Lord's two great commandments of love to God and man. Doubtless a Church 'based on this belief and carrying it out in practice would have been an unmingled blessing to the world,' though how the Christian Church would have fared in history had it never possessed any other bond of cohesion than this it would be difficult to say.

We regret that Principal Donaldson should have taken up the extreme position which is defended in this volume, because its rigour and vigour put it out of practical consideration. Moreover, the book contains much that is well worth pondering, as could hardly fail to be the case with a writer of Principal Donaldson's ability and learning. A more moderate and reasonable inquiry into the existing conditions of subscription in the Anglican and Scotch Churches would have been more illuminating and helpful than the chapters before us. But the book is well worth reading by those who cannot sympathize with the author's sweeping denunciation of dogma.

What is Christianity? A Series of Lectures delivered in the Central Hall, Manchester. Two vols. (Charles H. Kelly. 2*s.* 6*d.* each.)

These lectures were delivered, as many of our readers will be aware, during the winter of 1904-5. Vol. I. deals with questions of Christian doctrine; vol. II. with questions of Christian life. The work attempted was well worth doing, and on the whole it seems to us to have been done very well. It was time that Christian apologists, possessing sufficient knowledge, should descend into the market-place, and deal frankly with matters of religion, in language free from uncertainty to the common man. This has been done, and we have not seen a doubtful line in the two volumes. Any one who takes the trouble to master them will be able 'to speak with the enemy in the gate,' and also with the shufflers in religion, of whom there are a great number.

We do not care for everything we read here, e.g. Mr. Adeney's speculation that there may be an infinite number of distinctions in the Godhead, equal in value to those of Father, Son and Spirit; but the clear and fair statements of Mr. W. C. Allen, Dr. W. T. Davison, Dr. Fairbairn, on the Trustworthiness of the Gospel Record, 'What think ye of Christ,' and Miracles, seem to us very cogent and useful. As might have been expected, there is more room for controversy in the matters dealt with in vol. ii. With much that Mr. Keeble says on the subject of war we heartily agree; but how far does he go with the principle of non-resistance? Does he go all the way to the end with Tolstoi? We do not know. Can Love or Justice ever carry a sword? We know what Tolstoi says; but what would Mr. Keeble say?

Mr. Arthur Henderson in his lecture on Christianity and Democracy rather speaks as if the democracy consisted of the wage-earning classes; but of course it includes everybody in the State. We are in profound sympathy with the passion for social redemption which Mr. Henderson and many others are feeling today. The sin, the degradation, the sorrow of every class belong to us all. It is in some sense *my* sin, *my* degradation and sorrow—that is the true Christian feeling. But when Mr. Henderson and others reproach the Churches, as if they were almost entirely responsible for the alienation of the working classes from religion, we think they forget what human nature is on the one side and the other, in the Church and out of it. Religion is an irksome thing, and the ideal Christian life is very hard to pursue; and when the

non-religious working man understands from the lips of his friends that to join any church or to make any profession of religion will be to make him, *ipso facto*, the target of endless reproaches for not leading the ideal life, and to saddle him with the blame of all the irreligion of his neighbours, he will think twice before he becomes a member of any church. And this is what he is doing.

There are many other interesting topics dealt with in these volumes. Enough has been said, perhaps, to show that money would be well spent in the purchase of these volumes by all those who wish to know in what way people are regarding religion at the present time.

The Redemption of the Body. By Wm. Fitzhugh Whitehouse, M.A. (Elliot Stock. 2*s.* net.)

Mr. Whitehouse is described on the title-page as 'Layman of the diocese of New York,' and Dr. Potter, Bishop of New York, writes a short but friendly introduction to the second edition of this little work. It is a monograph on the famous passage, Romans viii. 18–23, and the chief purpose of its argument is to maintain that the crucial word κτίσις is not to be understood of the whole creation, but of the body of man. Mr. Whitehouse does not claim absolute originality for his interpretation; he finds the suggestion of it in a passage of St. Augustine: 'This passage is to be understood in such a way as not to imagine that grief or groaning is to be attributed to trees, or vegetables, or stones, or other created things of this kind; for this is Manichaeism: nor again, may we imagine that holy angels are subject to vanity, and think that they need to be delivered from the bondage of corruption, since they are not liable to corruption; but rather let us, without wronging any one, interpret *all creation* as applied to man himself.' The antithesis—'and not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit'—need not, he thinks, cause any difficulty. In his view, St. Paul first thought of all humanity, and then singled out for emphasis a particular class, which, though already included, might naturally have not been so regarded.'

Mr. Whitehouse writes in a modest, careful, scholarly way; and though he has an immense body of opinion against him, ancient and modern, yet his treatise will certainly invite many to a new consideration of the passage.

The Second Epistle to Timothy. By H. C. G. Moule, D.D. (Religious Tract Society. 2*s.*)

In reading this devotional commentary we are impressed with

the fact that Dr. Moule has entered into the spirit of his theme, and that he has the power to infuse some of that spirit into the minds and hearts of his readers. Selecting one or two verses for exposition in each chapter, the writer devotes forty-eight brief dissertations to elucidate Paul's teaching, which has been proved to be a perennial source of spiritual enlightenment to all seekers after God. Rightly does Dr. Moule characterize his work as 'short devotional studies.' He attempts no elaborate criticism. He approaches this precious 'dying letter' with certain formed and settled convictions about it; he assumes that it is a genuine production, and that it was probably dictated by Paul to the faithful Luke in a Roman prison, not very long before the death of the author as a martyr for his Lord.

Of Dr. Moule's style we can only remark that it is clear, forceful, and vigorous; for example, speaking of Timothy's 'holding straight onward through the word of truth,' he remarks—'He was to "cut a straight line through" that Word, even as the ploughman draws his long furrow true across the breadth of the fertile field. In other words, "the counsel of God," and the whole of it, is to be his meditation and his message, from the first and to the last, whoever around him may still be fighting over words.'

The Truth of Christianity. By Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton. (Wells Gardner. *2s. 6d.*)

There is an attractiveness about this book of Christian evidences which will commend itself to young people by whom dry-as-dust treatises are shunned. The arguments are stated with such clearness that a person who has received but the rudiments of an ordinary education will be able to follow them without any difficulty whatever. The author appeals to our sense of reasonableness, and never errs by overstating his case. He divides his subject into three parts, viz. Natural Religion, the Jewish Religion, and the Christian Religion. Of the last he affirms that while we have very strong external testimony in favour of the authenticity of the Four Gospels, the internal evidence is equally strong. That of St. John is presented with great lucidity; indeed, one of the main features of the book is that while all important arguments are restated in a particularly pleasing form, nothing of redundancy can be discovered. The author, moreover, never loses his balance, never gives us the impression of partiality; and his conclusion is that 'the truth of the Christian religion is extremely probable, because,

to put it shortly, though the difficulties of accepting Christianity are great, the difficulties of rejecting it are far greater.'

Words of Help on Belief and Conduct. Edited by Rev. A. R. Buckland, M.A. (Religious Tract Society. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a series of papers by distinguished leaders of thought of the evangelical type in both the Established and Nonconformist Churches. The subjects embrace those of vital interest to all who ask for guidance upon questions of faith and conduct, and their practical usefulness, as the editor states, 'may not be limited to any one class of readers.'

In literary style these addresses vary considerably, as might be expected from the wide range of topics, which cover almost every aspect of human life. On Reading, Dr. Barber of the Leys tells us to choose our pathway: 'due reading is no stroll in golden slippers; pride in a library is a good thing, modest pride in mental grip of the contents of a library far better.' He thinks it is impossible to recommend generally any one course of reading, and that it is infinitely better for the soul to choose its own pasturage.

We hope young men will read these eminently practical papers, which are published in such a cheap form, for we feel sure they will derive help therefrom.

The Prince of Judah. By Lumen. (Elliot Stock. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

The writer endeavours to prove that the generally accepted story of the return from the Captivity is incorrect. He argues that the Temple could not have been built *before* the walls of the city were restored, and that the error has arisen from 'the failure of our commentators to fix the correct date of the governorship of Nehemiah.' Our author assumes that he has discovered the pedigree of Darius, and on this assumption he bases his claim. The book will stimulate thought on this interesting subject, on which the last words have not yet been said.

BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL.

Life of St. Patrick. By J. B. Bury, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. (Macmillan & Co. 12*s.* net.)

THE mere fact that the name of the learned historian of Greece and of the Later Roman Empire, and editor of what is now unquestionably the standard edition of Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, stands upon the title-page of an historical work affords a sufficient guarantee of its excellence and value. Professor Bury is admittedly among the foremost of living English historical writers, and the volume now under review is worthy of its author, that is to say, it is a fine example of first-rate historical writing. The subject chosen is one of both interest and importance, but full of difficulty. Few great names of the past are more familiar to the present generation than that of St. Patrick, and yet it may be said with tolerable assurance that the story of his life and his actual achievements is, to the great majority, even of well-read people, to all intents and purposes a sealed book; and the reason is not far to seek. The Life of Patrick is, in matter of fact, wrapped in deep obscurity; and any certain knowledge of the actual facts of his career is rendered difficult by reason of the cloud of legend and of myth which has gathered round, only to darken and obscure where it was meant to glorify, the personality and services of the Apostle of Ireland. The very dates of Patrick's birth and death are matters of uncertainty, especially the latter. Common fame has represented him as having passed away in 493 at the supposed age of 120 years, 'like Moses.' This is one computation of St. Patrick's age found in the *Book of Armagh* (Liber Armachanus), in which, however, is also found another and shorter computation which allows to the saint 111 years of life. This whole question, which is just typical of the sort of problem that meets the historian continually in the course of his investigations, is critically discussed by Professor Bury in Excursus 20, and the result to which the inquiry leads him is that Patrick died in 461 at the age of 72. Through the many chronological and other difficulties with which the subject is beset our author skilfully steers his way, and, bring-

ing order out of the somewhat chaotic materials which form the sources of his work, presents his readers with a clear and connected account of the life and labours of St. Patrick. Ireland, Patrick's sphere of God-appointed toil, was in the fifth century a country apart, and lay almost entirely outside of the general life of the West. True, there were links of connexion; that of trade, for instance, was one, and that of religion was another. It is practically certain that before the coming of Palladius and Patrick, Christian communities already existed in Ireland. The evidence upon which this conclusion rests is made the subject of a careful investigation in Excursus 10. But these links were slight; and the religion of Ireland, such as it was, was of an unofficial type, an unorganized extra-Roman Christianity. Professor Bury's careful exposition of the contemporary political and social condition of Ireland is therefore welcome, and most valuable.

The period within which the life-work of Patrick falls, the fifth century, is one of the supremest importance in general European history. The century opened with the fall of Rome before the Visigothic onset, a disaster which was followed, two generations later, by the collapse of the Western Empire. The imperialism of Rome meanwhile was changing its form, the Roman episcopate became a popedom, and upon the wreck of an effete Caesarism a new and more terrible autocracy began to rise. This same century witnessed, too, the first decisive step of the Teuton in the direction of that commanding place in Europe which he was in future to occupy. Last, but by no means least from the standpoint of the work now under review, the fifth century saw Ireland brought within the sphere of Roman influence, a result due to the labours of Patrick more than any other single individual.

Alike in the text and in the appendices of *The Life of St. Patrick* many matters of wide general interest are incidentally, but at the same time carefully, dealt with. Most suggestive, for example, are Professor Bury's remarks upon the contemporary position of the Roman See, the power of which was, as we have indicated above, at this period undergoing a process of rapid development. The appellate jurisdiction of Rome, and the decretals, 'gradually to be converted from letters of advice into letters of command,' are described in a few words, but with admirable clearness and force, as the chief foundations upon which grew up the spiritual empire of Rome. The serious rivalry which, for a few years, Milan threatened to offer to ecclesiastical Rome is also well brought out. Very interesting, too, is the criticism of the common tradition that

Pelagius the heresiarch was a Briton. While admitting the possibility of the view advanced by Zimmer, and followed by Lambert in the recently issued *Protestant Dictionary*, that Pelagius was an Irishman, Professor Bury inclines to the opinion that he belonged to an Irish family settled in Western Britain, and that the name by which he is known to history represents, not the Welsh 'Morgan,' as so often stated, but 'some Irish sea-name such as Muirchu, "hound of the sea."' His characterization of the Pelagian heresy, though brief, is both suggestive and helpful.

The narrative proper occupies, so far as actual amount of subject-matter is concerned, probably less than half of the volume, the remaining portion consisting of three extended Appendices, which from a purely historical point of view are, in some respects, perhaps of even greater value. Appendix A is devoted to an exhaustive and critical survey of the original sources upon which the narrative is based, a piece of work which badly needed doing. Appendices B and C deal critically with the numerous obscure or disputed questions which could not well be discussed in the text. Among the matters thus discussed, by way of illustration and to give some idea of the width of the ground covered, we may name the following:—Excursus 2, Irish Invasions of Britain; 6, The State of Gaul A.D. 409–16; 10, Evidence for Christianity in Ireland before St. Patrick, a subject already alluded to above; 12, The *Senchus Mór*, i.e. the Irish code of law, preserved only in late MSS., 'a work which contains a very ancient code embedded in glosses, commentaries, and accretions'; 16, Appeal to the Roman See. It need scarcely be said that this portion of the volume gives abundant evidence of the author's complete mastery of the data of his subject and his critical insight. Indeed, a careful study of Professor Bury's treatment of his sources will afford excellent training in historical method and criticism to those who have the enthusiasm and perseverance to follow it out in detail. The reader may thus get a glimpse into the interior of an historian's workshop, the value of which cannot be too highly appraised.

Considered as a whole, *The Life of St. Patrick* will, we think, rank higher as history than as biography. For a biographer, Macaulay's amusing remarks with respect to *Furor Biographicus* notwithstanding, sympathy not untouched with enthusiasm appears to be a desideratum. Professor Bury in his preface admits that his 'interest in the subject is purely intellectual'; his book, in consequence, lacks some of the warmth and glow which go to make up a really effective biography. Though we learn what Patrick did,

and the story of his life is laid before us with a clearness and precision hitherto unattained, it can hardly be said that the *man* lives and moves in these pages, interesting as they are. It should, however, not be lost sight of that the available data are of such a character, the traditional Patrick being enwrapped in an atmosphere of myth and marvel, that it would perhaps be hardly possible to base thereon a biography which should be at once effective and authentic. The spirit of the writer is emphatically that of the historian, impartial and quite free from either partisanship or passion, simply anxious to wrest the truth, so far as it can be known, from the mass of myth and legend with which it has been encumbered. This Professor Bury has done with eminent skill, and the Apostle of Ireland has now become an historical character in a sense that he has not been heretofore. We thank Professor Bury for a most able and valuable book, which will, we think, remain the standard work upon the subject for a long time to come. We shall place it, however, among the histories rather than the biographies.

John Wesley. By Rev. Richard Green. (Religious Tract Society. 6*s.* net.)

Mr. Green is an acknowledged expert in all that concerns Wesley's life and times. In his knowledge of Wesley bibliography no living man can pretend to rival him. He has a complete collection of Wesley's works, perhaps the only one ever made. For many years he has put his stores of knowledge at the service of Methodist students, who are all eager to acknowledge the debt they owe to his research as a student and his skill and patient care as a collector. This is the most popular and most attractive volume we have had from his pen. It is a marvel of cheapness, and its two photogravures and twenty-four page illustrations are not the least valuable and instructive part of the work. Mr. Green has sought 'to give prominence to the preparation—divine and human—of a distinguished agent of God, obviously raised up to bring about, in a very remarkable way, the spiritual awakening of this kingdom; possibly, and as many believe, to save it from a descent into a deeper gloom, if not into a dreadful catastrophe. A second object in view has been to bring into relief the courage, the fidelity, but more particularly the unbroken continuity of effort, which characterized Wesley's evangelistic labours.' Mr. Green says that Wesley created nothing. His was the work of revival. 'The problem of the world's regeneration was first wrought out within the

sphere of his own experience. After his own change, when he was able to appreciate his own blindness, sinfulness, and need, he was able to estimate the needs, the blindness, and the sinfulness of others. To open the eyes of men born blind like himself, to lead them to fountains where he himself had washed, was the work to which his life henceforth was consecrated, as these pages are designed to show.'

That is excellently put, and Mr. Green's chapters give weight to every word. Three-fifths of his book deals with 'The Preparation' of Wesley at Epworth; at School and College; in University Life, and in Georgia, each of which stages has its own chapter. Then we study 'The Spiritual Conflict' out of which he emerged with that living faith in Christ which was his inspiration to life-long service. An important chapter on 'The Foundations of Methodism' (1739–1740) brings this first division of the work to a close. The results of the latest research into the Wesley ancestry are incorporated into the first chapter. Many tributes have been paid to Susanna Wesley, but none more graceful than Mr. Green's: 'We must banish all notions of harshness, haste, or irritability of temper in this gracious woman. Calmly, gently, firmly and lovingly she moulded the plastic spirit of each child. Watching the first buddings of intelligent activity, she was beforehand with her gentle guidance, not waiting for a habit to be formed and then with severity correcting it. The rule, if inflexible, was not harshly imposed. Her biographer says, "All her commands were pleasant as *apples of gold in baskets of silver*." The guide and teacher of these little children and growing youths was their best, most loving, and most beloved friend—a wise, sweet, and saintly woman.' Each stage of Wesley's early history is discussed with exact knowledge and sound judgement. 'Wesley's preaching,' Mr. Green says, 'was of a peculiarly effective character. If he lacked Whitefield's dramatic picturesqueness, his style was singularly clear, vivid, and incisive. None could misunderstand him. He denounced sin in terms entirely free from equivocation. He appealed with penetrating closeness to the consciences of his hearers, in a large proportion of whom there was the inevitable response of self-condemnation, so that, under his preaching, men and women were deeply convinced of personal sinfulness.' Wesley did not hide the terrible consequences of sin, yet men could not hear him and 'doubt whether God loved them and desired their salvation; or whether He had opened a way to Himself for all.' The second part of the volume, headed 'The Great Work,' gives a chapter to each decade of Wesley's evangelistic toil. It opens with a somewhat full account of the state of England when the

revival began. Tribute is also paid to Wesley's colleagues. 'Never was a leader in a great enterprise freer from jealousy of any honour which his co-workers gained.' After the first decade the story is told more briefly, but no essential points are overlooked. Tables are given which show Wesley's itinerary in 1760, 1770, 1780, 1790, and the towns at which he preached. These will be studied with the deepest interest. 'The last year' has a too-brief chapter to itself, with a fine illustration of the house at Leatherhead in which he preached his last sermon. The book is written with a catholicity of spirit and a strong faith in the providence and grace of God worthy of Wesley himself. We have all sorrowed with the writer in his recent distressing bereavement, and are devoutly thankful that his own life has been spared.

Edward FitzGerald. By A. C. Benson. English Men of Letters Series. (Macmillan & Co. 2*s.* net.)

FitzGerald will live—if he does live—by virtue of his *Omar* and his Letters. His translations from Aeschylus and Calderon cannot be pronounced successful from any point of view; his *Euphranor* has neither the merits of a Platonic dialogue nor a FitzGeraldine soliloquy, and in the volumes of his works hardly anything else even deserves mention. But fame is capricious, and certainly does not depend upon the number of volumes to which a writer's collected works run, and a critic can no more define the quality which gives long life to a reputation than a physician can say what constitutes the vital energy which gives long life to the bodily constitution. The hold which FitzGerald has gained upon two successive generations depends largely upon the charm of his singular personality. This is to a considerable extent preserved in his Letters, which may undoubtedly be ranked with those of Gray, Cowper, and Lamb as amongst the best in our language. And the remarkable original poem which must still be called a translation of the *Rubá'iyat* of Omar Khayyám has already gathered around it a small literature of commentaries and given its name to more than one literary coterie.

Mr. Benson has portrayed FitzGerald's attractive, though hardly admirable, character with the skill that the readers of his *Rossetti* would expect. The life itself was wholly without incident—that of a recluse, and for the most part an idler. Many a quietly spent life is full of inspiration and instruction, but FitzGerald's was 'not rich in results, not fruitful in example.' He knew and regretted his own weakness, and his irresolution, his 'languid lingering upon the

skirts of life, is not a beautiful nor an admirable thing.' But those who knew him best loved where they could not admire. A man who could gain and keep the friendship of Thackeray, Tennyson, Carlyle, Spedding, Cowell, and others less known to fame, and hold the chief place in the affections of some of the foremost of them, must have possessed qualities at least as valuable as those which enable a business man to stick to his office and make a fortune. Mr. Benson's account of these friendships is full of interest and charm, while he is not blind to the faults which, together with certain rare and altogether admirable virtues, endeared FitzGerald to the few but choice friends who knew him well. Many of Mr. Benson's sentences contain the most delicate and discriminating characterization and kindly criticism. He shows how FitzGerald, 'by his lover-like tenderness of heart, his wistful desire to clasp hands with life,' did, in spite of his melancholy, attain 'a certain gentle and pathetic philosophy,' so that he became 'a sort of sedate Hamlet; the madness that wrought in his brain does not emerge in loud railings, or in tempestuous and brief agonies of desperate action; but it emerges in many gentle gestures and pathetic beckonings, and a tender desire, in a world where so much is dark, that men should cling all together and float into the darkness.' A melancholy outlook upon life indeed; but, as Mr. Benson says, 'There are many who cannot believe and cannot act—and for these, as for FitzGerald, it seems best to hold fast to all that is dear and beautiful.'

Of *Omar* it is impossible to speak briefly and adequately. This 'single, small volume of imperishable quality' speaks for itself to those who know it, whilst to multitudes it will—happily—not speak at all. FitzGerald himself described it in a sentence to a friend: 'It is a desperate sort of thing, unfortunately at the bottom of all thinking men's minds; but made Music of.' Or, as Mr. Benson puts it, 'probably the most beautiful and stately presentation of Agnosticism ever made, with its resultant Epicureanism. The poem cannot be appreciated if it is viewed as a translation; such charm and power as it possesses arise from the fact that FitzGerald passed the Persian quatrains through the alembic of his own sad and tender spirit and gave them forth to the world transmuted. 'What a world it is for sorrow! And how dull it would be if there were no sorrow!' This utterance of FitzGerald is, says Mr. Benson, the mood of Omar, but the English poem is no mere reproduction of the Persian, but a real utterance of a nineteenth-century mind, one which FitzGerald himself, however, would hardly have had the

energy thus to express had he not found in the *Rubâ'iyat* a fitting groundwork and occasion.

The attraction of the solitary, fastidious, affectionate man is felt in every page of this book, which so sympathetically portrays him. A tinge of wistful sadness colours the whole story of his life. 'Given the shy and sensitive temperament, the acute and sceptical mind, the indolent disposition of FitzGerald, and the ample competence which he enjoyed, and the resultant was bound to be what it was.' Perhaps. The ample competence had much to answer for, but the root of the whole trouble lay in the lack of faith. FitzGerald's history shows in what twilight men must move, when they seclude themselves from their fellows and meditate on life with no light of revelation to guide them.

The Life of Nelson. By W. Clark Russell. (S.P.C.K. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

The life is told in 'a series of episodes,' and the style is such as we should expect from Mr. Clark Russell. He goes over the ground rapidly, but with vigorous tread. Some blunt language is used with regard to Lady Hamilton, and the theory of a merely Platonic relation between Nelson and that lady is not considered. Whatever the relation was, it fills one with grief that a name so large and fair should have this smirch upon it. The cause of morality suffers immensely, of course, because some of the greatest men have failed in the common obligations of life; but mischief is added to mischief when apologists seem to suggest that there is one code of morality for the man of genius, and another for 'the man in the street.' Mr. Clark Russell is not one of these; his book is a wholesome, popular, stirring account of the great sailor's life, and may be specially commended as a capital present for a boy in this centenary year of Trafalgar.

Ernest Renan. By William Barry, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Barry has already written a volume on Newman, and now writes what may be regarded as a companion volume on Renan. The companionship of the two men is not obvious at first sight. They were, however, contemporary, and the movement of the two in opposite directions came to its crisis within one and the same week in 1845. In that week Renan turned his back upon the Roman Church, and Newman, three days later, submitted to it at

Littlemore. The collation of the two lives gives occasion to Dr. Barry for many illuminating passages, which, with other good things in his book, would have been more readily accessible if he had given himself the trouble to make an index. The work before us is both biographical and critical. The biography is admirably done. Not the least interesting part of it is the story of the life of the simple peasant family to which Renan belonged, and its pathetic struggle with poverty in his early days. Dr. Barry has used his materials with wise discretion, eliminating much, but retaining all that was necessary. His portraiture of the generous, wise, and altogether noble-hearted Henriette, Renan's sister, is a fascinating picture; and both sister and brother are not only exhibited but live before us in these pages. The critical work is also distinctly good, but not quite so good as the biographical. Dr. Barry's vivid and picturesque style is more suitable for biography than for criticism. His rhetoric, pleasing at first, becomes a little wearisome for lack of variation. One cannot walk on stilts continuously, however exhilarating the sensation at the outset may be; and even the most brilliant epigrams are cheapened by overcrowding. The reader is conscious on every page of the presence of two engrossing personalities: one is Renan and the other is Dr. Barry; and that is distinctly one too many. Apart from its literary style, the criticism is sound and wholesome. Nevertheless Dr. Barry has made no use of nor reference to a very significant document, Renan's preface to his fourteenth edition of the *Life of Jesus*. It is difficult to understand how he can have overlooked that preface, for it introduces what is practically an expurgation by Renan himself of his own famous work in order to make it agreeable 'aux pauvres, aux attristés de ce monde, à ceux que Jésus a le plus aimés. . . . Pour être historien, j'avais dû chercher à peindre un Christ qui eût les traits, la couleur, la physionomie de sa race. Cette fois, c'est un Christ en marbre blanc que je présente au public, un Christ taillé dans un bloc sans tache, un Christ simple et pur comme le sentiment que le créa. Mon Dieu! peut-être est-il ainsi plus vrai.' There is more to the same effect extending to twelve pages of this fourteenth edition, published within a year of the first appearance of the book. Whether for biography or for criticism, this preface is too important to be ignored. It illuminates and enforces Renan's own epitaph upon himself, the most just which ever was written, 'I feel that my life is always controlled by a faith which I possess no longer.'

Life, Religious Opinions, and Experience of Madame Guyon. By Thomas C. Upham. (H. R. Allenson. 6*s*.)

Thomas C. Upham published his *Life of Madame Guyon* in New York nearly sixty years ago; but of this fact no mention is made on the title-page or in the prefaces. Yet it is information which the reader ought to have. Then this book of five hundred pages has no index or table of contents. Yet there would have been no difficulty in supplying either, or both. We wonder why requirements so obvious as these were not attended to. Turning to the work itself, it will be found full of interest for all those who care about the spiritual life. Endowed with beauty and wit, and possessing singular charm of manner, Madame Guyon had also as much practical ability as the famous Santa Teresa; but, as Mr. Inge in his Introduction says, it was her ambition to be a saint. It is perhaps too earthly a term to be applied to that ardour of soul with which from childhood to old age she sought after holiness. Through disappointment and suffering, through misrepresentation and persecution, she held on her way. There are several references to Madame Guyon in Wesley's works not wholly favourable. He thought her deceived in many things. But the closing sentence of the preface to the Extract of her Life, which he published, contains a judgement which all must ratify who read this book: 'Upon the whole, I know not whether we may not search many centuries to find another woman who was such a pattern of true holiness.'

There is truth, no doubt, in what Vaughan says (*Hours with the Mystics*): 'Speaking generally, it may be said that France exhibits the mysticism of sentiment; Germany, the mysticism of thought'; but, at any rate, in the case of Madame Guyon it was united with ceaseless activity in endeavouring to do good. Of course, she was persecuted. She had not much of the accent of the Catholic devout. If she was not Protestant in her utterances, she was so, if the paradox may be allowed, in her silences. Her teaching on Prayer and on Disinterested Love, i.e. the love of the Divine Being, apart from the hope of heaven, for that which He is in Himself, proved distasteful to Louis XIV., that gorgeous libertine and faithful son of the Church; and when her influence began to spread in aristocratic circles, especially amongst ladies, the celebrated Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, was summoned to assail her. But the duel could not be a fair one; and a very interesting portion of this book deals with the chivalrous intervention of Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambray, on her behalf. Madame Guyon, however, suffered

imprisonment for several years, and for a considerable part of the time her confinement was absolutely solitary. When, in failing health, she was released, she was banished to the province of Blois for the remainder of her life. Here she died in 1717 at the age of sixty-nine. In her unselfish goodness and purity she reminds us of Browning's line—

'My flower,
My rose, I gather for the breast of God.'

Arthur Moorhouse: Memories and Aftermath. Edited by J. Anthony Barnes. (Charles H. Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

This memorial of the Rev. Arthur Moorhouse will be welcome to his friends. It consists of six-score pages of biography, skilfully put together by Mr. J. Anthony Barnes, and two hundred pages of literary remains, varied in both character and quality, but illustrative of the man who produced them. There are two pleasantly written articles on the Arthurian story, which was perhaps the central point of attraction in English literature to Mr. Moorhouse. They were first printed in this REVIEW ten years ago, and attracted attention at the time as vigorous in their style and full of promise for the future. These are followed by four brief homiletical lectures on Elijah, by three sermons of an edifying type, by a communion address prepared for the Didsbury students, but through the sudden death of the author never delivered, and by a paper on pulpit prayers, with a model prayer, of which parts are beautiful. In the case of several of these documents all the materials available to the editor were verbatim reports, or notes that possibly had not received their final shape at the hands of their composer. Had he been able to revise and re-set them, their phraseology and connexions would have become a legitimate matter for investigation. As it is, they must be treated sacredly, as a few undesigned and unadorned products of a career that was cut short suddenly before its prime; and as such, they will be valued by all who knew their author, the strenuousness of his right intentions, or his headlong devotion to what he deemed duty or truth.

Arthur Moorhouse was born near Huddersfield in the second month of 1865. Fifteen years later he was apprenticed as a pupil-teacher in a Board School, but shortly after, his course was diverted to St. Andrews, whither he went as secretary to Professor Meiklejohn. The opportunity of further study thus afforded was eagerly seized, and in due time he graduated in Arts and in Divinity. In 1888 he was accepted as a candidate for the ministry. After a year as a

student at Headingley, he was promoted to the assistant-tutorship. His circuit life commenced in 1893, and was spent in succession at Lincoln, Sydenham, Harrogate, and Eccles. Ten years later he was appointed to the tutorship at Didsbury in Old Testament languages and literature, with responsibility also for the instruction in philosophy and English literature. On January 20, 1905, he returned from a morning's work of exceptional brightness in his classroom, and barely reached his home before he fell down dead. His heart had for some time been preyed upon by an insidious and unsuspected disease; and in a moment 'he was not, for God took him.'

In so brief and circumscribed a career, beyond the tragedy of its close there was little of incident that was noteworthy except to the circle of Mr. Moorhouse's personal friends. He died in the midst of preparation for work yet to come, cut off in the very hour when the harness was ceasing to chafe. As to what he actually did, he shone especially in two departments of service. His early training helped to make him an admirable conductor of classes for Sunday-school teachers; and his preaching in his later years was simple, devout, and effective. It is easy to imagine what he would have been had his powers been exercised and his spirit mellowed by the passing of another score of years. But, as he was, his memory will be most cherished by those who knew him best. And for this appropriate memorial, well planned and well edited by one of the closest of his friends, they all will be grateful.

Socrates. By Rev. J. T. Forbes, M.A. (T. & T. Clark. 3*s.*)

It would not be uninstructive to imagine a case for trial, after the fashion of procedure in a modern law court, the object of which should be to decide the rightful ownership of ideas found in Socrates, Plato, Xenophon and Aristotle. The procedure would no doubt be embarrassed by one element quite foreign to modern suits. It would have to deal with people who had not been stealing one another's ideas, but on the contrary had apparently been attributing their own ideas to another. The question for the jury would be: How much that goes to the credit of Socrates in the writings of the others is rightly his, and how much belongs in fact to the too generous disciples themselves? It is probable that when the case came on for trial some of the evidence would be ruled out of court as being no evidence at all, and that some of the writers who have thought themselves judges would be found to be merely special pleaders. A literary critic is by no means necessarily acquainted with the laws of

evidence, nor is he always aware of his own deficiencies in that respect. Mr. Forbes, however, would no doubt be welcomed as a good witness. He recognizes the intricacies of the case, and proceeds judicially. After all, it perhaps does not matter very much who is the originator of ideas if the ideas themselves are true. But the habit of our times is to seek for historical accuracy as well as for ideal truth. That is just where our habit is different from that of ancient writers. Mr. Forbes is an excellent guide. His only fault is that, like some other guides, he knows too much, or at all events attempts to impart too much knowledge within the space at his disposal. His historical introduction is too closely packed in the fifty pages available. In later chapters, where he has been able to work on an ampler scale, he is admirable. His analysis of the Socratic method, and his exposition of the Socratic teaching, are alike masterly. There is neither too much nor too little for a just appreciation of the man and his contemporaries. Any intelligent reader who will study this book and then proceed to Jowett's *Plato* will have before him a most fascinating course of study for the winter months. We ought to add that Mr. Forbes' index is a piece of work which is singularly perfect.

The Progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire. By J. P. Mahaffy, C.V.O., D.D., D.C.L. (Chicago: The University Press. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 5*s*.)

This collection of six lectures is passing dear at a crown. From the brilliant professor, who can speak with authority on any period of Greek history or literature, we expected great things when he promised discourses on the period which he has made especially his own. Our expectations are the measure of the disappointment ultimately realized. The *obiter dicta* of a first-rate authority on his own subject will always be welcomed by students; and the general reader will of course find plenty of instructive and brightly written matter. But precious space is perpetually wasted on irrelevant incursions into modern politics and other things on which Professor Mahaffy is no more a specialist than the rest of us. The subject is so fascinating, so important, and to most people so new, that we had the right to demand more from a man whose original contributions are so valuable. The story of the extension of the Greek language, and its transformation from the wonderful classic tongue into the equally wonderful world-

language in which the Greek Bible was written and the gospel preached to the Roman Empire, would alone have given a worthy subject for as large a book as we have here, and few men could have done it better. As it is, we must go to Thumb, Deissmann, Krumbacher and other Germans for the information a scholar needs, and the English general reader must wait still for a popular account of this momentous development. One or two detailed remarks must close this notice. Professor Mahaffy positively allows himself (p. 114) to sneer at Catullus, whose modicum of 'quasi-inspiration' is traced to Hellenist sources. '*Quasi*-inspiration' indeed! Such a judgement on one of the world's greatest lyrical poets is a sad blot on a page which ends with a most true and well-put estimate of the noblest Hellenist literature, as exemplified in the gems of St. Luke's Gospel. On the language of the New Testament (which, by the way, contains no 'Book of Revelations'), Professor Mahaffy has some excellent things to say; but he goes much too far in suggesting that our Lord's 'public teaching' and His 'discussions with the Pharisees . . . were certainly carried on in Greek.' We welcome, however, this notable accession to the ranks of those who claim a large part for Greek in the speech of our Lord's circle. Finally, we must note, as a very unfortunate policy, Professor Mahaffy's dismissal of the question of Buddhist propaganda in Syria. To say as much, or as little, as he says on pp. 98 and 100 is very unfair. Probably the Greek expert does not know that great Oriental experts, such as Professor Hopkins of Yale, have reduced to absurdly small proportions the amount of genuine coincidence between Buddhist and Christian origins. We are sorry not to be able to speak more heartily of an interesting little book by a veteran scholar. It is with himself that we compare him, and what in him is so disappointing would in most men be meritorious.

GENERAL.

Ideals and Realities of Russian Literature. By P. Kropotkin. (Duckworth & Co. *7s. 6d.* net.)

To all students of Russia this fine work is essential and invaluable. It consists of a series of illuminating studies of Russian writers, with their work, covering the last century. Prince Kropotkin is well known in this country as an author, a scholar, a patriot whose knowledge of Russia is unequalled, and who reflects in his books all that is best and noblest in the life of his unhappy country. This volume originated in a course of lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute, Boston; and it will be greatly to the advantage of the reading public that these studies have been published in permanent form.

With the exception of three or four writers, little Russian literature has been translated into English; and yet, as the author says, 'it is a rich mine of original poetic thought. It has a freshness and youthfulness which are not to be found, to the same extent, in the older literatures. It has, moreover, a sincerity and simplicity of expression which render it all the more attractive to the mind that has grown sick of literary artificiality. And it has this distinctive feature, that it brings within the domain of Art—the poem, the novel, the drama—nearly all those questions, social and political, which in Western Europe and America, at least in our generation, are discussed chiefly in the political writings of the day, but seldom in literature.'

To understand Russia apart from the study of its literature is impossible. In Russia there is no open political life, and in literature alone have the best aspirations and ideals of the nation found expression, and it has been profoundly influential in moulding what is noblest in the character of the youthful generation, whose power is beginning to assert itself despite the repressive energy of the oligarchy. The works of Tolstoi, Turgenieff, Gogol, Dostoyevsky and others have been 'real stepping-stones in the development of Russian youth during the last fifty years.' The record is a painful one. The autocracy has treated infamously literary men. Take the case of Dostoyevsky, for instance. This able writer, in 1849,

for criticising the Russian Church and State, and for taking part in a secret meeting, was arrested, tried, with closed doors, and condemned to death. He was taken to a public square, placed on a scaffold under a gibbet, to listen there to his death-sentence, and only at the last moment came a message from the Tsar bringing a pardon. Three days later he was transported to Siberia and locked up in a hard-labour prison at Omsk. Here for some minor offence he was subjected to the terrible punishment of the cat-o'-nine-tails, which brought on epilepsy, from which he ever after suffered.

In 1859 this gifted writer was pardoned and allowed to return to Russia. He died in 1883. This is only a sample of the systematic cruelty with which cultured voices, if they dared to breathe a sentence which could be interpreted as antagonistic to the bureaucracy, or as in sympathy with aspirations after constitutional liberty, were stifled. Tolstoi is almost alone in successfully defying the whole arsenal of punishments with which successive Tsars have terrorized literature; but even he has not been famous enough to escape the ban of the Orthodox Church!

The eternal muffled note of sadness rings out of the work of Russia's great authors,—it is the sadness of despair, but in its very heart is the deeper, richer note of hope; it rings out to-day not the doom of liberty, but the doom of tyranny. And the prayer of Gorky seems near an answer—'Oh, for a man, firm and loving, with a loving heart, and a powerful, all-embracing mind! In the stuffy atmosphere of shameful silence his prophetic words would resound like an alarum bell, and perhaps the mean souls of the living-dead would shiver.' We heartily commend Prince Kropotkin's fascinating and instructive book.

With Russian, Japanese, and Chunchus. By Ernest Brindle. (John Murray. 6*s.* net.)

These experiences of an Englishman during the Russo-Japanese War are interesting reading. There are graphic descriptions of battle and siege. The awful tragedy of this monstrous conflict fills us with pain as we witness it in these pages. But there is many a gleam of nobility and rare heroism and magnanimity to light up the sombre record. The superiority of the Japanese in guns and men and generalship is apparent, and the chivalry displayed by them to fallen foes is one of the fine traits that characterize this remarkable people. The Japanese soldier is good-tempered, kind-hearted, and takes a delight in his work. Even the Russians like him, and

fraternization between combatants is not uncommon. His fighting qualities are unmistakable, but he does not love war. 'He would rather follow the arts of peace than the art of war, although at the call of duty he relinquishes without a murmur all personal interests, and has but one devotion—and that is to the flag of his country.'

Accepting Mr. Brindle's statement as accurate, that 'the war started with Russia in a state of total unpreparedness, and with only a few regiments of Siberian troops in Manchuria to take the field,' we cannot wonder at the course which the war has taken; especially when on the other side there were 'readiness, complete efficiency in all departments, patriotic determination, a definite plan of campaign thought out in every particular, and an army fighting for the attainment of an object, the righteousness of which was believed in by every man in Japan.' The Russian soldier is marked by stubborn doggedness, but lacks the dash and supple initiative that characterize the Japanese. 'He is animated more by fear of, than liking for, his officers,' and, in this war, the inspiration that possesses men who fight for a great cause that is dearer than life is entirely absent. He does what he is drilled to do, and that is all. And the army has not escaped the anarchic spirit that is rife in the Russian nation. 'The spirit of vague unrest,' Mr. Brindle says, 'crept into the Russian army with the advent of the news of the fall of Port Arthur, and the domestic strife in Russia,' so that General Kuropatkin had to cope with it, and with recalcitrant subordinates. Under such conditions only defeat could be expected.

The author has strong views on the necessity for the renewal of the alliance between Great Britain and Japan, now happily accomplished, if a mutual blow is not to be struck at our power in the Far East, and if Japan is to achieve her peaceful mission, at the close of the war, to lead the way in the development of the boundless resources of the Chinese Empire for the benefit of the world.

A Peculiar People: The Doukhobórs. By Aylmer Maude. (Grant Richards. 6*s.* net.)

The Doukhobórs are one of the numerous nonconformist bodies in Russia. Mr. Aylmer Maude has given us in his volume a well-informed, vividly illustrated, and deeply interesting account of their rise about the middle of the eighteenth century in the Ukraine, their history, which is one of many vicissitudes and much persecution, their religious tenets, which are extremely mystical, their communist and non-resistance principles, their collective refusal of military service, their harrying by Russian troops, the breaking up of their

homes by the Government, and their scattering among her Georgians and other tribes, and their migration to escape from the iron hand of the Czar to Canada. It is a sad story, and illustrates the cruel intolerance of the Orthodox Greek Church, and the blind folly of the autocracy in tormenting beyond all endurance, flogging, imprisoning, exiling for long years, a peace-loving and industrious people, and driving a great part of them, in 1899–1900, to find a home where thought might breathe beyond the seas on British territory.

The Doukhobórs have affinities with Quakerism—in the doctrines of 'the inward light,' and in their rejection of the sacraments of the Church, and with Tolstoyism in their socialistic views. At certain periods of their history they are credited with having practised a low morality, and stained their religious rites with cruelty. But the evidence of this comes from tainted sources.

The branch of this sect, numbering some 6,000 souls, settled in Canada, in three colonies in the far North-West, presents one of the most remarkable economic and social experiments now proceeding within the confines of the British Empire. They are communists; there is communal ownership of property, of stock, of machinery, of finance. Members of the community working away from home, at railway construction, saw-mills, &c., pay all their wages into the common fund, used as capital for the exploitation of the land. They are farmers, growing wheat and flax, and raising cattle; they are brick and tile makers, and are developing other industries. They are prosperous and contented under the leadership of Peter Verigen, a man of genius, who suffered fifteen years' exile for his views. Before Mr. Verigen arrived they were disturbed by an outbreak of religious fanaticism, accompanied by pilgrimages, the liberation of their cattle, the burning of their implements and clothing, and other singular phenomena. Since he has taken his place at their head there has been a comparative absence of freaks of this kind. Their profound ignorance and superstition are gradually disappearing. There is very little crime among them. They are honest and hospitable and sober, and have won the confidence of Canadians and Colonists surrounding them.

The faults of Mr. Aylmer Maude's book are that it is verbose, and blows hot and cold. The omission of the first chapter, which had been printed separately, the views of which he now to a large extent abandons, would have improved the book. Still, this is a valuable contribution to the history of autocratic Russia, and of a primitive people strong enough to resist tyranny.

Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning. By John Edwin Sandys, Litt.D. (Cambridge University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Some months ago readers of THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW were introduced to the *History of Classical Scholarship*, written by Dr. Sandys. They will now be interested to know that the learned author has published the above volume as a convenient sequel to the earlier work, pending the preparation of the larger study which will bring down the survey of classical scholarship from the Revival of Learning to the present day. The book contains seven delightful lectures delivered at Harvard in the spring of this year. Though the subjects appeal primarily to lovers of the classics, yet the style is so graceful and the treatment illustrated by so many fascinating incidents, that even those who have only a general interest in the humanist developments of the Renaissance will find pleasure in these studies. Dr. Sandys has a happy gift of grouping his facts so as to bring out the links and associations which bind together places and times separated by great distances; while he contributes many picturesque touches to the story of scholarship, investing with dignity and life individuals known only as mere names by most people. Thus the first lecture, which treats of Petrarch and Boccaccio, brings these distinguished scholars before us in their less familiar character as students of the Latin Classics. The former, who was the discoverer of the *Pro Archia* of Cicero and also the letters to Atticus, inspired Boccaccio with his own enthusiasm for the Latin Classics. Dr. Sandys, in relating the story of Petrarch's ascent of Mount Ventoux, a mountain 6,000 feet high, north-east of Avignon, mentions how this expedition, inspired by Livy and accompanied by reminiscences of Ovid and Virgil, culminated in a quotation from the *Confessions* of Augustine, and maintains that this relapse into the mediaeval mood does not deprive Petrarch of his right to be described as 'the first modern man.' It is curious to note how the *Confessions* influenced another of the Renaissance scholars, Maffeo Vegio, who transferred his adoration from Virgil to St. Augustine, and found pleasure in the cult of St. Monica.

The discovery of ancient MSS. is the theme of another lecture, which, *inter alia*, traces the journeys of that eager and insatiable manuscript-hunter, Poggio Bracciolini. Another lecture on the theory of education as expounded by Vergerio, Lionardo Bruni, Aeneas Sylvius and others is fitly succeeded by one on the academies of Florence, Venice, Naples and Rome. As an example of the author's skill in investing his theme with popular interest, we may select his

lecture on 'The Homes of Humanism,' which conducts the reader on a kind of tour through Italy in search of the remains, portraits, monuments and MSS. of the humanists. Beginning at Florence, where we look into the Church of Santa Maria Novella with its glorious fresco, which sums up the educational and theological system of the Middle Ages, the Convent of San Spirito, where Niccolo Niccoli lies buried, the great Medicean Library, and many another memorial of the Renaissance, we pass by way of Arezzo to Siena and thence to Venice, famous for Bessarion's great library, and home of the Aldine Press. From there we wend our way in order to Padua, where the relics of Livy's history are stored; to Verona, where are the MSS. of Catullus and Cicero; to Como, Milan, Lodi, Mantua, Ferrara, Bologna, Naples—each with its special treasures—and finally to Rome, whither all roads lead. Here we view the monuments of the popes and scholars who felt the impetus of the great Revival, beginning with Nicolas V. and ending with Clement VII., in whose pontificate the sack of Rome took place,—that terrible event which quenched the Revival of learning and, according to Erasmus, was the fall not of a city, but of the world. There is a brilliant discourse on Ciceronianism—that curious controversy conducted by the scholars of the day on the merits of Cicero's style—followed by one on the study of Greek in the Middle Ages. Dr. Sandys dispels the idea that the fall of Constantinople was the cause of the revival of Greek studies in the West, pointing out that exactly a century before, Petrarch possessed a manuscript of Homer, that Boccaccio was a student of Greek; and that half a century before, Greek was taught in Florence by that enthusiastic professor, Chrysoloras. This lecture further gives a charming sketch of Erasmus, especially in his connexion with Cambridge, and of the universities of the Netherlands, with which the founding of Boston and Harvard stands historically connected. Dr. Sandys quotes Erasmus' advice to Margaret More, and we may fitly close our notice with the words of the great humanist: 'The Latins have onlie shallow Rivulets: the Greeks, copious Rivers running over sands of gold. Read *Plato*, he wrote on marble with a Diamond: but above alle read the New Testament. 'Tis the Key of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

The Shadow of Rome. By H. C. Pedder. (Elliot Stock. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This book, on a subject which concerns all Englishmen, is written with much moderation and charity. Mr. Pedder uses no harsh

terms: he never 'raises his voice'; he is far from being a blind, undistinguishing opponent of the Romish Church; but he is justly afraid lest, through the supineness of Protestants, that Church should push her way to greater influence, even a determining influence in the affairs of the nation. It is not her doctrine or ritual that he assails,—but Rome as a political force, as the enemy of the liberties of mankind. He reminds us, and it cannot be too often repeated, that *Rome is the same.* She claims now whatever she has claimed, and condemns whatever she has condemned. She still proclaims the duty of persecution, and affirms her right to make use of 'the secular arm' to repress heresy; and she still anathematizes as pestilent doctrine all that we mean by liberty of conscience. Let Englishmen look to it. There is much food for reflection in this fair and thoughtful book.

The Calvert Scientific Exploring Expedition. Compiled by J. G. Hill. (Philip & Son. 2*s.*)

This expedition was organized in the year 1896 to explore as much as might be of the 260,000 square miles of Central Australia, as yet unmapped and unsurveyed. But successive misfortunes overtook the little band of brave men. The heat, the drought, the sand foiled all their careful preparation. After five months, everything but food and a few camels, all instruments, ammunition, specimens collected, had to be abandoned. Two of the party of seven went on a flying trip of eighty miles, and never returned; and much of this unpretending narrative is occupied with the efforts made to discover them. As was said, when seven months afterwards the remains of these two—C. F. Wells and G. L. Jones—were interred at Adelaide: 'It is the old, old story of the advance guard of the race, toiling with bleeding feet in the desert ways, and toiling often to death that the millions might safely follow.'

The Missing Elisabeth. By Adeline Sergeant. (6*s.*)
The Phantom Torpedo-Boats. By Allen Upward. (6*s.*)
When a Girl's Engaged. By Hope Merrick. (3*s.* 6*d.*)
Taken from the Enemy. By Henry Newbolt. (1*s.*)
(Chatto & Windus.)

Miss Sergeant's book will be welcomed as a memorial volume. She never wrote anything better worth reading. The story is somewhat tragical, but the interest is well sustained and the two

heroines are cleverly sketched. It is a tale that ought to have a good circulation.

The Phantom Torpedo-Boats professes to describe the events that led up to the notorious attack on the Hull fishing fleet at the Dogger Bank. Monsieur V. and his intrigues in the interest of peace furnish material for an exciting story which centres round St. Petersburg and Tokio. The way in which the famous secret agent is matched against the Russian Princess Y. gives rise to some thrilling situations, which Allen Upward knows how to turn to the best account.

When a Girl's Engaged rather taxes one's patience at the beginning, but it becomes natural and entertaining when the two friends change lovers at Tunbridge Wells. It is an unexpected end to their quarrels, but it is eminently satisfactory and very amusing.

Taken from the Enemy is a cheap edition of a popular tale. A plot to set Napoleon free from St. Helena is the groundwork of the story. A young British naval officer is unconsciously drawn into the net through his love for Madame de Montaut. He is a manly fellow, and one is relieved to find that he escapes from the meshes without suffering serious harm.

The Class-Leader at Work. By Thomas Barclay. (Charles H. Kelly. *2s. 6d.* net.)

The leaders of Methodism are its lay pastors, on whom rests the heavy responsibility of caring for the spiritual interests of the same groups of individuals and maintaining the power and interest of their weekly meeting year after year. That is no easy task, but there are hosts of men and women in Methodism who have accomplished it. This book will multiply the number. It is a school for leaders; a treasure-house of hints for every kind of class, not least for those nurseries of our Church, its Junior Society classes. Mr. Barclay has gathered his material from all sources, chiefly from the Class-Leaders' Column of the *Methodist Times*, but he has been able to secure other valuable contributions to enrich his store. Every reader of this book will be thankful for it. It is not easy to think of any problem of a leader's work on which some helpful light is not thrown in its pages.

A Daily Message from many Minds: Thoughts for the Quiet Hour. (Allenson. *2s. 6d.*)

The catholicity of the compiler of this devotional volume is seen in the wide range of authors whose thoughts are given us. From

Marcus Aurelius to Phillips Brooks we may expect to find all that is best and noblest in literature, but the full flavour of Christian teaching is exhibited in the choice excerpts from such writers as Miss Havergal, Christina Rossetti, Drummond, Faber, Keble and our own Wesley. Though there are many books of this class, we can heartily commend this one to all who desire daily spiritual help.

Short Prayers and Counsels for Soldiers. (S.P.C.K. 2*d.*)
Thoughts and Prayers for Young Men. (S.P.C.K. 3*d.*)

The first of these booklets is an excellent little manual for soldiers in the field. All is brief, manly, and Christian. If any of our readers have a soldier friend, let them send him a copy, and ask him to keep it inside his tunic.

The second is very useful in its design. It is intended for those who desire to be prepared for 'Holy Orders.' Some such work on a more extended scale might be of great service to those who are 'thinking of the ministry,' and would enable them to think more deeply.

My Bible Story Book. By Kate T. Sizer. (Charles H. Kelly. 2*s.*)

This book contains forty-five stories from the Old and New Testaments, told with simplicity and brevity by Miss Kate Sizer. It is a book children can understand, and will like to have. There are many pictures.

We have also Received—

Aurora Leigh. By E. B. Browning, in Mr. H. R. Allenson's sixpenny series.
Emerson's Works. Vol. V. (York Library.)
The Review of Reviews. July-Sept. (Mowbray House. 6*d.*)
The Rapid Review. July-Sept. (Pearson. 6*d.*)

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 Quarterly Review (July–October) opens with an article on *The School for Critics*, by Dr. W. Barry, in which that versatile and brilliant writer, taking as his text Professor Saintsbury's *History of Criticism and Literary Taste in Europe*, and Professor Butcher's edition of Aristotle's *Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, succinctly and beautifully traces the development and the variations of literary criticism, and discusses the rival claims of the didactic and impressionist schools. He agrees with Saintsbury in accepting Pater's dictum that the three stages of the critic's duty are 'to feel the virtue of the poet or the painter, to disengage it, to set it forth,' but he cannot admit that the critic's duty ends here. 'The end' of criticism 'is revelation of the Beautiful; but it must not pause till it has climbed the summits and caught a glimpse of "the First and only Fair."' The True and the Good, as well as the Beautiful, must be implicit if not explicit in 'every literature by which man lives; and it is the critic's duty to set them in the fairest light.' Dante, he thinks, 'combines them all more clearly to our sense than Greek or even English singers.' This fine article is followed by a posthumous Lecture on *Historical Ethics*, which would have been more accurately entitled *The Ethics of History*, by Bishop Creighton, who pleads for a recognition in our historical judgements of the distinction between public and private morality, and for 'as much casuistry in history as will serve to distinguish between venial and mortal sins.' Mrs. Creighton, who writes an introductory note, says that to the bishop 'the study of history was only part of the study of life, and must be approached in the same spirit.' The moral law, to him, was inflexible, and its standard must on no account and in no case be lowered; but 'in applying these to individual men he never could forget they were men like himself, and that his first business was to understand them—an end which could not be attained without sympathy.' Another article of more than passing interest affords Professor Elton an opportunity of

dealing with an enormous mass of *Recent Shakespeare Criticism*. Most of it, however, is, happily, devoted to a sympathetic and detailed estimate of Dr. Georg Brandes' 'great work,' and Professor Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*, which 'revives the strictly philosophical criticism of Shakespeare which, in this country, has lapsed since the time of Coleridge.' The writer thinks that 'the most firmly and masculinely written of Mr. Bradley's chapters are those on "Macbeth"; those on "Lear" best show all his gifts.' He is 'at his best when describing Hamlet's melancholy,' though his reviewer does not regard Hamlet's melancholy as the key to his character. 'Hamlet, we would ourselves say, is rather touched than constituted by this mood; touched only at intervals, and chiefly in the fourth act, when he feels himself the prey of "bestial oblivion."' Nevertheless, Professor Bradley's view is regarded by the writer as a valuable corrective of 'the Schlegel-Coleridge theory, according to which Hamlet suffered from a combination of over-thinking and palsied will.'

Two articles in **The Edinburgh** (July–October) are conspicuous even in a number of exceptional interest. *Historical Christianity* is a review of Harnack's latest volumes, *Reden und Aufsätze*, a miscellaneous collection of articles which have appeared in German periodicals during the past twenty years, and 'illustrate Harnack's standpoint from various sides, and more fully' than his famous *Wesen*. The subjects dealt with are Legend as a source of History, Christianity and History, The Apostles' Creed, Ritschl and his School, &c., &c. The reviewer thinks that 'the history of Christianity as a whole indicates two conclusions: 1. That the lines on which mankind is advancing are not those of ecclesiastical or dogmatic Christianity; 2. That the gospel is independent of these lines, that it is passing beyond and will survive them.' He is sanguine as to the future of religion. 'While women are loved, and men achieve, and children link heart to heart as they pass the lamp of life with increase from generation to generation, its interests are secure.' To idealize is, according to him, the one thing needful; and in the present revival of idealism he finds another ground of hope. 'That this sense of the ideal is being developed among us, that the horizons of life are becoming more luminous, that the field of moral effort is enlarging its borders, that we are coming to think more worthily of God and man —this may inspire us with courage and hope.' In *A Modern Utopia* another writer compares Mr. Wells's recent work with the Utopias of the past,—Plato's, More's, Bacon's, Bellamy's, &c. Mr. Wells is declared to surpass all his predecessors except Plato 'in the ingenuity with which he contrives to throw upon his work the changing light of different personalities.' The curious thing is that Englishmen, who are supposed to be exclusively practical, should have excelled all other moderns as utopists. And Mr. Wells is English 'from the bottom of his soul to the tip of his pen.' But that is not to say that he is nothing if not practical. 'He is a typical combination of stern common sense and glowing idealism, of an exacting love of truth and a profound religious

instinct.' And he is not only of our race but of our time. He is a man of science, and in love with practical reform. Not only has he 'dreamed the dream of his generation': 'he has preached a new crusade to a new chivalry.' His book is 'a call to action, and a plan for the march'; the vital part of his proposal being that 'we should band ourselves to make the majority of men what only the small minority can be now.'

Mrs. Humphry Ward is severely handled in the July number of **Blackwood** by a writer who, while admiring her talents as a novelist, finds her latest work, *The Marriage of William Ashe*, 'neither wholesome nor agreeable.' After a detailed analysis of the plot and characters, we are told, in words which would apply to much of the fiction of the day, that 'there is not a respectable character in the story who is allowed to have the least influence over its course. The few who are credited with any virtues at all are quite subordinate in importance, and helpless in their insignificance. There is neither art nor common sense in delineating social or matrimonial life without any ray of light which can relieve the sombre monotony of vicious extravagance and incessant excitement, untempered by any sense of personal dignity or self-control. The whole thing is overdone—as much overdone as the agonies of an agnostic parson in a former work by the same authoress.'

'Is Scotland Decadent?' asks 'Malagrowther' in **The National Review** for August, and answers the question in an analysis of the vulgarizing tendencies at work beyond the border which, but for the prudent pseudonym assumed, would have brought vials of wrath upon the writer's head. Scotland, he says, lives on its past *plus* Mr. Andrew Carnegie and Sir Thomas Lipton. The Presbyterian Churches are all 'run' by the mammon-worshippers whom they perfunctorily denounce. The Episcopal is the only Church which counts from the standpoint of fashion, and it is merely a sect of about 30,000 adherents. The working people stand aloof from them all, and are absorbed by Socialism of the *Clarion* type. The country towns are now 'centres of the mining industry, and are notable mainly for smoke, dirt, and maniacal drinking. The villages are simply recruiting grounds for the slums of the cities. There is nothing bearing the semblance of society in either the one or the other.' There are only two men of letters left, it appears, in Scotland, Mr. Neil Munro, the novelist, and Mr. J. H. Millar, 'whose *Literary History of Scotland* shows that his country still possesses one critic who can write English that is free from solecisms, and who has the courage to say what he thinks of the snivel and drivel of the Kail-yard.' Newspapers have taken the place of literature, and they are 'not only excellent but super-excellent.' Never was the country so wealthy, but the gulf between rich and poor is wider than ever. Both the old gaiety and the old earnestness of the nation have disappeared. Whether they will reappear after a process of social transformation remains to be seen. At present Scotland is the dreary paradise of bourgeois prosperity and sectarianism, a country of 15 sects, 3,000 churches, 300 bowling greens, 250 golf courses—and no poet.'

In the **Contemporary** for August, M. Paul Sabatier gives a gracefully written and suggestive account of the recent moral and religious movements in France. 'France, to-day,' says this delightful writer, 'is profoundly different from the France of ten years ago.' There has been a great moral awakening, as witness *l'Union pour l'Action Morale* associated with the name of M. Paul Desjardins. There is also a real religious movement in the bosom of the Catholic Church—represented by such men as l'Abbé Loisy, who are aiming, among other things, to 'place religion on a scientific basis.' Even free-thinkers have 'taken the root sayings of Jesus to heart.' To all classes, inside the churches and outside, religion appears 'less and less as a revealed metaphysic, more and more as a tie uniting man to man.' For the sake of both, M. Sabatier advocates a religious as well as a political and social *rapprochement* between his country and our own. In *Hora Mortis Nostrae*, the writer, who signs himself 'F.R.C.S.,' recalls attention to the opinion of the late Sir James Paget that the act of dying is a pleasurable one. It is a natural act, and is probably therefore not unaccompanied by a sense of ease or satisfaction. He also quotes the famous physician William Hunter, who said when dying: 'If I had strength to hold a pen I would write how easy and pleasant a thing it is to die.' Good use is made of the death of Socrates as described by Plato, and of the phenomena of anaesthesia. In many cases death may be what Milton calls it, 'a gentle wafting to immortal life.' It is difficult to see exactly what is meant by the word 'spiritual' in the title of Mr. George Barlow's paper, and, indeed, in the paper itself, on *The Spiritual Side of Mr. Swinburne's Genius*; but the paper is well worth reading as a detailed review of the whole of the poet's collected works from this point of view. There is also in the same number a capital article by Mr. G. G. Coulton, who finds 'The High Ancestry of Puritanism' in the Church of the Middle Age—in St. Bernard, Bonaventura, Aquinas, St. Francis of Assisi and the early friars: all of whom were 'Puritan in heart if Catholic in eye and ear.' "Puritanism is not of one time but of most times, and especially of most religious revivals. Its faults are simply the faults of exaggeration, an exaggerated belief in the value of religious phrases and religious deportment, with an exaggerated depreciation of the world. . . . The Puritanism of the Reformation was simply the strictest and most logical attempt yet made to realize certain thoroughly mediaeval ideals.'

The Hibbert Journal for July opens with an article which is apparently to be the first of a series on *Impressions of Christianity from the Points of View of the Non-Christian Religions*. In this instance Mr. C. G. Montefiore deals with the Synoptic Gospels from the point of view of 'the Jewish consciousness.' The article is written with fairness and insight. The writer readily acknowledges the elements of 'fresh and original teaching which has produced fruit to be ever reckoned among the distinctive glories of Christianity' in the life and words of Jesus, when viewed merely as a human teacher. He marks two aspects

in which Judaism was conspicuously deficient,—the special attitude of the Master towards sin and sinners, and the 'yearning and eager activity to save and to redeem.' The 'lofty fervour of the Synoptics' is dwelt upon by Mr. Montefiore, their enthusiasm and passion, 'religion and morality joined together at a white heat of intensity.' He takes the very just and sensible ground that whilst parallels to many separate sayings of Jesus may be found in Rabbinical literature, the cumulative effect of the Gospels and 'the atmosphere which confirms and sustains them' produces a unique impression of its own. What Mr. Montefiore, of course, does not do is adequately to account for this 'atmosphere' and unique spiritual impression. Christians have their own explanation, which Mr. Montefiore does not accept, but which holds the field till a better is forthcoming. Mr. G. M. Trevelyan answers the question 'Should Agnostics be miserable?' in the negative, and if man need hope for no more than the Agnostic creed admits, he may perhaps—if he is a philosopher—acquire a resignation which delivers him from misery. But to be 'without God in the world' is, in the deepest sense of the word, to be without hope. Dr. Moffatt appears to be as well read in poetry and fiction as he is in erudite German monographs. He writes a suggestive paper entitled *Mr. Meredith on Religion*, which forms a companion to that of Mr. Trevelyan. For Meredith is in religion an Agnostic, and such joys as he holds out for man are joys of earth indeed, for he finds no ground for belief in a living God or in personal immortality. As Dr. Moffatt puts it, 'Beyond the bar which he summons the soul thus cheerily to cross, it is doubtful if any Pilot is to be met face to face, and more than doubtful if any haven lies for what men learn upon these shores of time and space to prize above all price.' Other articles in an interesting number of this Review are Rev. J. A. Hutton's plea for an affirmative answer to the question, *Is the Age of Faith Returning?* a criticism by Joseph M'Cabe of Sir O. Lodge's criticism of Haeckel, and an exposition by Prof. Hugh Walker of the significance of Oscar Wilde's *De Profundis*. He describes it as 'The Birth of a Soul,' but a just estimate of that much over-praised book might characterize it very differently.

The Journal of Theological Studies (July) opens with an instructive article by Dr. F. H. Chase, Bishop-designate of Ely. It deals with our Lord's command to baptize contained in Matt. xxviii. 19, which is for many reasons just now a crucial passage. The integrity of the text is questioned, the source whence this whole section of the Gospel was obtained is said to be doubtful, and a passage upon which reliance has long been placed as a proof-text of the doctrine of the Trinity, and as containing both Christ's commission to His disciples and the warrant for Christian baptism, is placed in jeopardy by criticism. Dr. Chase's discussion of the subject is scholarly and thorough. He argues with great cogency that this Matthaean section is derived from the primitive Petrine Gospel, and that the words of our Lord are reported with substantial accuracy. The integrity of the text is vindicated against

the objections of Mr. F. C. Conybeare and others. Further, the interpretation of the meaning of the command to 'immerse into the name' is discussed. Here we cannot agree with Dr. Chase so completely, though every line that he writes concerning the meaning of *εἰς* and the 'incorporation' implied in the preposition is interesting. Dr. Sanday contributes an appreciative notice of Canon Adam Storey Farrar, whose Methodist lineage and kindly Methodist sympathies shown in Durham for many years will be familiar to many of our readers. Amongst the shorter articles one of the most interesting is that by Dr. W. E. Barnes on the 'ten words' in Exodus xxxiv. These are quite distinct from the 'ten commandments' of Exodus xx., though presenting points of affinity with them. Scholars are not agreed as to the exact numbering of the 'ten words' contained in vers. 6–26, but it is generally agreed that they do not, like Deut. v. 6–21, present a variant text of Exodus xx., but rest upon a different tradition regarding the substance of the Decalogue. We cannot reproduce Dr. Barnes' arguments. He presents his own scheme of the ten divine utterances, whilst admitting that 'ten' may be understood freely to mean 'the few chief words,' and if twelve commandments can be distinguished, the title might still apply. But the whole discussion sheds light upon the original composition of the Pentateuch, and it is one in which all Bible students should be interested, whatever their opinion upon 'Higher Criticism' may be. The shorter notes on *Irenaeus' Testimony concerning the Gospels*, by Dom Chapman, on the *Epistle of Jude and the Marcosian Heresy*, by the Rev. J. B. Mayor, and on the *Hymns attributed to Hilary of Poitiers*, by Rev. J. B. Mayor, are interesting chiefly to scholars. But it is by the regular publication of articles of this kind that theological study is advanced, and their cumulative value is considerable.

It is both a pleasure and a duty to make repeated reference to the high quality and sustained interest of **The Expository Times**. It is simply packed with material for the student and the preacher of the Word, and instead of degenerating, as so many periodicals are apt to do, it seems to us to improve from year to year; a tribute not merely to Dr. Hastings, the editor, but to the writers, British and foreign, whose choicest contributions he is able to command. In the August number the Rev. John Kelman continues his suggestive expositions of *The Pilgrim's Progress*; and the Rev. Canon Sir John C. Hawkins his most valuable papers on *The Use of Dante as an Illustrator of Scripture*.

The Review of Theology and Philosophy (Edited by Professor Allan Menzies, D.D., Edinburgh. Otto Schultze & Co. 15*s*. per annum) is a new venture to which we offer a cordial greeting and best wishes for its abiding success. It aims at occupying the ground so usefully covered by the *Critical Review*, and the editor has apparently gathered round him a similar staff of writers. Amongst the contributors to the first number, which appeared in July, are Principal Lindsay, Professors Iverach, Bennett, V. Bartlet, Estlin Carpenter, Lewis Campbell, Henry Jones, Dr. Moffatt, and others. The subjects handled are theological

and philosophical, with a preponderance of the former class. In the August number, Professor Carl Clemen of Bonn reviews Dr. Sanday's *Outlines of the Life of Christ* in a distinctly critical tone, and Professor Lewis Campbell writes an interesting critique of Stewart's *Myths of Plato*. Professor Findlay's last volume on the 'Epistles to the Thessalonians' receives warm commendation from Dr. Muirhead of Broughty Ferry. The September number contains scholarly notices of the volume on 'Amos and Hosea,' published in the *International Critical Commentary*, and of Wellhausen's 'St. Matthew and St. Luke,' written respectively by Professor Kay of St. Andrews and the Editor. Some American books reviewed in this number deserve attention, notably one on *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*, by Professor Davenport of Hamilton College. The bibliography published each month promises to be a very useful feature in a periodical which we trust will be well supported by students of philosophy and theology south of the Tweed. Scotch scholars are sure to rally round a review which possesses a decided but not excessive flavour of North Britain.

The United Free Church Magazine (August) is not unnaturally preoccupied with Scotch ecclesiastical affairs; but it finds room for more than one other paper of general interest. The sketch of Principal Iverach, with a fine presentation portrait, will be welcome to many of our readers. Other papers deal with *Leonardo da Vinci*, *Knox and his Family*, *The Summer School of Theology*, &c. The liveliest, by the Rev. J. M. Wilson, of Highbury, lectures Miss Corelli, *A Cassandra of To-day*, on her 'raw haste,' her 'unbalanced speech,' and other literary misdemeanours. 'She aims,' the writer says, 'at being a satirist; she frequently succeeds in being merely a scold. She uses extravagant language; her invective loses its force by being utterly untempered. . . . Mr. Ruskin and Mr. Carlyle could make effective use of satire, because they had humour, and style, and some Christian charity; but Miss Corelli fails to be effective just for lack of these necessary qualities.'

AMERICAN.

In **The American Journal of Theology** (July–October) Professor König, of Bonn, describes *The Latest Phase of the Controversy over Babylon and the Bible*, and contends, not unsuccessfully, for the uniqueness of the religion of Israel. Comparatively new ground is broken by Professor Haskins, of Harvard, in a paper on *The Sources for the History of the Papal Penitentiary*, and hints are given as to the direction in which fruitful results are likely to be obtained in this obscure but deeply interesting field of research. No separate monograph on the subject as a whole has yet appeared, and references to it in the ordinary histories are exceedingly fragmentary and unsatisfactory. In the later Middle Ages the penitentiary was 'one of the most significant institutions of the central government of

the Roman Church.' Unfortunately, the principal sources for the history are in the archives of the Vatican, and are not open or likely to be opened to examination. As the result of a long and learned investigation of the Scriptures relating to 'Jesus' Voice from Heaven,' Professor Bacon, of Yale, concludes that 'Jesus' own representation of the voice that sent Him on His mission of realization of the kingdom was simply: "Thou art my Son."' 'The Isaian ending,' he says, 'like the Davidic, is an epexegetic addition. Its probable derivation is from the transfiguration story, that apocalyptic paraphrase of the revelation of the messiahship and impending fate of Jesus at Caesarea Philippi.' Among the critical notes there is one extending over twenty-seven pages on 'Philo's Doctrine of the Divine Father and the Virgin Mother.' It consists chiefly of classified citations from Philo's works, and has a bearing, however remote, on current controversies respecting the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth of our Lord. The eighty-three pages devoted to the review of recent theological literature are of special interest and worth.

Bibliotheca Sacra.—Owing to the prominence given to Consecration in meetings of the Society for Christian Endeavour, Dr. W. H. Bates enquires, in the July number, into Biblical teaching on this important subject. In his examination of the New Testament passages he makes no mention of the suggestive marginal rendering of John xvii. 17. Of the four different Hebrew terms, the first (Exod. xxx. 30) is said to refer to the consecrating *act*, the second (Num. vi. 12) and the third (Mic. iv. 13) to the *state* of the thing consecrated, and the fourth (1 Chron. xxix. 5, lit. 'fill the hand') to the *result* of consecration. In the practical application Dr. Bates emphasizes the fact that God performs the work of consecration and preparation for service; our part is to submit ourselves to God. The proof that we are consecrated is 'a sense of willingness to do His will.' Dr. James Lindsay writes on *Theology and Art* with the conviction that the time has come for a 'closer and more sympathetic relation between them,' each being, in its own way, 'a revelation of the Divine.' The appeal, in Art, is held to be predominantly to the emotional life, in Theology to the cognitive elements in man. The moral pointed from a study of the great historic periods in art is that 'nothing is more certain than that sensual selfishness will degrade art.'

In a thoughtful note on *Evolution and Freedom*, signed Chauncey J. Hawkins, evolution is shown to be in harmony with the Christian conception of human accountability. 'God is not pushing humanity forward by material and irresistible forces. He does not even compel a forward movement. Rather, He invites men forward and leads them by the power of ideals.' In a comment by James H. Ross on *Lady Huntingdon as a Hymnist*, a story is told of Robert Robinson, the author of 'Come, Thou Fount of every blessing.' To a lady who plied him with questions during a time of doubt, and who finally quoted his own hymn, he said: 'Madam, I am the poor, unhappy man who

composed that hymn, many years ago; and I would give a thousand worlds, if I had them, to enjoy the feelings I had then.'

In the **Methodist Review** for July–August our new editor conducts us pleasantly along 'The Pilgrims' Way' from Winchester to Canterbury. The subject is exactly to Mr. Telford's taste, and the paper is much more than a review of Mrs. Ady's and Mr. Belloc's charming books: it is an original description of this famous way, and embodies the results of much personal observation. Other papers deal with *Moral Emphasis in the Preaching of the Cross*, *The Missionary Interpretation of History*, *Methodism and the Church of England*, etc. *A Book in Purgatory* describes the French version of the Gospels by Henri Lasserre, and tells the story of its suppression by the Holy See. Twenty-five editions were exhausted in 1887, the first year of publication, and the version was approved by the Archbishop of Paris, by Cardinal Jacobini, the Congregation of the Index, and by the infallible pontiff himself. Before the end of the year, however, it was discovered that, 'through this book an enemy (Henri Lasserre of all men) had been sowing Protestant tares all over France.' 'Swift came the condemnation. . . . Here are the words sent forth from Rome on the twentieth of December, 1887: "So let no one, of whatsoever rank or condition, dare, in any place or in any tongue, either to publish in the future, or, if published, to read the forementioned and proscribed work." The book is printed no more; it is difficult to obtain a copy in France. The volume we possess was found by a friend in Switzerland. Henri Lasserre was not a Martin Luther, not even a Hyacinthe Loyson. He received the sentence which annihilated his life-work without protest or appeal. His voice has been as silent since as though hushed in the dungeons of the Bastille or the Inquisition.' There is also an interesting paper on *The Submerged Tenth among the Southern Mountains*, a population of some 600,000, living a purely natural and incredibly degraded life in the deep mountain gorges of the Appalachian region of the South. They are a mongrel race, largely occupied in petty pilfering, and, among the problems of Home Missions in America, is what to do with this 'low down white trash,' as by their negro neighbours they are not inaptly called.

The Baptist Review and Expositor (July–October) opens with a *Study of the Second Gospel*, by Dr. H. C. Vedder, in which, after a careful and detailed analysis, the learned professor reaches the conclusion that the culmination of St. Mark's narrative is to be found in the exclamation of the centurion at the cross. 'He does not say what a Jew would have said, "This is the Son of God," nor even, "This is God's Son," but exactly what a heathen could only say under such circumstances, "this is a son of a god," or "a god's son,"—i.e. a divine being. . . . The evident purpose is to furnish the strongest possible confirmation of the claims of Jesus to divine power. . . . Mark has proved his thesis: Jesus is clearly shown by His words and works to be

the Son of God, the Christ foretold by the prophets. His Sonship has consisted in His life of service, in His death of sacrifice. The Second Gospel is, in a word, the historical justification of the doctrine set forth by Paul in the Epistle to the Philippians.' Other articles in this able American Review treat of *The Essence of Christianity, Scholasticism, or the Evolution of the Latin Theology, Some Contemporaries of Moses*, &c. Perhaps the freshest and most interesting is the article on *The Bible and the Church of the Euphrates*, in which there is a capital account of the missions of the Persian Church in 505–20 to India and China, and of the translation of the New Testament into Chinese in the year 635.

FOREIGN.

Theologische Rundschau.—In the August number of this magazine Bassermann discusses *Homiletical Questions* in a comprehensive article which reviews a number of works, bearing such suggestive titles as 'How should we preach to the modern mind?' 'How should we preach to peasants?' and 'Revival preaching—a present-day need.' It is interesting to note that the pamphlet which bears the last-named title is published in Stuttgart,—long the headquarters of German Methodism. Martins, its author, warns against methodistical accessories, but insists on the need of calling sinners to repentance and faith. It is a reproach which may be borne with joy, that mission preaching and Methodist preaching are treated as identical. No Methodist missioner would dissent from Bassermann's dictum: "Every edifying sermon ought to be awakening, for it ought to awaken the slumbering religious consciousness.' This is true, and yet there is wisdom in the old distinction between a sermon whose main purpose is to edify saints and a sermon whose primary aim is to awaken sinners. If the edifying sermon ought to be awakening, there is no reason why the awakening sermon should not also be edifying.

G. Mayer, in a series of lectures, lays stress upon the connexion between preaching and pastoral work. 'The impressive sermon which grips the individual grows out of the faithful discharge of the duties included in what is known as the cure of souls.' The same writer lays down a good rule for controversial preaching in general when he says that the most powerful polemic against the errors of Rome consists in the positive emphasizing of evangelical truths,—such polemic being all the more effective when it is naturally suggested by the recurrence of some festival or by the Gospel or Epistle for the day. Bassermann thinks that Mayer unnecessarily depreciates apologetic and ethical preaching; it is scarcely enough to say that 'the preacher's theme—old, yet ever new,—is sin and grace, law and gospel, repentance and faith.' The true position is that of Schian, who has re-written Christlieb's fine article on *Preaching* in the Hauck-Herzog *Real-Encyklopädie*. Schian maintains that there is room for apologetic preaching, if it is more than apologetic; it should be religious as well

as scientific, 'rather testimony than proof.' In like manner when dealing with social questions, the preacher should rather strive to cultivate the feeling of social responsibility than to discuss technical social problems. Maurer calls attention to the special difficulties encountered by the preacher who is called to explain the truths of the Gospel to uneducated peasants, whose 'religious ideas are realistic,' and to whom abstract thought is distasteful. He urges that the needs of the people should determine the treatment of the text; subjects legitimately found in it will be lightly passed over if they have no practical bearing on the hearers' lives, but the text will never be treated as 'a mere motto.'

Theologische Literaturzeitung.—Harnack's *What is Christianity?* has aroused much interest in Jewish circles, and has called forth a number of replies to its attacks on Judaism. Paul Fiebig reviews (No. 15) one of the ablest of this class of writings—Rabbi Eschelbacher's *Das Judentum und das Wesen des Christentums.* Fiebig agrees with the author in holding that what Harnack regards as the essence of Christianity is something quite different from that which—according to the old canon *quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus creditum est*—has been taught from the beginning of the Christian era, and is still believed by the vast majority of Christians. On the other hand, Fiebig shows that it is an exaggeration to describe Harnack's definition of Christianity as differing in all respects from the traditional view. His attempt to separate the kernel from the husk may be pronounced a failure, but it cannot be denied that he treats the subject historically, and that his aim is to prove that the essential elements of Christianity—the gospel within the gospel—are permanent and unchanging. Eschelbacher, in the course of his comparison of Judaism with Christianity, is led to ask, 'How much of the teaching of Jesus was new?' Fiebig, like Harnack, emphasizes the inwardness of Christ's teaching. He concedes to Eschelbacher that the Pharisees and Scribes, in spite of their faults, represent religion; but he inquires, 'Was not Jesus right in maintaining that a clean heart is better than clean hands?' and 'What Rabbi has taught this as Jesus did?' Although Fiebig differs from the author on many points, he heartily commends this work to Christian theologians; it helps to fill the gap in our knowledge of Talmudic literature, and by so doing casts light on the early history of Christianity.

Harnack speaks with high praise (No. 14) of a work on post-apostolic Christianity which is described as worthy to rank as a sequel to Weizsäcker's book on the Apostolic age. *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, by Privatdoz. Lic. Rudolf Knopf, is a history of Christianity from the beginning of the Flavian dynasty to the end of the reign of Hadrian. It is said to give evidence of a thorough acquaintance with the sources and of a conscientious study of modern literature dealing with the important period between A.D 70 and 140. 'It is clear,' says Harnack, 'that no further progress can be made until the discovery

of new sources furnishes more material.' The author is gifted with sound judgement; no dazzling hypothesis and no eccentricity disturb the calm flow of his narrative.' Amongst the interesting questions dwelt upon in this most able and instructive article are the following: Harnack thinks that it was the Jews who called Nero's attention to the Christians, and that in Pliny's letter to Trajan it is not all Christians, but only renegades, who are referred to as having ceased to attend the Christian meetings after the publication of the edict. Knopf's independent investigations lead him to identify presbyters and bishops until the formation of a monarchical episcopate. Harnack's comment is that they were, as a rule, identical, just as the Lutheran minister is the local inspector of schools; but 'every presbyter was not also a bishop.' With this slight qualification, approval is expressed of the description given of the organization of the early Church. On one subject Harnack thinks that Knopf does not write with his usual caution: 'That the stories of the miraculous birth of Jesus originated amongst Christians in heathen lands is most improbable, not to use a stronger word.' In general, the monograph is said to be free from exaggeration and onesidedness.

In the same number of this journal Dr. Wendt of Jena warmly commends Dr. E. W. Mayer's lectures on *Christianity and Culture*. The author holds that the Christian principle of love, rightly understood, leads to a true appreciation of culture and to active participation in it. It is true that culture aims at bodily and intellectual betterment and not directly at spiritual improvement; but the development of the spiritual life is promoted by favourable conditions of body and mind. Hence Christian love inspires sympathy, with all attempts to uplift men and to surround them with an atmosphere of sweetness and light in which the higher life of the soul may find fit nourishment.

Preuschen's Zeitschrift for June has comparatively little to interest any but the technical scholar. The longest article is devoted to the date of the 'Apocalypse of Moses,' which touches the New Testament only in the suggestion that St. Paul may have referred to some ideas that found their way into this literature. Gressmann's studies in the Syriac Gospels are of importance for textual criticism: it is a pity that they came too late to be used by Mr. Burkitt in his *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe*, the more so as they confirm judgements of his about the late date of the Peshitto. A short paper follows by Professor B. W. Bacon, of Yale, on the controversy between J. Weiss and Wrede as to the Marcan narratives of demons recognizing the Messiah. It is quite refreshing to find Dr. Bacon for once on the side of the more conservative critic (Weiss), pleading that a historical kernel must be presumed to underlie at any rate one of these narratives, to account for the rise of the rest. The fact that Matthew does not reproduce these passages is the one really noteworthy circumstance which emerges from a mass of subjective criticism of the familiar kind. Next comes a discussion of 'the prince of the world' by a Swedish scholar,

S. A. Fries. It starts from a difficulty which may be freely admitted, the entire absence of any Jewish parallel for the phrase if used as a title of Satan. Fries does not, however, face the fact which he himself refers to, that phrases exceedingly like it are found in the Temptation narrative and in St. Paul; nor, we may add, does he allow for the markedly technical meaning of *κόσμος* in St. John. The absence of Jewish parallels therefore may merely mean that the phrase is original on the lips of Jesus. If this is not disproved, the motive is largely wanting for the elaborate argument that the 'prince of the world' is Mitatron, the Rabbinic 'mediator' angel, whom on this view the ascended Christ will displace. The improbability of the thesis relieves us from discussing in this context the interesting question of Mitatron's relation to the Persian Mithra, which Fries accepts from Kohut's 'Angelologie,' without however accounting for the perplexing discrepance of the names—a stranger fact than their degree of resemblance. Apart from the main thesis, there are many details of exegesis which repay examination; and it is a long step in the right direction when the Hebrew character of language and thought in the Fourth Gospel is recognized, and the authorship of an eye-witness. Probably most would allow that the theory of direct translation from a Hebrew original raises more difficulties than it solves. One striking novelty may be quoted, the note that the initial letters in Hebrew of Truth, Life, Way make up the word for One (=God). It is not likely, however, that the Evangelist thought of it, any more than of the famous anagram *Quid est veritas?* = *Est vir qui adest.* Professor Bousset's article on the Aḥikar legends will interest those who have been fascinated by the problems of the Book of Tobit, and have read the curious lore collected by Dr. Rendel Harris and his collaborators in 'The Story of Aḥikar.' Bousset's decision in favour of Persia or Media as the original home of the legend lends independent support to the theory that *Tobit* is a piece of Median folklore worked over for an edifying purpose by a Jew who has imperfectly removed the traces of Parseeism (see Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iv. p. 989). Vollmer, writing on *The King with the Crown of Thorns*, incidentally observes that Frazer's *Golden Bough* is 'unfortunately not accessible.' The confession curiously matches one made earlier in this journal by Gressmann, that 'the literature buried (*verborgene*) in English and American journals is mostly inaccessible to' him. What would the Germans say of an English theologian who naïvely admitted that, say, Schürer's *Jewish People* in its latest form was 'inaccessible,' or that he had ignored the literature 'buried' in the *Theologische Litteraturzeitung* or the *Zeitschrift* now under review? Among the other short contributions which conclude the issue we need only notice Reitzenstein's discovery of quotations of the famous 'Raise the stone' Logion in grammatical works of the Byzantine age.