Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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. 259

JULY, 1918

Fifth Series
No. 31

LIBRARY OF MICH

The London Quarterly Review.

Contents.

London
CHARLES H. KELLY
25-35 CITY ROAD, E.C. 1, and 24 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C. 4.

PRICE 2s. 6d. NET. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 8s. POST FREE.

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY 1918

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE FUTURE

I

THE Christian Church should present not division, but unity to the world; and we must with sorrow confess that it has failed to achieve unity, because it has sought that unity in a uniformity that only provoked discord. Have not both Catholicism and Protestantism defined their positions more in antagonism to one another than in their relation to the Christian faith that was in them both? Has not Protestantism rejected in Catholicism (Roman, Greek, or Anglican) what must find a place in the Catholic Church of the Future which we truly desire to be world-wide, and has not Protestantism also its own contribution to make to that Church? That Church we may hope will be the synthesis of which these have been hitherto the thesis and the antithesis. Our purpose in anticipating what that Catholic Church will be must be synthetic, as also our method. We must constantly be on the outlook, not for alternatives but for complementaries; *both* is a more useful conjunction in this connexion than *either—or*. While it is true, that what has emerged in history may be submerged by history; and we must not be too hasty in claiming permanent and universal validity for any development; yet on the other hand we must not assume the necessity of submergence of any development, simply because it is unfamiliar and uncongenial to us; but must test its claim to

grow and spread in the Christian community. To give one instance to make the principle of synthesis plain; not episcopacy, or presbyterianism, or congregationalism must be debated as mutually exclusive; but a polity to which each contributes its own distinctive element of value must be sought.

It would be folly to attempt any forecast of the distant future. One Christian Church as a world-wide organization seems to be beyond the immediate historical horizon within our ken; but on the other hand we must aim at, and work for, something more than an invisible unity, the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace, which is often put forward as a plea for perpetuating our divisions. The unity of the Christian Church for which Christ prayed, according to the testimony of 'the beloved disciple,' was to be manifest to the world as the condition of its conversion to faith in Him (John xvii. 20–21). How far must the unity be visible to fulfil this purpose? At least there must be co-operation in philanthropic, social, and moral endeavour. Even of that there is not as much as there should be and needs to be. Is this enough? Will the world see the Church as one, if intercommunion is denied, or exchange of pulpits? Unless Christians can remember the Lord's death and partake His life together, unless all are prepared to hear the word of God from any man whom God has called, can they be said to be so one that the world will confess that Christ is come from God? Among Nonconformists in England, and in Scottish Presbyterianism, that measure of unity has already been reached. The next step surely is to discover how far Anglicans and Nonconformists can unite in these ways, so moving towards the Catholic Church of the Future.

As with the Evangelicals and Liberals in the Church of England there is no insuperable difference in principle for Nonconformists, it is with the Catholics in that Church that we must concern ourselves in trying to find out the possibility of the synthesis of Catholicism and Protestantism.

Many questions of interest and importance must be left aside. Although there are exceptions, Catholicism favours liturgical services, Protestantism free prayer. For neither can exclusive validity or absolute value be claimed. Each has dangers and defects as well as advantages. What is necessary is that there should be room left for both, and that Christians should be prepared to set aside their prejudices and preferences so as to accustom themselves to both in order that they may have joy in the fellowship of worship with one another. The Sacraments, however, must be dealt with more fully, as here a common understanding appears more difficult. In dealing with the Sacraments the dispute about infant or adult baptism must be untouched, as we are now concerned with the great antithesis of Catholicism and Protestantism, and not differences within Protestantism itself. A brief reference must be made to Confirmation, as it is sometimes insisted on by Anglicans as a necessary condition of communion. The crux in the relation of Anglicans and Nonconformists is the demand made for the acceptance of 'the historic episcopate,' and to this question special attention must be given. In all that follows I am not making any proposals, but only for myself, moved by my own intense desire for Christian reunion, exploring the possibilities of mutual understanding.

II

(1) As it is the redemptive revelation of God in Christ Jesus our Lord, proclaimed in the Gospel, that is the foundation of the Christian Church, we must first of all ask ourselves what will the doctrine of the Catholic Church of the Future be? We must, however, narrow this question down within practicable limits, as it is evident that an account of the theology of the future would be an impossible undertaking. It is to be hoped that there will be the largest measure of individual freedom compatible with a common witness to

the world. Will there be a creed as this common witness? *The Thirty-nine Articles* or *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, or any of the products of the divisions of Christendom at the Reformation will not have any place in the Catholic Church of the Future, for the following reasons: (*a*) We are recognizing that the Bible is not a text-book of theology from which we can draw an elaborate theological system which can be imposed as authoritative on Christian faith; there is even in the New Testament temporary and local *husk* which must be separated from the permanent and universal *kernel* of the divine redemptive revelation, the gospel of the truth and grace of God in Christ Jesus our Lord; and the creed of the future, unlike these confessions of the past, will be confined to the kernel. (*b*) As the methods of interpreting the Holy Scriptures become more exact, there will be a larger measure of agreement as to the teaching of Scripture, and less necessity of formulating in a lengthy creed what is to be commonly believed. (*c*) We know more to-day of the evolution of categories, the changes in the forms of thought in which truth seeks expression in each age, and shall be very much more careful than were men in the past, who had no sense of the relativity of human thought, not to identify the permanent and universal substance of the faith with temporary and local forms of thought.

(2) Catholicism will probably desire to maintain as authoritative the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. Protestantism at the Reformation accepted them, and probably many Protestants would to-day be just as ready in their acceptance. There is a sense in which the Catholic Church of the Future might accept these creeds with advantage, and another in which the acceptance would be undesirable. (*a*) It might affirm the historical value of these ancient symbols as the necessary and proper confession of the Christian Faith relatively to the religious perils and theological problems of the age to which they belong, the stage of

the development of the Church which had then been reached. It might thus affirm its continuity in faith with the Church that formulated its beliefs in these creeds and so dissociate itself from the heresies against which they were directed. (*b*) To assert, however, that these symbols can or do express adequately and finally the common witness of the Christian Church for all times would be an intolerable imposition of the fetters of the past on the freedom of the future. (i) For *in the first place* neither of these creeds is an adequate expression of what is commonly believed among Christians. From both of them what may be called the distinctively evangelical presentation of Christianity is absent. (ii) *Secondly*, can the Virgin Birth, the descent to Hades, and the resurrection of the flesh be imposed as the necessary articles of Christian belief? (iii) *Thirdly*, the Nicene Creed expresses the divinity of Christ in the philosophical terminology of the age, and not of all time. From this objection there is no escape in the pleas that what the Church borrowed was the language and not the substance of its creed, for we cannot so separate word and thought as to leave the one unaffected by the other; still less that the metaphysics of the period of the creeds was permanent metaphysics, unless we ignore all modern developments of philosophy. If to affirm the identity of the Church throughout the ages these creeds are accepted in the Catholic Church of the Future it can be only in recognition of past value, and not assertion of present validity.

(8) In the creed that will be the common witness to the world, Protestantism no less than Catholicism must offer its contribution; the Atonement must be no less emphasized, if not more, than the Incarnation, and the personal experience no less than the corporate history. I myself would be content with the Apostolic Benediction, exegetically and historically interpreted. The three articles, the love of God, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, with the minimum of explanation which

each age might require in a common confession issued from time to time as occasion arose, would give the Church a creed quite adequate to its witness in the world if kept in organic connexion with the Holy Scriptures and the doctrinal development of the Church. Have the elaborate confessions of the past kept the Church from error, and grounded it in the truth? Is not the only guarantee of the Church's unity of faith the common experience of the saving love of God in the atoning grace of the Lord Jesus Christ through the renewing communion of the Spirit?

(4) The Church of England has a creed, and it is divided into three parties, Evangelical, Catholic, and Liberal. Congregationalism has no creed in the sense of a confession authoritatively imposed; and while it has to suffer occasionally from its theological free-lances, nevertheless it has more of a religious unity than the Church of England has. The experience of the past surely teaches that the creed adapted to the needs and questions of each age should be a common witness to the world and not a common bondage imposed on the ministers or the members of the Church. It is for public proclamation, and not for private subscription. When it is made the latter it leads to ingenious, if not dishonest reservations, to concealment of personal convictions, or to an inconsistency between the creed subscribed and the convictions expressed which is very injurious to the reputation and influence of the ministry. It is to be hoped that the Catholic Church of the Future will make no attempt to force uniformity of opinion by means of any creed subscription. To the other use of a creed mentioned there is not only no objection, but every recommendation. The Church is in the world for witness. Doubts and difficulties arise, contradictions and challenges are offered, with which the Church can deal only by setting forth a creed in which the common Christian faith is presented in the terms most appropriate for the time, and yet is not entangled in the

controversies of the hour. This is how I conceive that the Catholic Church of the Future should deal with doctrine.

III

(1) It is probable that Catholic and Protestant most misunderstand one another in regard to the Sacraments, and especially the Lord's Supper.

(*a*) Because the Protestant rejects the Catholic metaphysics he fails to appreciate the Catholic experience; and because the Catholic does not find his metaphysics in the Protestant he depreciates the Protestant experience. Mr. Campbell informs us that what he all along missed in Nonconformity was the altar, and what he believes he has gained by reordination in the Church of England is that to his ministry as a prophet of the word of God he can now add the ministry of a priest of the altar.

(*b*) There are some misrepresentations on both sides which must be got rid of if any understanding is ever to be reached. It is not the metaphysical explanation, transubstantiation or consubstantiation, or any other modification of these that gives the believer the reality of the altar; it is the personal grace of God and the personal faith of man. It is not the denial of the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper that can save us from such error as may attach to the Catholic doctrine of the altar.

(*c*) It must be frankly confessed that Protestantism in its opposition to Catholicism, and Nonconformity in its antagonism to the Church, have taken up a negative attitude to the Sacraments, which is an impoverishing of its religious life, and that Catholicism in its witness to the altar has preserved a valuable element of piety.

(*d*) The Catholic Church of the Future, it is to be hoped, will not insist on a common doctrine of the Sacraments as the necessary condition of a common participation, for that would be to limit divine reality by human explanation; and yet that common participation may become as sincere

and intense a fellowship as possible it does seem necessary to strive for as close an approach to a common experience as can be.

It is a well-known fact that the departure of the Reformers from Roman Catholic doctrine was not so great in respect of the Sacraments as the present position in popular Protestantism; and we need not repudiate the Reformation in the endeavour to discover what common ground may be found by Protestant and Catholic. For convenience we may confine ourselves mainly to the Lord's Supper, where the crucial experiment at reconciliation can best be made.

(2) To go to the root of the matter, we may ask ourselves the question: What do we mean by the *sacramental principle*, to which Catholicism attaches such importance? (*a*) There is a difference between soul and body, spiritual and material, but there is no separation or opposition. We speak by means of our physical organism, and yet our speech conveys our thought to other minds which hear our speech by their physical organism. If a real communion of spirit with spirit is secured, speech becomes a sacrament, the material not only the symbol but even the vehicle of the spiritual. If I gaze upon the beauty and glory of the sunset, and in gazing I realize 'a Presence that disturbs me with the joy of elevated thoughts,' my sight of that sunset becomes a sacrament to me. Does any Protestant deny the sacramental principle in these instances? When in obedience to the Lord's commandment to remember His death, and in confidence that He who died liveth for evermore, and is present with and ever makes His presence known to the believer, I take the bread and the cup as symbols of His sacrifice on my behalf, does He not Himself convey to me the blessings of His salvation, do I not abide in Him and He in me? If this is my experience, and it is, and surely of every devout Protestant also, is not the Lord's Supper a Sacrament to us in the fullest sense, that

the symbol is also the vehicle of what it signifies; and have we not also an altar? (*b*) We may even ask: would not a symbol be an empty form, meaningless and worthless, if it did not also become a vehicle? The flag of the regiment is the symbol of the endurance and courage of its past history. It only fulfils its purpose if the sight of it inspires a like endurance and heroism in present experience. Even the symbolic view of the Lord's Supper, if taken seriously, leads on to the full sacramental, as I have tried to state it.

(3) It is very curious, however, to find the depreciation of the gospel as a Sacrament in comparison with the Lord's Supper which is implied in Mr. Campbell's assumption that the priestly function of the altar is something higher than the prophetic function of the pulpit. Christ has found men, and men have found Christ, when the gospel has been preached no less, even if not more, than when the bread has been broken. Is preaching less the command of Christ than the keeping of the Lord's Supper? Can Christ's passion be less adequately presented by the impassioned word to the ear, than by the revered sight to the eyes? There are memories and associations of the Lord's Table that for many souls make it more impressive, it may be, than the sermon. This may be conceded, but does that justify the distinction that he who hears the Gospel at the mouth of the prophet has less the altar than he who receives the Sacrament at the hand of a priest?

(4) If what is meant by the altar is that in the Sacrament Christ is again offered up as a sacrifice well pleasing unto God, and that it is in the power of the priest to bring about that repetition of the sacrifice of the Cross, then the Protestant, nay even the evangelical Christian who knows his New Testament, and does not assume that he needs to take over all the later developments of Catholicism, must refuse such an interpretation. The Cross was the final and adequate sacrifice; it needs not to be added to for its efficacy unto salvation. He can and does believe that

Christ who has entered into His glory has not withdrawn from the historic process of man's redemption, but that He is still present to save to the uttermost all who come unto God through Him. If Protestantism regarded faith as merely belief in a transaction that had taken place, it would be at a disadvantage as compared with Catholicism; but if it means, as it meant for Paul, a present personal union with the Christ of God, who having once for all atoned, is ever saving to the uttermost, we may ask: What more does the altar of Catholicism give?

(5) Again, if what is meant is that faith can have no certainty of the presence of Christ to save in the Lord's Supper unless there is the guarantee of the administration of the ordinance by a priest ordained by a bishop in the apostolic succession, then the answer must be that we cannot think of the God and Father of the Lord and Saviour as so confined in the gifts of His grace that He will bestow only within, and withhold beyond, any such prescribed channels. What belongs to the interests of order in the Church must not be confused with what appertains to the necessities of God's grace, which is and cannot but be according to faith. That the sacramental principle then must be fully asserted in the Catholic Church of the Future we may admit; that it must be freed from some of its accretions we must no less maintain.

(6) When infant baptism is practised and there is no rite of confirmation, there does seem to be need of an ordinance that would solemnly mark the beginnings of conscious and voluntary membership in the Church of Christ. Some Nonconformists would be prepared to adopt confirmation as a desirable and appropriate rite for the purpose; but only on the distinct understanding that it cannot claim the same authority as Baptism or the Lord's Supper in the express command of Christ. The use of it from early times has not been constant and universal. Accordingly the refusal of communion to those who have

not been confirmed must be held as unjustified by the history of the ordinance in the Church ; and Nonconformists cannot disown their previous full membership in the Church of Christ by submitting to any such demand.[1] That would be to count an unholy thing many a precious experience, when their eyes have been opened and they have known the Lord Himself present giving Himself to them in the breaking of the bread (Luke xxiv. 30, 31).

IV

(1) We can trace the same tendencies, the conservative that is most concerned about order, and the progressive that desires most liberty, in regard to the polity and orders of the Church. There are certain general principles for our guidance in the discussion of the question which must be stated at the outset.

(*a*) As man is not separately body and soul, but embodied soul, or animated organism, so in the Christian Church inspiration and organization are inseparable. In the Apostolic Age inspiration—the presence and power of the Spirit of God—was the primary interest, and yet organization was its inevitable secondary concern. When some pietists exalt the *dynamics* at the expense of the *mechanics* of the witness and the work of the Church, they are trying to put asunder what God has joined together. The dynamics without the mechanics means waste of power ; the mechanics without the dynamics weakness for work.

(*b*) But if it be true, as I believe it is, that life is the immanent teleology of the organism, then it follows by analogy that the inspiration in the Church must determine its organization ; the one must be the expression of the other, and not a limitation imposed upon it. What explains and in some ways justifies the opposition made between the dynamics and the mechanics of the Church is the fact that the new life has often felt itself not helped but hindered by

[1] See *Constructive Quarterly*, V. pp. 724–5.

the old body in which it was confined, and which it could not remake for its full expression and free exercise. When Paul looks forward to a spiritual body at the resurrection he recognizes an incongruity of the heavenly spirit and the earthly body in man; and in the same way the Church's organization has been out of accord with its inspiration; and the sin of schism is no less, if not even more theirs who refuse to change the organization than theirs who follow the inspiration even to the breaking up of the organization.

(*c*) The history of Catholic polity and orders gives proof that this organization was not wholly and always the result of the inspiration: Jewish and Gentile institutions and customs affected the development of polity and orders in the Church. It is not enough, then, for Catholicism to claim that the polity and orders it stands for have held the field for a longer time than any others. It must be shown not only that theirs is the title of possession, but the merit of fitness. If in the papacy the influence of the Roman Empire comes to full expression, no less is the monarchial episcopate a relic of an autocratic stage of political development, incongruous with the democratic stage.

(*d*) It may surely be taken for granted as the conclusion of modern scholarship that no organization—episcopal, presbyteral, or congregational—can claim exclusive validity on the ground of apostolic authority; that the history of the early development of the episcopate is still too much a matter of conjecture to afford a solid basis for any dogma regarding its necessity to the very existence of the Christian Church; and that if the episcopate is to find general practical acceptance it must be on the ground of its value to the Church as the organ of its unity and continuity, without insistence on any doctrine on which its claims have been hitherto based. Even in the Church of England it is accepted by many on that ground, and no one doctrine obtains in that communion. It would be wanton folly now to imperil all prospects of reunion of episcopal and non-

episcopal communities by making any demand for subscription to any doctrine of the episcopate.

(2) Can the episcopal and non-episcopal communions get nearer to one another?

(*a*) The threefold order of the ministry—deacon, priest, and bishop—has been long recognized in the greater part of Christendom; the attachment of the episcopal communions to it is close; for many of their members it is not a question of expediency but of principle, bound up with their vital relation to the Church of Christ; it has distinctly practical advantages as at least the visible symbol, even if it has not always proved the effective organ, of the unity and the continuity of the Church. For these reasons the conclusion seems inevitable that the episcopate must have a place in the Catholic Church of the Future.

(*b*) On the side of the non-episcopal communions there is often a strong aversion to the episcopate on account of the part it has played in the persecution of schismatics, to the autocratic authority with which it is in some episcopal communions endowed, to the suppression of the rights of the Christian people to a share in the government of the Church which sometimes results from it; these, however, are not insuperable obstacles.

(*c*) The bishop of to-day is not, and does not desire to be a persecutor; in the bench of bishops itself there is a strong insistent desire for a less autocratic and a more democratic form of the government of the Church, as *the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Relations of Church and State* shows; and there are episcopal communions in which the representative character of the bishop is recognized, and his monarchy is a limited constitutional rule.

(*d*) The Churches that have hitherto been at the opposite extreme from episcopacy—the Congregational and the Baptist—are recognizing the need of more compact organization, of not less liberty, but a more ordered liberty: or the

Baptists have appointed superintendents, and the Congregationalists will, if they can. There is not on the side of the non-episcopal communions any such conception of the nature of the Church as would preclude on the ground of principle an episcopal organization.

(*e*) These communions, however, are conscious of a noble spiritual ancestry, of an inheritance of witness regarding the place and the power of the ministry and the membership in the Christian Church, of the possession of types of life, worship, and work valuable to the Kingdom of God, which they cannot repudiate or sacrifice even in the interests of Christian unity; and if they are to enter into the Catholic Church of the Future they must be allowed an abundant entrance. They must bring all their treasures, bought with blood and tears, with them for its enlargement and enrichment.

(*f*) Of a submission of congregationalism or presbyterianism to episcopacy it is useless to speak, least of all will we be inclined to listen to those who have made such a submission by accepting episcopal reordination; all that can be thought of is such a reconstruction of the Christian Church as will harmonize episcopal authority, presbyteral equality, and congregational liberty; and such an organization it is not beyond the wisdom of the Church, enlightened by the Spirit, to devise.

(3) One practical difficulty there is, the demand for episcopal ordination of even those who have already been ordained.

(*a*) Mr. Campbell's distinction between ordination to the prophetic and the priestly function is no relief of the difficulty at all; the suggestion of a conditional ordination, i.e., the use of some form of words indicating that only if the previous ordination was invalid, is the present ordination to be regarded as necessary, seems no less a subterfuge: to have a bishop present along with other ministers at a non-episcopal ordination so as to secure its validity also

looks too much a compromise. The demand for reordination lacks historical justification. The direct authority of Christ for ordination by bishops cannot be invoked. An arrangement made, even in the interests of order, by the Church, the Church can modify when there is good reason for a change. Responsible authorities in the Church of England have recognized that there have been, and may be again, conditions in which non-episcopal ordination may be accepted as valid, (e.g. Hooker). If bishop and priest do not differ in respect of order, but only of function (Archbishop Ussher, Archbishop Maclagan), no principle is surrendered, only a regulation, in recognizing the validity of ordination by other ministers of Christ. The Church of England will assume a very serious responsibility if it now insists on a restriction that neither its distinctive principle nor its uniform practice in the past has imposed. To ask men to disown or even cast any doubt on their standing as ministers of Christ and His Church is surely to dishonour the Spirit of God.

(*b*) At present I see no way out of the difficulty if Churchmen will insist on what Nonconformists cannot concede. But what we are hoping for is not the admission of Nonconformists into the Church as they now are, and as it now is; but a rebirth of the Christian Church by the spirit of love, peace, brotherhood; a new creation of the living and Reigning Lord, and then surely venerable precedents and ancient practices will no longer hold in bondage. Would not a united act of penitence for all amiss in the past, and of consecration to the will of God for the future, bring such an outpouring of the Spirit of God as would rob all questions of valid ordination of all but antiquarian interest?

(4) This difficulty has behind it, however, a difference of view regarding the ministry, which must be harmonized if union is to be effected. In the Catholic view the ministry is given *to* the Church, in the Protestant or Non-

conformist view it is given *through* the Church. In the one view the spiritual continuity of the Church is preserved by the ministry, in the other view the spiritual continuity resides in the people.

(*a*) The Catholic argues that his view of the ministry—an order instituted by God to convey supernatural grace to men—gives due emphasis to the fact that God *gives* all the good which man has in Christ Jesus the Lord. He does not deny that the Spirit of God moves and works among the Christian people; but the supernatural grace of cleansing and nourishment of the soul in the Sacraments can come only by this God-appointed channel. Protestantism in many of its popular forms, it must be conceded, is suffering serious loss because it fails to recognize adequately that the Christian life is not the work of man with some aid from God, but the work of God in man with man's submission thereto; and this emphasis in Catholicism on the givenness of the life in Christ would be a welcome corrective of this defect.

(*b*) Again in some Nonconformists there is no adequate recognition of the function of the Christian ministry. Some Christian ministers have been so anxious to escape the charge of clericalism that they have lost all sense of the privilege and responsibility of their vocation. The man whom God has chosen and called, who has been specially tested, and trained for fitness in that calling, whose sense of vocation and fitness have been recognized by the choice and call of the Christian Church, who devotes himself wholly and solely to ministry for Christ, is not to regard himself, or to be regarded by others, as just one of the members who is paid to give all his time to do work that the others can't find time to do. There are men in the ministry who do not desire to be regarded in any other way; and they show their sense of reality in so regarding themselves. But the man of whom the Christian ideal of the ministry holds good in any degree, in his intention

even, if not always in his activity, should also be regarded as given of God to the Church as a means of grace. It is fitting that the unity and continuity of the gift of the ministry by God to the Church should be declared in the rite of the ordination of the minister by his brother-ministers.

(*c*) That the call of the Church is insisted on in Presbyterianism and Congregationalism is a recognition of the fact that this ministry is not imposed on the Church, but that the Church has its part in constituting that ministry by recognizing and accepting the gift of God in the minister. Grace in God is received and responded to by faith in man, and it is surely a defect in Catholicism that while thus insisting on the *givenness* of the ministry it does not in some such way adequately recognize the acceptance by the Church of the gift. The two points of view which have purposely been stated antithetically to begin with are not so opposed that they cannot be harmonized. As has been indicated in the episcopal communions there is a movement to modify the episcopate; harmonious with it would be a movement to recognize that the ministry can both be given *to* the Church and *through* the Church. I use the term *Church* for the whole Christian community, as although in common thought Church and clergy are often identified, this is an aberration of the Catholic standpoint, and not an essential of it.

(*d*) There still remain differences. To the Catholic supernatural grace resides in the Sacraments, and their validity and efficacy depend on the priesthood that administers them. The term *supernatural* is one that lends itself easily to ambiguous use, and its meaning needs to be cleared up. If we are to regard all God's actions in grace as *supernatural*, then certainly what man receives in the Sacraments is a supernatural gift. If by *supernatural*, however, we mean action different from, if not opposed to, the habitual activity of God, as we know it, in nature and in man, then the application of the term is by no means

so inevitable. There are what we have come to regard as the normal activities of man in thinking, feeling, and willing, and God no less really acts in him because He acts, not in disregard of, or opposition to, but in accordance with these activities. If we use the word supernatural in the second sense, then we need not apply it to God's gift in the Sacraments, although that gift is a *real activity* of God, since we have refused to extend the epithet *supernatural* to all God's activity. What some writers intend when they use the word supernatural in this connexion is to make plain that there is a real activity of God, and that it is not merely man cleansing and nourishing his soul; this, Protestantism, whether it uses this language or not, no less recognizes than Catholicism. There need be, then, no quarrel about this matter. In the Sacraments God and not only man acts.

(*e*) But even this agreement does not remove all the differences; the extreme Catholic view is that God acts in the Sacraments irrespective of man's receptivity and responsiveness. This Protestantism can never concede. We may not strictly measure God's grace by man's faith, and yet grace is according to faith, and when there is no faith, the Sacrament must be ineffective; God's intention must be thwarted by man's indifference. Again, when the Catholic maintains that the validity and effectiveness of the Sacraments depend on the qualification of the minister, Protestantism must maintain that, while for order in the Church its Sacraments should be administered by those who are appointed to this office, it dare not so limit God; or suppose that grace can be withheld from faith, even when the Sacrament is irregularly administered.

(*f*) Lastly, the emphasis on the supernatural gifts of the Sacraments often involves a depreciation of the other means of grace, such as the preaching of the Gospel. There is much in the Sacraments that lends them peculiar impressiveness; to some minds the visible symbol of the Sacrament

is more effective than the audible symbol of the word, for in the latter the human personality of the preacher is obtruded as that of the minister in the former is not; but giving full weight to such considerations, can we maintain that God's grace is necessarily different in kind, or greater in degree, in the Sacraments than in any other means of grace? I have never yet met any one who made this claim who could offer an intelligible reason for it. This sacramentarianism is the frequent companion of a mysticism which places God's communion with man in a supernatural region, which prides itself on a superior piety when it is in reality suffering from an inferior rationality. The psychological theory of the subliminal consciousness is affording a very plausible justification of this sacramentarian mysticism. That intense religious emotion can never give a complete account of itself, that God's activity in us is never fully apprehended in our consciousness, that in the Sacraments there is an appeal to imagination rather than to intellect, which is entirely legitimate, and a stimulus through the imagination to the emotions more potent than in many devout souls any appeal to the intellect could give,—all this must be fully acknowledged. All that must be insisted on is this, that in the Catholic Church of the Future this subjective type of piety must not attempt to determine the exclusively valid objective doctrine of the ministry in its relation to the Sacraments. Protestantism might learn much from Catholicism in appreciating the Sacraments as means of grace, and Catholicism from Protestantism in giving its full value to the hearing of the Gospel. Here synthesis is what we must hope and pray for as the correction of present defects.

The Catholic Church of the Future will not be, and cannot be, national, associated with, dependent on, or responsible to any State. If the Gospel is spread to the ends of the earth, the Church can become the bond of human unity only as it is stripped of all national exclusiveness. Into

the universal community of the Church all the nations must bring their spiritual treasures. India, China, and Japan should be free to bring their peculiar contributions of doctrine, worship, order. Jewish piety, apart from the universal elements taken up into Christianity, Greek philosophy, or Roman polity, cannot dominate always and everywhere a world-wide community. I have attempted to trace the directions of movement towards Christian reunion with special reference to Catholicism and Protestantism as represented by Anglicanism and Nonconformity, for this alone was the practicable course; but now we must look beyond that narrowed horizon so that we may see even our present tasks in due proportion. The Catholic Church of the Future I have ventured to sketch is but the porch of that vast temple, the universal Church of Jesus Christ, into which all the nations shall be gathered. We cannot conceive its glory, and yet we can live and labour to hasten its reality.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

THE CINDERELLA OF THE NATIONS

A FEW months ago, when stationed at a hospital devoted to the needs of Serbian military patients, the writer found a private soldier deep in the mysteries of the English alphabet, as displayed on the first page of a Serb-English grammar.

'Why are you going to learn English?' I asked.

'Because after the war I want to go and see England.'

'And why are you so anxious to see England?'

'England has been our best friend through the war; and we look to England for all the help we shall need when it is over. In the next ward I have a comrade who was studying medicine at Vienna; now he, too, is learning English, that later on he may go and finish his medical course at an English University.'

I knew the man he referred to; in his period of convalescence he had collected quite a number of English medical books. I hope to meet him some day in this country.

Two or three weeks later, I found a patient in the officers' ward who greeted me in fluent French. He had studied philosophy in Paris. Like all the rest, he talked eagerly of the future, and England.

'Yes,' he said, 'England is our hope; but sometimes we grow discouraged. You have so much to think of in England. You have Ireland; you have your labour troubles; you will have so much to do when the war is over. And little Serbia is so far away; so few of you know our language; so few of us know yours. You will forget us, and we shall be left alone. What do you think?'

I told him that I believed that when England once formed a friendship she would never desert it.

'I know it. But she does not know us South Slav peoples. Yet she is good. Perhaps she will be willing to think about us.'

. . . . .

In every statement of War Aims, the restoration of Serbia is set side by side with that of Belgium. The Prime Minister himself has given the most explicit expression to this resolve. But it is safe to say that in the minds of most English people the two countries take a very different place. Belgium is close to us ; its people have crowded to our shores and received hospitality from every town and village in the land ; and while for us the championship of the outraged territory was a debt of chivalry, it is also recognized as vitally necessary to our own national interests.

With far-away and unknown little Serbia, the case is different. Most of us know more about Bulgaria than Serbia ; Kirk-Kilisse is better remembered than Kumanovo. We all agree that Serbia must be restored ; few know why she deserves restoration, still fewer why England is bound in honour to secure it ; fewest of all suspect that Serbia's restoration is as vital to our interests as that of Belgium.

Nor has the name of Serbia been always free from uncomfortable associations. Its people, we have been led to understand, are no better than the rest of the inhabitants of the Balkans, backward, barbarous, and unruly ; and its political instincts have been mainly for despotism tempered now by anarchy and now by assassination. But for the political faults of the Serbs—not nearly so heinous as German and Austrian writers have tried to make out—her circumstances and her enemies have been mainly responsible ; and to condemn the Serb peasants and small farmers as no better than a tribe of bloodthirsty cut-throats is no wiser than to label the Scotch a nation of caterans.

All this will be made clear by a glance at her history. The ancestors of the Serbs began to settle down in the Balkan peninsula in the seventh century. Like most of

the invaders of the Empire, they showed for a long while no instinct for political cohesion; and they were claimed by the Greek Emperors as vassals and regarded as having been 'presented' with the territories which they had occupied. For five centuries their history was one of constant struggles, with the Greeks and Bulgars on the south and east, with the Germans and Magyars on the north-west. At one period, during the short-lived Bulgarian supremacy in the Balkans, in the tenth century, they completely lost their independence; but it was soon recovered, and in the middle of the twelfth century the dynasty began which for nearly three centuries united the great bulk of the Serbian peoples, as well as certain non-Serbian elements in the Balkans, under a single rule. Under Stephen Dushan, emperor from 1331 to 1355, the Empire included all of modern Serbia and Montenegro with a large part of Greece, and stretched across Albania and Dalmatia to the Adriatic; on the other hand, certain territories as purely Serb as Serbia itself, such as Croatia and Bosnia and Northern Dalmatia, lay outside his dominions.

Dushan suddenly died when Europe was on the eve of a great and abiding change. The Turk was already at the door. The Byzantine Empire, the natural bulwark of Europe against the disciplined and formidable Moslem invaders from the East, had been permanently weakened by the Crusades; one of the most curious ironies of history had turned the self-styled champions of Oriental Christendom into the destroyers of Oriental Christendom's only real chance of deliverance. At Dushan's death, the Turks had seized all the Balkan peninsula not included in his empire. To win their richest prize, Constantinople, it was necessary to seize the rest. Serbia alone stood in the way.

But without Dushan, Serbia was not what she had been before. Divided once more beneath the rule of independent and rival princes, she seemed an easy prey. But for nearly a hundred years, often without an ally at her side, she

resisted the invader. And in doing so, she was not only protecting Byzantium; she was barring the way into Europe. Once in command of the road to the Danube and the Save, the Turk could force his way into the centre of the continent. In 1381, twenty-six years after the death of Stephen Dushan, Serb met Turk at Kossovo, the wide plain in the centre of Serbia. Largely through an act of treachery, she was completely routed. It is not uncommon to find even now Serbian peasants who can recite great stretches of the long ballad that describes that fatal day.

From that moment, Serbia became theoretically a part of the rapidly growing Turkish Empire. But the fiery love of freedom was not so quickly extinguished. Beyond Serbia to the north-west lay Hungary; and in Serbia's tribulation Hungary saw her opportunity and her danger. Now she sent her own forces to aid the Serbians in their despairing attacks on the Turks; now she tried to snatch parts of the half-conquered Serbia to add to her own territory; but whether with her or against her, Serbia fought on, till Smederevo, on the Danube, the last of the Serbian fortresses, was captured in 1459. Even then the little Serbian principality of Montenegro, clinging to its rugged mountains, maintained the struggle, until 1496. But it was too late. Six years before the fall of Smederevo, while the Turks were still stamping out the last embers of the flame of independence in the Balkans, they stormed Constantinople, and the Byzantine Empire came to an end.

It was stated above that Dushan did not collect all the Serbs under his rule. In this he was like every other ruler over Serbians, native or foreign. Only a moiety of the Serbs have ever lived in Serbia and its little western annex, Montenegro. Beyond what was Serbia in 1912, and within the confines of the Austrian empire, stretching up between the Adriatic and the Drave, as far as Pola and the Italian

frontier, are the Croats and the Slovenes. Both are pure Southern Slavs. The latter speak a slightly different dialect; but the Croats are both racially and linguistically identical with the Serbs. The only differences are political and religious. Croatia became part of the Hungarian kingdom in 1102; and through their geographical position, on the western side of the artificial dividing line between the Roman and Greek Churches, the Croats have belonged to the Catholic Church, as the Serbs have always belonged to the Orthodox; and therefore they use the Latin alphabet, while the Serbs use the Cyrillic, a modification of the Greek alphabet invented by the Orthodox evangelists of the Slav races for the use of their converts. Their independence, lost for nearly 400 years before that of the Serbs, has never been regained. Two other Slav peoples, the Czechs and the Slovaks, have been absorbed into the Austro-Hungarian Empire, with the astonishing result that at present nearly half the population of Austria-Hungary is composed of Slavs, who are more numerous than Austrians (Germans) and Hungarians (Magyars) put together, and who have never had a tithe of the political power of either of those smaller but dominant and ill-matched races. In 1496 the whole Slav race, with the exception of the then insignificant Russia and the turbulent Poland, was living under alien dom nation. No wonder that there has been a Slav question, ever since 'questions' were first thought of!

Let us now return to the Serbs. For 400 years, like Bulgaria and Greece, Serbia was simply a province of the Turkish Empire. But her spirit was never broken. Harsh and exacting as they were, her Turkish masters left her four possessions: her language, her literature, her social institutions, and her religion. Like the Jews long before them, the Serbs found that the saddest songs of national disaster were the surest nourishment for the hopes of future resurrection. At no period of those four centuries was the sword ever definitely sheathed. But it has been

Serbia's destiny to discover that what her sword has won, others have seized from her.

Once the Turks were masters of the southern bank of the Danube, it was clear that the next great struggle would be between Turkey and Austria. At first, the Turk was the aggressor. Even as late as 1683 the Turks were thundering at the gates of Vienna. One of the greatest achievements of another Slav race, the Poles, before that colossal crime, the dismemberment of the Polish kingdom, was their deliverance of Vienna, and the whole of the Austrian Empire, under John Sobieski. Just one century later, such is Austrian gratitude, Austria had calmly absorbed into herself 45,000 square miles of Polish territory, and 3,700,000 Poles. In the eighteenth century, when the Turkish power was waning and Austria took the aggressive, the Serbs rose again and again to assist the Austrians. In 1718, by the Treaty of Passarowitz, a large part of Serbia became definitely Austrian, only to revert to the Turks again in 1739.

Whichever side won, the unhappy Serbs suffered. If they were under the Austrians, they were persecuted for being Orthodox and not Catholic; if they were under the Turks, they were persecuted for being Christian and not Moslem. As the eighteenth century wore on, the aim of Austria became more clearly manifest. Turkey was evidently doomed. The reversion of her Balkan provinces was to fall to Austria. Whatever province dropped from the Turkish Empire was to be no independent State, but simply a new part of the Austrian Empire. At the same time the Magyars, whose fortunes were clearly more or less bound up with those of Austria, were determined to destroy any trace of freedom or initiative in their Slav rivals.

The condition of Serbia at the beginning of the nineteenth century might well seem desperate. At the end of 400 years of slavery, her strength exhausted in fruitless struggles against her oppressor, for which her only reward was fresh oppression by the power which had made use of her;

debarred by miles of difficult and often hostile country from the sea on the west, and from Russia, now a great power, who might have defended the forlorn Slav race, on the East; with her internal political morale corrupted by ages of foreign domination, what future could be hers? But the impossible happened; and in another long and heroic series of conflicts, first under 'Black George,' an ancestor of the present King Peter, and then under Milosh Obrenovitch, she gained the position of a semi-independent principality. The two rival houses plunged into a suicidal vendetta; the Turks employed all their diplomatic arts to divide and alienate Serbia's natural allies; Austria fixed her eyes more and more hungrily on the acquisition of influence and territory in Serbia; kings came and went; frustrated hopes led repeatedly to political crimes; but the struggle went on, while each year Serbia learnt how little she could trust any power except herself.

Once a pawn between Austria and Turkey, she was now drawn into other diplomatic conflicts. Russia had long since made no secret of her resolve to seize Constantinople, when the time came. That, in English eyes, was an intolerable menace to our road to India. But if Constantinople was to be saved from Russia, Turkey must be bolstered up; and if this was to be done, England had no sympathy to waste on Turkey's restless little foe, Serbia. In the latter half of the century another complication in Balkan politics appeared. Germany set her eyes also on Constantinople; both she and Austria gave themselves with all the ruthless subtlety of their diplomacy to the *Drang nach Osten;* and the first obstacle in their way was—Serbia.

Surrounded by avaricious enemies, where was she to look for friends? Italy was anxious to extend her own influence on the Eastern shore of the Adriatic, where over nine-tenths of the population were of pure Serb race; and Russia, which now posed as the champion of all the weaker Slavs, was far more interested in the geographically nearer

principality of Bulgaria. Neither Austria nor Turkey could be content that Serbia and Bulgaria should live at peace together. On one occasion indeed Serbia found Austria at her back. In 1885, when Bulgaria received Eastern Rumelia, Austria hounded Serbia into war with her neighbour, and when she was defeated Austria had to intervene. Austria liked Bulgarian supremacy in the Balkans no better than Serbian. But Austria had already showed her hand six years before. The Treaty of San Stefano had transferred to Serbia from Turkey the purely Serbian provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. By the treaty of Berlin, in the following year, these two provinces, and the 'sandjak' of Novi-Bazar, the heart of the old Serbian kingdom, were handed over to Austrian garrisons. The Austrian plenipotentiary, Count Andrassy, returned to the Emperor with the words, 'Sire, I bring you the keys of the Balkans.'

From that moment Serbia found herself. Rebuffed by every European power, she determined at last to put herself, wild as the design might appear, at the head of the Serb race; and gradually there developed, not only in Serbian territory, but through Montenegro, Dalmatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the wide tracts of Austria and Hungary inhabited by Serbs, the ideal of a 'great Serbia,' or a southern Slav State, in whose birth Serbia herself should play the part played by Piedmont in the birth of the Italian kingdom. For the first time in history, all the peoples of Southern Slav race and language were to be united, and to be free.

Austria regarded this programme, not unnaturally, as a flat defiance. From that date, the position of her Slav subjects, bad enough before, began to grow almost insupportable for men of spirit and independence. A long course of repression, prohibition of even non-political societies in Bosnia and Herzegovina, proscription of Serbian books and of the Serb-Croat language in the schools, culminated in the famous Agram, Hinkovitch, and Friedjung trials in

1908-1910,[1] in which Austrian judicial procedure was proved to have been stained by the methods of the bully, the forger, and the thief; in the wholesale trials and condemnation, on evidence that could hardly be called even hearsay, of whole batches of so-called rebels in 1915 and 1916; and in the imprisonment and execution of thousands of Slav youths and the exile of thousands of Slav families on the outbreak of the present war.

To Serbia herself the conduct of Austria has been all of a piece. Not content with 'administering' Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austria waited until the Young Turk revolution of 1908, and then calmly announced her definite annexation of those purely Serb provinces. Serbia was forced by European pressure to look on in anguish and helplessness, and to assert that her interests were not affected thereby. But unlike other Slav peoples, who have passed from disaster to despair, the Serbs have always found in calamity a stimulus. In 1912 the European powers were amazed and chagrined at finding that the three States of Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece, tired of waiting for 'reforms' that never came, had decided to sink their differences (the veteran Serb statesman, Pasitch, found a worthy ally in the Greek premier, Venizelos), to take their affairs into their own hands, and to capture from Turkey the territories which no one could deny to be theirs by right. At last Serbia could hope to gain an outlet to the sea. Greece was to annex Salonika; Bulgaria was to expand into southern Macedonia; and Serbia was to reach the eastern shore of the Adriatic.

The coalition succeeded beyond all the hopes formed by its members, or by any one else. The Turks were swept back to the very walls of Constantinople. But the little Balkan States could not be allowed to rearrange their own Balkan affairs for themselves. That, of course, was the

[1] See, for details, *Austro-Magyar Judicial Crimes*, published by the Jugoslav (Southern Slav) Committee in North America.

work of the great concert of European powers, and to the more compact group in that 'concert,' the Triple Alliance, Serbia's access to the sea was unendurable; to Italy, because she hoped at some time to gain the Eastern Adriatic for herself; to Austria, because she could tolerate no expansion of the virtual head of the Southern Slav movement; and to Germany, because whatever made Serbia stronger hindered her road to Constantinople and Bagdad. The diplomatists in London, therefore, with the full approval of our English statesmen, determined to set up an independent State between Serbia and the sea, ruled over by a protégé of Austria herself, while Serbia was to be 'compensated' by a part of Macedonia that would naturally have fallen to Bulgaria.

The settlement settled nothing and satisfied nobody except the Central Powers. They at least had the satisfaction of knowing that there would be no more unity in the Balkans. Within six months, Bulgaria, instigated undoubtedly by Germany, and without delaying for the formality of a proclamation of war, attacked her former allies, and, to the vexation of her secret friends in Central Europe, was decisively beaten.

But Serbia was still without her road to the sea. Her strip of territory in Macedonia could do her little good; her true direction of expansion was westwards and northwards.

Before she could take another step, while she was still exhausted by the two wars, the crime at Serajevo had been committed, the crime for which no trace of responsibility has ever been affixed on Serbia herself. At once Austria, with Germany at her back, finding the specious pretext and the convenient moment for direct intervention in the Balkans, presented Serbia with an impossible ultimatum, and attacked Belgrade. In two separate campaigns, Serbia beat back all the forces that Austria could bring against her. Only when Austria had summoned the help of Ger-

many, and Bulgaria had, for the second time, flung herself upon her former ally, was the dauntless little army, already half paralysed by a fearful epidemic of typhus, forced, in a heroically stubborn retreat, across the rugged mountains of Albania to the sea.

Along with the troops, and protected by their dogged resistance, crept and stumbled through the pitiless blizzards whole crowds of old men, women, and children, in ox-waggons and on foot, famished and dying, their corpses piled upon the sides of the ice-bound tracks as they fell—a nation in retreat. And behind them rose from time to time great sheets of flame as their pursuers, with all the contempt of the Apostles of Kultur for their barbarian victims, fired the villages they had left.

Private help from the west had already been sent; English doctors and sisters marched with that forlorn procession to the end; but the forces of France and England joined the Serbian troops too late save to accompany them on their retreat and to convoy the survivors to their refuge in Corfu. This was in the winter of 1915. But not even then would the Serbs despair. In the middle of 1916, when not a Serb soldier was left on Serbian soil, when their king was an enfeebled exile, and their country was being exploited by its bitterest foes, they were again in arms,

> Still nursing the unconquerable hope,
> Still clutching the inviolable shade.

The capture of Monastir later in the year was chiefly due to the superb mountain fighting of the Serbian remnant under their brilliant general, Misitch; and to-day all the available Serbian bayonets and guns are helping to hold the line in Macedonia, waiting for the moment when they can advance into their own land again. Some one has said of the Balkans that the Bulgar will hold on as long as there is anything to hold on to; but the Serb will hold on whether there is anything to hold on to or not.

Such is the fate of the nation which has been the first

to attack the foes of the peace and well-being of Eastern Europe, Turkey in the middle ages and Austria to-day; and the first to suffer from their revenge. How different has been the history of Bulgaria! Like Serbia in being a nation of peasant proprietors, and in modern times, largely owing to geographical advantages, in advance of Serbia in popular education and commercial development, Bulgaria has never fought for other people's freedom nor her own. She sent no troops to Kossovo, and in the succeeding years she was overrun by the Turks almost without a struggle. In the nineteenth century her efforts after freedom, unlike those of her neighbours Greece and Serbia, were only local insurrections; and when, after the treaty of Berlin, through the efforts of Russian and English diplomacy, she became an independent State, she promptly began to enter the sphere of influence of Germany, who had done nothing for her previously, but now saw what use could be made of the youthful principality. Her successes in the first Balkan war were in part due to the help given to her troops by Serbia; but because, owing to the interference of Austria, she was not allowed to take possession of the Vardar valley, which Serbia had conquered, she twice hurled herself, at the instigation of Germany, upon Serbia's flank. To-day she is the only European belligerent power whose territory has remained unscathed; and whatever the result of the war may be, she has little to fear except the disappointment of her wilder dreams.

. . . . .

That we must insist upon the complete restoration of Serbia, the Cinderella among the nations, is beyond question. In her repeated struggles for freedom, in her championship of the other oppressed Southern Slav peoples, in her position as the one serious obstacle to Turkey's progress to the west and Austria's to the east, no nation has suffered more than Serbia, and no nation deserves better at the hands of the great empire whose professed aim is the inde-

pendence of the smaller nationalities. Moreover, to desert her would be a disgrace to us. Her secular policy has been the same as ours. With far fewer resources and far slenderer hopes, she flung herself at Turkey in the fourteenth century, as we flung ourselves in the sixteenth at Spain. In the twentieth century we are facing the Central Powers, and their allies, Bulgaria and Turkey. Serbia alone has been forced into a consistent policy (save for the one brief period of alliance with Bulgaria) of opposition to all four; and in her conflicts with them, she has found in English diplomacy no assistance, but only cold refusal or neglect. If we had shown less support to Turkey, and less complaisance to Austria, the position of the Eastern question, in August 1914, would have been very different from what it was. And for our mistakes, the penalty fell with crushing force upon Serbia.

To restore Serbia, however, means something more than merely to place King Peter again in the Konak at Belgrade. To-day, Serbia is facing nothing less than the peril of extermination. There is no doubt that her extermination is precisely what Austria and Germany desire. In the typhus epidemic and the retreat across Albania, she lost at least between 100,000 and 150,000 troops, besides an enormous number of her civil population. To-day, she cannot put more than 25,000 bayonets into her front line, and of her civilians, thousands have been imprisoned and exiled by Austria, thousands have taken refuge in other lands; of the fate of the survivors who have remained in the country, those who know the methods of Austria in dealing with the Slavs in her power can only dare to surmise.

It is literally true that there are not enough Serbians left to inhabit the waste places of their land, or to prevent the wild beast from increasing upon them. But there are others of the same race outside Serbia. There are the seven millions of Serb-Croats and Slovenes in Austria-Hungary. All these peoples are now solid for the Southern

Slav programme. The latest and most explicit pronouncement of their aims was made on June 20 of last year. To restore Serbia means to set up a South Slav power in south-eastern Europe. This arrangement would give to the new Serb State a mass of intellectual and industrial vitality; it would secure her access to the sea; and it would effectually shackle the tyrannical power of Austria. It would of course mean a radical change in the territorial extent of the artificial and arbitrary congeries of peoples known as the Austrian Empire.

But the return to the *status quo ante bellum* is impossible. Either the Southern Slavs under the Austrian rule must be freed, or the cause of Serbian independence will be for ever betrayed. A third alternative, Trialism, has been discussed—the granting to the Slavs within the empire of political equality with the Germans and Magyars. But, if this were anything more than a sham, like the Prussian franchise, it would mean that the Austrian Empire became preponderatingly Slav; and no German or Magyar within the empire has hitherto shown the least sign of being willing to accept such an equality on any terms. 'We must be masters,' as the Emperor has said, 'within our own household.'

On the other hand, the creation of such a Southern Slav State is a necessity to us. So long as the door into the Balkans is open to the Central Powers, so long the *Drang nach Osten* will be a menace to the peace of Europe, and a danger to our own position in the East, and therefore, in spite of all our shortcomings, to the happiness of hundreds of millions of human beings. But the creation of such a State, and the independence of a population whose feelings towards our own country are now of the friendliest, will mean that the German dream of territorial expansion eastwards is at an end, and will allow us to hope that German aims will at last be content to move in more legitimate channels after the war. Abiding peace can never

dwell with injustice; but unless the Southern Slavs are freed, injustice, oppression, and hatred will be fixed more firmly than ever in what has been for centuries the real storm-centre of European politics.

The hopes of the Serbs are fixed upon England. They know that England, alone of the belligerents, can have no territorial ambitions in the Balkans. As the English visitor talks to them—private soldiers or officers, in hospital or camp—he hears from all the same pathetic words, 'We have lost our all. We have no longer a country. Our men are killed. Our boys have not yet grown up. England alone can speak the word that will ensure our return to our desolated homes.' That is their one desire, only the stronger for the martyrdom which they have endured, to return to their homes; to till their ancestral holdings, without fear of the foreigner and with the prospect of prosperity which access to the western sea will ensure.

They are not bandits or brigands; they have been taught in the school of calamity lessons of political cohesion and sobriety which men of Slav race could have learnt nowhere else. If, four centuries ago, maddened by the horrors of Turkish supremacy, Serbian peasants took to the mountains and forests and played the part of Robin Hood or Rob Roy; and if, in later years, tutored too well by the heartless intrigues of the Porte and the still more heartless administrative persecutions and judicial murders of Austria, a few misguided enthusiasts have had recourse to the desperate remedy of assassination, which of us, who live in lands where the habitual methods of Turkish and Austrian rule are unknown, will dare to cast a stone at them? Their national hymn begins with an appeal to the God of justice; and whether we decide to listen to that appeal or not, sooner or later its cry will be heard and answered.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE.

DIVINE PROVIDENCE

THE horrors through which the world is passing have made it harder than ever for many sincere minds to attach meaning or reality to belief in Divine Providence. The orgy of violence goes on; laws, human and divine, are set at defiance; millions of young men are being killed and mutilated; mankind is exterminating itself; and God, apparently, does nothing. Bombs are dropped from the clouds on peaceful towns, and nothing but pure 'chance' seems to decide what or whom they strike. Whole populations are starved by a blockade, and the innocent suffer equally with, or more than, the guilty. Armenians are massacred by the hundred thousand, and the hand of cruelty is not stayed. As in the Psalmist's days, 'Many there be that say, Where is now thy God?' Where is the faintest sign of any Fatherly care over the individual life—and, more than that, over the welfare of humanity itself?

Nevertheless, human faith survives to-day, as it has survived before when God has seemed most hidden. It was in the darkest days of Jewish history, when the king and nobles of Jerusalem had been carried captives, and when the city and its holy places were about to be laid in ruins, that Jeremiah could write to the exiles, 'I know the thoughts that I think towards you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace and not of evil, to give you a future and a hope' (Jer. xxix. 11). The saints and prophets of humanity have been the men and women who have had the insight to discern

> That God is on the field when He
> Is most invisible.

That such faith has not been mere blind credulity, springing from men's need of comfort, is suggested by the fact that

it has borne. Not only has it nerved the saints themselves to worthy endeavour; it has often justified itself in history: the hope which faith has kindled has brought its own fulfilment. It was because Jeremiah was able to radiate into the exiles some of his own assurance that God had not done with them, that they were able to find in the sufferings of captivity a means of discipline, and to prepare a human soil for the sowing, by a greater than Jeremiah, of the seed of the Kingdom. So it may be, to-day, that those will have the main share in the shaping of the future, whose inward eyes have been made keen enough to pierce the black night of sorrow and desolation, and to discern, with George Fox, 'behind the ocean of darkness and death, an infinite ocean of light and love.'

Faith in God carries with it, of necessity, some assurance of His providential care. This does not mean that we have to try to persuade ourselves of the truth of the impossible—that He deliberately 'sends' these monstrous evils, or that they are any part of His will for men. Faith is essentially insight into a *purpose*, not our own, latent in the order of events, and the identification of ourselves with that purpose. We may but dimly apprehend it, but we know that it is good, and that we ourselves are responsible in part for its achievement. It is not a purpose that will fulfil itself automatically, or without our aid.

> The Norns shall order all,
> And yet, without thy helping, shall no whit of their will befall.

This purpose is, for the saints, the deepest thing in life; when they have touched it they have touched bottom; when they are helping it they are fulfilling the true law of their own being and of the world.

Belief in Divine Providence is not the shallow optimism which refuses to face the facts—which pretends that evil is only good in disguise, that nothing happens contrary to the will of God. What it does mean is the assurance that nothing happens outside His control and care; and that,

given our co-operation, He can and will work out His purpose through the very things that conflict with it. It is not only the 'Happy Warrior,' but He whose image he bears,

> Who, doomed to go in company with pain,
> And fear, and bloodshed, miserable train,
> Turns his necessity to glorious gain.

The truly religious man is sure that, as he identifies himself with the Divine purpose, that purpose will be worked out, not only in the world, but in his own personal experience, whether in this state of being or beyond the grave. He will not expect exemption from 'the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune,' but he will have the serene confidence that, if his will is being made one with the will of God, none of these things can really hurt him—that is, hinder the working through him of the Divine purpose. 'Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me.' More than that, he will prove that 'all things,' even the most seemingly adverse, 'work together for good'—the hindering and even apparently fatal things being turned into means of blessing, whereby he learns patience, tenderness, and sympathy with others.

Further, he will learn the meaning of Guidance. His way through life will not be chosen by himself, but in the spirit of following the Guide and great Companion who has a plan for him better than he could devise, and whom he has learnt to know and trust. He will not expect miracles; nor, unless he is specially endowed, the experience of 'monitions' or other super-normal manifestations. But he will ask for, and receive, the enlightened judgement that can discern the facts which ought to influence his decision, and which will give them their proper weight. Nothing makes God real to the soul like the habit of referring everything to Him; the guidance of God will be experienced through the practice of seeking for it, and following it, in the commonplace affairs of daily life.

But the purpose of God is hard to find—if we look for it, as we look for truth about the world, by the method of observation. It may be there is another method of search, by which we may have more hope of finding it. But leaving this for the moment, and confining ourselves to the world as it appears, it is clear that we must find God, if at all, *in* the world and not outside it. He did not make the world, as Augustine said, 'and then go away'—as a man may construct a complicated machine, set it going, and leave it to go of itself. He made, and is making, the world as He makes a primrose bloom by the hedgeside—by its own inherent forces. And this, the Divine Immanence, is perhaps the reason why we are so often baffled in the search for the Divine Purpose.

What does Immanence mean? We shall do well to recognize that it means different things in different departments of this complex world. God is not immanent in a stone or a planet in the same sense that He is immanent in a Christlike soul. Perhaps we can divide the world of our experience into categories, and observe how much more the Divine Immanence means as we proceed from 'lower' to 'higher.'

(1) There is, first, the world of inorganic matter—the star-systems, the rocks of the earth, the sea with its tides, the air with its storm and calm. In this 'dead' world, as it appears to us, God is, so to say, buried deeply out of sight. What matter is, and how it is related to spirit, we need not now inquire. It is sufficient to note that in this region of experience the forces that move matter appear to work in a chain of unbroken mechanical causation, so that if we knew enough of the conditions at any moment we could predict all that could happen, as astronomers predict an eclipse. 'Law' rules, and there seems to be no place left for free volition. Should it appear that some planet in its course is moving otherwise than known 'laws' would account for, it would be meaningless to assert that 'God'

has deflected it. The explanation must be sought either in a revision of the 'law,' or in a force exerted upon it by some hitherto unsuspected body. It would be rash to assert that, 'where the wheeling systems darken,' we can discover any Divine purpose. So far as we can tell, the future is rigidly determined by the past.

(2) In the organic world of living matter it is apparently different. Many attempts have been made to reduce the activities of living things to the operation of mechanical and chemical forces, but so far without success. Meanwhile, it appears that in this region Teleology at present holds the field: living things act in a way that cannot be explained apart from *purpose*. The smallest living cell can select, out of the inorganic materials that surround it, what it will absorb as food, and what reject. As Bergson has shown, the Life-force that works in them all is continually trying new means of expressing itself: breaking out in countless 'variations' which may perhaps, even with the most accurate knowledge of conditions, be wholly unpredictable, and which can only be explained in the light of some purpose which the variation is designed to accomplish. If Teleology holds, the future of organic beings is not wholly determined by the past, unless in the 'past' we include some Intelligence or Consciousness by which a purpose is entertained. A wholly unconscious purpose is unthinkable, and is probably a contradiction in terms.

The life-force does not 'break' the laws of nature: it introduces, apparently, no new force; but it has the power of *directing* the forces already present into channels where they achieve a purpose that we can in some measure apprehend. Life, so far as is at present known, has a measure of *freedom* to pursue its own ends, which inorganic matter lacks. God is, as it were, nearer to the surface: the Divine Immanence is more clearly manifested. Yet, even here, as in the inorganic world, there is little if any revelation of a purpose that is *good*. The Life-force pushes ruthlessly

on its way, by means of struggle and cruelty to the weak, as well as by 'mutual aid' and the devotion of parents to their young.

(3) It may be that in all life there is some dim kind of *consciousness*; but, when fully self-conscious beings appear, freedom and purpose are much more clearly shown. Every 'person' has some measure of Free-will. He is able to present to his consciousness the idea of an end to be reached, and to use his intelligence in the adaptation of means to attain it.[1] In self-conscious and intelligent beings the Life-force has won a far higher freedom than in those creatures whose acts are mainly instinctive. The former can appreciate the worth of ideas and ends, as true, or beautiful, or good: they can choose the worthy and reject the unworthy. 'Ye shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil.' Man, made in the image of God, reflects Him in a way that nature, whether inorganic or organic, has no power to do.[2]

(4) The *good* will, that consciously pursues the higher and rejects the lower—that follows of set purpose the true, the beautiful, and the good, is a higher and truer manifestation of God than the bad will. God is immanent in the one in a sense that He is not in the other. Every true saint—just in so far as he forgets himself in devotion to worthy ends—is an actual manifestation of the nature of God Himself. 'God is love: and he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him. . . . No man hath beheld God at any time; but, if we love one another, God abideth in us.'

---

[1] The important fact about Free-will appears to be that *ideas* held in consciousness as ends to be attained are real factors in determining the history of the world.

[2] But nature, both inorganic and organic, would seem to afford the environment necessary for the development of spiritual beings. If the reign of law involves, as in earthquake and storm, indiscriminate suffering to sentient creatures, it is yet under it and nowhere else that they can learn something of law, and find in its order the condition of progress. If freedom involves the capacity to inflict, even wilfully, suffering on others, it is only through freedom that character can be developed and holiness acquired.

(5) If, as Christians believe, a human life has once been lived in entire and unbroken devotion to truth, beauty, and goodness, then the Divine Immanence in that life has been absolute, and a perfect manifestation of God has been given to men. In Jesus Christ, as He is apprehended by the Christian consciousness, God is uniquely revealed. 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' 'No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him.' The revelation, said Jesus, could only be given to 'babes'—to those who had forgotten themselves in simplicity and obedience; and it was because He Himself was the perfect 'babe' that He could give it. He alone was bearing perfectly the 'yoke' of the Father's will, and He offered to share it with all who were meek and lowly in heart. The will of one Man was absolutely united with the will and purpose of God, and thereby that will and purpose was revealed. Like other prophets, Christ could bring men to God; but He could, like no other, bring God to men.

For Christians, therefore, Jesus Christ is the Way—the way to assured belief in the Divine Providence. His own certainty of His Father's care, over Himself and over all men, appears to have been wholly unclouded. He spoke of it, not as a doctrine that needed proving, but as a fact that men had only to open their eyes to see. Even if we take the Gospel records as they stand, making no allowance for errors and imperfections, there is in the recorded utterances of Jesus little or nothing of the superstition that has so often darkened men's thoughts concerning Providence. The operations of nature are all under God's control. It is He who clothes the lilies and feeds the birds, who makes His sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. In the storm on the lake Jesus calmly sleeps, and when awakened chides His disciples for their want of faith. He warns them against supposing that calamities like the massacre of the Galilæans by Pilate,

or the loss of life by the fall of the tower in Siloam, or physical blindness, are to be regarded as punishments for sin. Deep and all-penetrating as is His sense of God, His outlook on the facts of life is at the opposite pole from that of the fanatic.

Does not all this imply that there was for Him another method of arriving at the Providence of God than that of observation and reasoning on things as they appear? The teaching of Jesus suggests that he whose inward eyes are opened to behold God may find Him everywhere except in sinful deeds; and that even these are not outside His control, but may be made, by faith and obedience, to work out His purposes. We have not to wait for the strange and unaccountable to discover the hand of God. The commonest things of life are under His care; no young sparrow falls out of the nest without His knowledge; the hairs of our heads are all numbered. The very same events that to outward observation are the outcome of 'law' or 'chance' are to the eye of faith a part of the Divine Providence. 'Ye are of more value than many sparrows.' There is, for each one of us, a Divine purpose in life which we may find and follow, and in so far as we follow it we shall be safe from harm. Disasters may come upon us, but all may be turned into means of good. 'Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall in any wise hurt you.'

And surely this includes, for us as well as for the Master, even those calamities that fall upon us through the sin of others. Jesus undoubtedly foresaw, long before the end came, that His work would issue in apparent failure—that His only hope of victory lay in sowing, in the hearts of a few disciples, the seeds of a faith that should be strong enough to survive the Cross. He may not have foreseen clearly how the victory would be won; but His assurance of the Divine Providence was such that He knew that, by

obedience, He would win it even through defeat; that, indeed, He could achieve it in no other way—even though the defeat should be the result of human sin and blindness, and therefore, in itself, wholly outside the Divine purpose. And if, before the end, His human powers for a moment failed; if the cup that He had to drink was more bitter than even He had imagined to be possible; if the beacon-light of His Father's presence was for a time withdrawn, so that He felt Himself forsaken; what does this mean, but that it was necessary for Him to enter with His brethren into the darkest valley of desolation, and prove that faith and love could conquer even there? Who that believes in God at all can doubt that in this hour of His supreme obedience and self-sacrifice the Father was nearer to Him than ever; that on the Cross the Father's nature was most abundantly revealed; that the Divine Providence was not negated but uniquely emphasized in this last extremity of human woe?

And so it is that Christian faith can survive all that seems to shatter belief in the Providence of God. If, on the Cross, man's blackest crime was turned into the means of richest blessing—if life was won through death—is it too much to believe that all sorrow, including that which is caused by human sin, is within, and not outside, the circle of the Divine Providence? War, the evil passions that produce it, and the desolation it causes, are all contrary to the will of God; but the agonies it brings may yet be made, through human faith and obedience, to work out His purpose for the world and for the individual.

EDWARD GRUBB.

CICERO'S LAST STAND FOR ROMAN LIBERTY[1]

TO the lover of the picturesque in action—of the dramatic collision of great visible forces on the stage of history—Caesar and Pompey are the two commanding names in the long and crowded annals of the Roman Empire. Looked into more closely, this rivalry will be seen to have been largely a personal matter. Whatever were their claims on popular support, each meant to be master of Rome. Pompey was the representative of the optimates, the leader of the patricians. The appeal of Caesar was to demos. But with Caesar and Pompey alike the ruling passion was personal ambition, though in the case of the latter it was qualified by respect for the constitution and the existing order. In the long run it would not perhaps have mattered much which had been the victor.

There was never a deeper and more vital issue before the Roman citizens. It was a question of contending principles in their political life, a question of world-wide interest, which, even now, with two millenniums between, is being fought out by five continents. The choice on which Rome had to make up its mind was not between Caesar and Pompey. It was between Caesar and Cicero. Which had it to be—personal rule or national liberty? Owing to the deep policy of the one, and the prudence of the other, these two men, after the civil war, never came to an open breach. But though Caesar had other objects in view, and Cicero did not always at the moment see his way to the end he wished to reach, the contest never ceased until, in the moment of his victory, Caesar was struck down,

[1] *The Orations of Cicero.* Translated, with notes. By William Guthrie. 3 vols. (Waller. 1758.)—*Cicero and the Fall of Rome.* By J. L. Strachan Davidson.—*Life of Cicero.* W. Lucas Collins.

and, in Mark Antony, left only the parody or burlesque of himself to carry on the fight. It went on until the voice of the supreme orator that had so often thrilled the crowded forum was hushed in death and, after a brief struggle for power, another and lesser Caesar seized the imperial purple —and Roman liberty was dead.

In order to understand Roman history at this parting of its wide way, we should give Cicero credit for the principles, for which, in perils oft, he so heroically stood. Those critics—whether English or German—who belittle such a man lay themselves open to the charge that they are indifferent to the great cause of human freedom. Any one who has any enthusiasm for individual right and national independence must be attracted by the personality of Cicero. At the same time even his unrivalled eloquence and charm of character must not draw to themselves the attention which should centre on the purpose for which he lived and died. Still less, in such an age of opposing interests and political chaos, should any mistake or passing indecision on his part blind our vision to the great object he never lost sight of, and to which later on we shall refer more particularly, viz., the freedom of the city he so much loved, the inviolability of Roman law, and the safety, contentment, and prosperity of the dependencies of the vast empire of which Rome was the nerve centre. A brief glance at the position will suffice. In the age of Caesar the power of Rome had reached its summit—a power felt to the ends of the known earth. It is true that in the time of the emperors there was still further extension, for the process of annexation, when once started, cannot easily be stayed. Conquest, like things of lesser moment, grows by what it feeds on. Frontiers are to be protected; neighbouring tribes to be punished or subdued. But the main force of the mighty world movement had spent itself. What followed was derived from a momentum that lived on its past, and, as an engine when the steam is shut off

slowly comes to a standstill—the end was only a question of time. The decline, therefore, in the national vitality did not appear for generations, and outwardly, Rome was never so powerful as in the days of the great Julius Caesar and Pompey the Great. But the seed was sown. The inordinate love of excitement, the abandonment to pleasure, the shameless deterioration in morals and manners, the absence of political principle in the leaders of the parties, faction, lawlessness, bribery, and the civil wars of Sylla and Marius—all this, in the closing days of the republic, played havoc with the health of the State, and prepared a broad and popular way to national collapse.

Matters were at this pass when Julius Caesar appeared on the scene. But, instead of taking them in hand, and cleansing the Augean stable, he employed them as instruments by which to rise to absolute power. He admitted that he would use any tool, however vile, that might in any way serve his purpose, for he said that 'if he had been obliged to use the help of cut-throats and footpads, he would not fail in recompensing them.' There was no need for this cynical avowal, for doubtless the squalid character of his agents would be well known in Rome. National corruption and apostasy from high ideals are the opportunity of the unscrupulous politician. Under the Catilines and Clodiuses Rome was preparing herself for the master who would bring her into subjection. But not without an effort to return to the old paths. Cato resisted. So also did Cicero. His soul had been fed on the great traditions of Rome. Caesar's ways were not his ways.

Cicero was born on January 3, 106 B.C. in the little town of Arpinum, at the foot of the Volscian hills. His father belonged to the Knights, an order which stood midway between the optimates, or Nobles, and the democracy. The character of his grandsire may be inferred from his prejudice against Athenian scholarship. 'The more Greek a man knew,' he said, 'the greater rascal he became'—an

opinion which was happily falsified in the noble moral character of his illustrious descendant. Evidently the prejudice of the old knight was not shared by his son. His own education had suffered from the narrow views of his father, but he was resolved that his son should have the best education the schools of Rome could furnish. Grammar, rhetoric, 'the old and elegant humanity of Greece,' the necessary reading and training for the bar, elocution and composition—all were assiduously practised, with a view to equip him for his destined career. Rome being essentially a military nation, Cicero did not lightly esteem the advantage of a soldier's training and distinction. Travel completed an education which indeed was never completed, for the mind of Cicero grew even to the last. He visited Greece and the enchanted lands that lay within the eastern boundaries of the vast empire.

Cicero became the most learned man of his day. For such an age and country he was almost all that a man could be. In a pagan world, where licence knew no bounds, he was a knightly pattern of that purity and greatness of soul which he enjoined on his son. Noble and generous in disposition, he was beloved alike by his friends and his slaves. He had an unconquerable hatred of oppression and injustice of every kind; with a courage that never quailed or failed when wrong was to be opposed and right was to be done, and which never even hesitated except when, amid political chaos and fierce contending interests, the course to be taken did not immediately appear. Open-minded, frank almost to a fault, as seen in his letters to Pomponius Atticus and others, a gentleman by birth and training, brilliant in social converse as in public disputation, his personal attractiveness was such that he was one whom all could have wished for a friend.

As an orator he was transcendent. The purity, style, and range of his writings can only be mentioned in passing. Ciceronian Latin is Latin at its purest. With one excep-

tion—his great co-equal—as an orator he takes precedence of all of every age who have used human speech with which to move the minds and passions of mankind. As Quintilian says, 'Cicero is now less the name of a man than that of eloquence itself.'

Like a Damascus blade his entire power—intellectual and physical—had been trained and tempered to the most perfect strength and keenness. Added to this was the disinterested justice of his pleas, in virtue of which he was able to convince an unwilling senate, and even in his oration for Ligarius, who had been an enemy of Caesar, to win for him a pardon. The great man, before whom Ligarius was tried, threw down his papers, exclaiming in an ecstasy of admiration, 'Tully, thou hast conquered.' As a Roman, Quintilian may have been partial to his fellow countryman, when he distinguished between the Greek and Roman orators. 'Demosthenes,' he writes, 'is said to have been more compact, Cicero more copious—the one owes more to application, the other to genius.' Of that humour which, more than any other gift, conciliates an audience—Cicero had a superabundance. Demosthenes had none of it. Perhaps a Roman audience, being of a slower temperament, required to be amused; the Greeks did not. As Guthrie says, 'The object of each was to convince. The one was to convince the people of Athens, where every man had within himself that pure reason and that exquisite harmony which in Rome they expected from the orator.' There are other considerations, but perhaps it will suffice to say that each of these orators expressed in himself the genius of his nation.

Objection has been taken to his oratory on the score of too great vituperation, and certainly some highly flavoured passages which can be culled from his orations against Catiline, Clodius, and especially Mark Antony, would offend the taste of an English jury. Such criticism does not take into account the circumstances. In all these cases his

life was at the mercy of hireling gangs. The men of rank, in whose pay these ruffians were, justly merited the terrible scathing they received. They were not only a personal but a grave public danger. The central principle which governed all his public conduct must be credited to his regard for the constitution, respect for Roman law and liberty. These men were State wreckers, as well as social lepers.

It has been said, he was egotistic. He knew the charge, but he defends himself by the plea that, in a serious crisis, he had put down the Catiline conspiracy against the liberties of Rome and had been saluted by the title of *Pater Patriae*. In that proud moment 'he was the foremost man in Rome —and, as a consequence, in the whole world.' Surely he had a right to remind them of it, for not only were his enemies eager to dispute it, but the very people whom he had saved were apt to be forgetful and ungrateful.

Caesar is acknowledged to be the greatest man of the ancient world—perhaps of all time. If we can leave out of the estimate the moral elements of character, it might not be difficult to endorse the verdict. In a certain grandeur of nature who can stand before him? His figure is so commanding, he stands so clearly in front of the stage, that we feel, as did the Romans of his day, that when he willed anything he could not be withstood. Victorious commander, far-seeing statesman, orator, man of letters, personal beauty, and address—he had all the gifts that fortune could endow him with. Well did he know how to win the favour of the populace. Demagogues are dangerous, and he was the arch-demagogue. Deep in debt, his largesses demoralized the people, whom he amused and feasted on a scale hitherto unknown. He became the most popular man in Rome On the strength of all this, which not even his colossal vices could obscure, and by reason also of that demoniac sense of power which frightens men and paralyses opposition, he was accepted at his own valua-

tion. Destiny itself seemed to march with his victorious legions when he crossed the Rubicon. As to Pompey and the proud patricians, it was a foregone conclusion, when, at the dreaded approach of Caesar, they retired hastily from Rome. Potentially, Pharsalia was fought and lost before the armies faced each other; and none knew this better than Pompey and the haughty nobles who followed his waning fortunes to the decisive battle. It is to the credit of Cicero that he could oppose such a man. His strength lay not in himself, but in his cause.

The complicity of Caesar in the lawless acts of Catiline and Clodius could not be doubted. He stood in awe of Cicero, whom he did all he could to win to his side, but Cicero would have nothing to do with unconstitutional procedure. As he could not silence Cicero, Caesar meditated employing force against him. He held Clodius in leash, to be slipped on his prey if Cicero opposed the Triumvirs—himself, Pompey, and Crassus.[1]

Shakespeare, in the omnipotence of his art, has dealt tenderly with Mark Antony, yet in every public act, as in his private life, he was a byword and a shame. Without the genius and grace of Caesar, or the strength of Sylla, he was a tyrant—the antithesis of everything that worked for virtue and refinement, for order and freedom in the State. He is gibbeted for ever in the second Philippic, which was not delivered but published, and read by Mark Antony, with the result known to every reader of Roman history.

We come now to those principles of State which, like pillars of granite, support the pleadings of Cicero. In the forefront he placed the dignity and independence of the Roman citizen. For this he contended, with all the power of his matchless eloquence. *Civis Romanus sum.* To secure this the whole machinery of civil and criminal law was framed—which has been a model for all nations and

[1] Strachan Davidson, p. 223.

ages. By this justice was guarded, and the protection and personal liberty of the individual guaranteed. Too often, alas, in the later days of the Republic, these laws were rendered nugatory by bribery, tyranny, and force. To Cicero this was a falling away from the days of old, when the Romans worshipped Liberty as a goddess, and a political crime. He claimed absolute freedom of deliberation and discussion. This right of the citizens was in a perilous state in the days of Tully. Pompey himself, to whom the senate had given charge that the Republic should suffer no injury, hired armed ruffians, whom he placed round the courts in the Milo trial to overawe and defeat the course of justice. Once those courts were set ablaze by Clodius and his rabble. Worse still, Caesar could rig any assembly to vote as he pleased. All this moved the soul of Cicero. The Roman people, he said, demanded nothing more earnestly than the revival of the ancient steady force of public trials. He exposed 'the infamy of the tribunals, and urged that they should put men of integrity and worth into the administration of the government.'

He pleaded fearlessly for the rights of the Comitia, and the right of the Roman citizen to vote, to take part in the elections, and to decide cases. In support of all this he ever appealed to the constitution of the State, which was the palladium of the ancient liberties of the people. The danger to national life and international peace of the *imperium in imperio* is forcibly illustrated in the political history of more than one country to-day. Lover of freedom as he was, it was the liberty of order, for there can be no true liberty without it, and, as in the case of Catiline, he did not hesitate to employ force to put down disorder. More, perhaps, for the credit than for the rightness of the act, Caesar, and Pompey too, envied Cicero the glory of breaking up the conspiracy.

Cicero was the champion of the dependencies of the empire. Not even Burke, in the trial of Warren Hastings,

pleaded more powerfully for this. In his oration against Verres, Cicero was the advocate for the safety of their allies, for the rights of provinces, for the force of laws and the dignity of justice. 'The best men,' he said, 'in the best ages of Rome have ever deemed the fairest and most distinguishing part of their character to consist in redressing the wrongs and asserting the properties of strangers, of their own vassals and tributaries of Rome.' 'The forum was the centre of equity.' 'Even foreign kings and nations had turned to the Roman senate, as to a pure and certain refuge, and had appealed to them as the arbiter of all their differences.'

The sentiment of veneration was deep in Cicero. With this we associate his religious feeling. It comes out in his *Offices*, and finds expression in his orations, when he claims for the city the presence and protection of the gods. Referring to his discovery of the Catiline conspiracy, he exclaims, 'It was therefore, O Romans, the directing providence of the immortal Gods that inspired me with such resolution and foresight.'

Cicero was a true patriot. His soul and imagination, his oratory and all that was greatest in him were fired by the majesty and grandeur of Rome. What Jerusalem was to the pious Jew, Rome was to him, and for that we admire and love him. 'This city,' he exclaims, 'the Eye of the World, and the Refuge of Nations.' This, then, was the vital issue on which, in this crisis of their history, the Roman people were called to make their fateful choice. Cæsar or Cicero? In these two men were represented two opposing principles of State polity, for which each had put his life to the hazard, and for which he died. Which had it to be? It was too late! By a strange irony, and by a steady and relentless preparation for it, the power of the Roman people to decide had been taken from them.

The sun of Cicero's life, in which there had been so much strenuous effort, was setting; but there were no lengthening

shadows. It was going down in storm and darkness, and what made it so difficult to bear—in loneliness. Pompey, whom he had supported with all his strength, and for whom he had fought at Pharsalia, was dead. Caesar too, for whom he had never had any personal animosity, had followed his great rival to a violent end. Cicero had never, perhaps, recovered from the effects of his exile. With sorrow, and almost despair, he had submitted, when Caesar became Master of Rome. He was old and weary, but a last effort had to be made. And he made it. He had to enter the field of deadly battle with Mark Antony, who was a worse foe than Caesar, for the Dictator had, at least, magnanimity. Antony had none.

There were fourteen orations in all. They were pronounced in the Senate, for whose dignity and authority he had always contended, and with which we associate so much of his glory. For this effort, like Samson, he collected all his strength. Every weapon with which the armoury of forensic oratory could furnish him—wit, satire, rhetoric, humour—if such a term could apply to anything so terrible as the exposure of the private and public life of Antony—and lightning invective,—all were employed in this impeachment, which, for all time, stands out as the one supreme achievement of the kind. Antony 'had dissipated the ruins of the State.' 'He had used the language of robbers.' 'His profligate life had taken from him all right to be consul.' 'He had used force to terrify him in this chapel of concord.' With a significant reference to the assassination of Caesar he exclaimed, 'If the people of Rome could not bear with a Caesar, will they endure an Antonius?' Concluding this, the second Philippic, he said, 'In my youth I defended my country: in my old age I will not abandon her. The swords of Catiline I despised; never shall I dread yours. Two things only have I now to wish for; the first is that I may leave Rome in the enjoyment of her liberty; the other, that the reward of every man be

proportioned to what he has deserved of his country.' In almost similar words Demosthenes had concluded his great Philippics on the Crown.

Oration after oration followed, in which the power of the orator seemed to increase with each blow. In the sixth he said, 'The question hangs now on its last issue. The struggle is for our liberties. Other nations may endure the yoke of slavery, but the birthright of the people of Rome is liberty.' At the end of his fourteenth and last Philippic crowds surrounded his house, escorted him in triumph up to the Capitol, and back to his house, as they had done in the days of his early glory. This, which was Cicero's last stand for Roman liberty, looked like victory. For the moment, he was the foremost man in Rome.

Mark Antony could not forgive this holding up of his character to infamy and contempt. The triumvirs, Octavius, Lepidus, and Mark Antony, met. They had the army at their back. Caesar's dead hand controlled the situation. The people were powerless. Caesarism triumphed. The three were resolved on proscription. Each had to sacrifice those of his friends who were obnoxious to one or both of the others. Antony demanded the life of Cicero. Octavius yielded. So the end came. Overtaken by hired assassins, his slaves, who loved their kind master, would have fought for him, but his philosophy, which had been sorely tried at times, stood by him in the hour of his death. He suffered with fortitude and calmness 'the compulsion of adverse fate.' And in the manner of his death his enemies violated every right for which he had ever contended. Yet who would not have died with Cicero rather than with Caesar? So opposite were their aims in life. Of its kind the death of Cicero was the greatest human tragedy in the world's history.

The end was worthy of the man and the cause. Referring to the dangers which beset him, he had said, 'I would bear them, not with courage only, but with pleasure, provided that from these my sufferings the people of Rome were to

derive dignity and security.' 'With resignation and resolution I am prepared to die, for to the brave death can never be dishonourable.' 'For nature has given life to us as an inn to tarry by the way, not as a place to abide in.' 'O glorious day when I shall set out to join that blessed company and assembly of disembodied spirits.' The parallel to the greatest Roman citizen who ever lived will occur to every one. Cicero lived a hundred years before St. Paul. Well has it been said that Cicero spoke more like a Christian than as a pagan.' Erasmus said, 'I feel a better man for reading Cicero.' He held him 'worthy to be canonized as a saint of the Catholic Church, but for the single drawback of his not having been a Christian.'

Dante dreamed that in the regeneration and emancipation of Italy lay the future of the world. It may not be all that, but there can be no such future for the world without it. With long, long intervals and reactions the work has gone on. It has had its prophets and soldiers. The names of Cicero, Dante, Rienzi, Mazzini stand in the great succession. Their principles are immortal, and like a Roman vallum, resist the foe.

Speaking on the hill of the Capitol itself, in the time of this world war, that great English statesman on whom has descended not a little of the spirit of the finest culture of Greece and Rome said, 'From the civilizing genius of Rome, the founder of the European State, the law of nations was derived. What place more appropriate than Rome to reaffirm the sacredness of the common law of Europe, that law which, having outlived the ancient Roman State, has become the universal heritage of man?'[1]

Of that Roman genius for law and liberty, the most consistent, attractive, and potent expression stands in the right of Marcus Tullius Cicero.

RALPH W. G. HUNTER.

[1] Mr. Asquith's speech at Rome.

THE EARLY CHURCH AND ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

WITHIN recent years the old way of looking at early Christianity as a religious movement which, while proclaiming Christ as Saviour from sin, did not concern itself much with sociological, economic, and political matters, but went along quietly singing its song of trust in the night, with its eye on Eternal Life rather than on the life that now is—this way of looking at the first centuries of our religion has received some rude shocks. In 1900 the English socialist, Mr. C. Osborne Ward, published the second volume of his very interesting and suggestive book—in some places more interesting than reliable—*The Ancient Lowly* (new edition, Chicago: Kerr, 1907), in which he claims that Christ was a bold labour leader and socialist, and that His followers were simply a labour union. In 1905 Albert Kalthoff, pastor of a free church in Bremen, who believes there never was an historical Jesus, published his *Die Entstehung des Christentums* (translated by the rationalist convert from Roman Catholicism, Joseph McCabe, *The Rise of Christendom*. London: Watts, 1907). He takes a wider view than Ward, but still agrees that early Christianity had an economic basis, that the 'whole frame of mind of early Christianity was communistic, and only recognized social ownership as the foundation of ecclesiastical administration' (p. 163). The Church gave to the world, says Kalthoff, the 'widest communist manifesto that was ever framed, demanding a communism of the inner as well as of the outer life; not only a rigid organization of economic, political, and juridical relations, but also a moral and religious order, a rule of faith and thought to which the individual is implicitly bound, and that leaves him no right as an

individual, but places all right on a common ground. The one Christ in all men—present in all that are poor, ailing, or imprisoned—that was the programme of this religious organization, a programme such as had never before been given to the world. None should evermore hunger in the land, none should be poor, no ailing man should lack help, no dying man lack consolation' (p. 181).

In 1901 L. Brentano, the Professor of Political Economy in the University of Munich, was made rector, and in his inauguration address turned his attention to the light Church history had to throw on his subject. He says:

> The mediaeval writers (including also ancient Church writers) who had to do with economic matters were moral philosophers. That standpoint ruled them. The ideas of property determined by Churchly teaching were standard for their judgement in all economic phenomena. This led them to an inimical attitude toward the natural feeling of mankind in regard to these things as well as toward the chief impulse of economic life.[1]

That chief impulse, says Brentano, is that worldly blessings are a good to which man has a natural, strong, and innocent desire, a desire not only to possess them but to possess them in ever-increasing quantities. Against this pressure of the whole economic life of mankind Christ set Himself in numerous passages on riches, and the ancient and mediaeval Church followed His ideal. This representation by Rector Brentano was resented by some Catholic scholars, which led him to put forth a formal defence of it in a long paper before the Munich Academy of Sciences.[2]

More in the spirit of C. Osborne Ward, the knight of the toilers, our American Rauschenbusch, the brilliant Professor of Church History in Rochester, whose experiences in the East Side, New York, when his father was a German Baptist pastor there, had entered into his soul like iron, giving him a vivid sympathy with their sad lot, came out in 1907 with his startling and radical book, *Christianity and the Social*

[1] *Ethik und Volkswirtschaft in der Geschichte*, München, 1901.

[2] *Die Wirtschaftlichen Lehren des Christlichen Altertums*, in *Sitzungsberichte*, &c., München, 1902, Heft ii. pp. 141–193.

Crisis, which, however, was not too radical to be placed by the bishops in the course of study for probationers for the Methodist Episcopal ministry. With keen sympathy for the social message of that book, I regretted much that ever and anon I met passages in its Church History part with which I could not agree. My studies had brought different results. Anyhow, the economic relations of the ancient Church are a most interesting theme, from whatever point of view discussed. Let us examine them for a time.[1] Let us take the New Testament as sufficiently well-known, and begin with the post-Apostolic literature.

The *Didache* or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* (A.D. 100–125) takes Christ's words in Luke vi. 30 at their full value. 'Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask not back, for the Father wills that from our blessings we shall give to all' (i. 5). Here the full right of private property is presupposed, as well as the varying economic condition of believers. The responsibility is on the asker or receiver. If he asks when not in need, he is to be later strictly examined and in some way punished by the society (i. 5). Prophets and Christian workers were to receive voluntary support from the believers, not from a common fund, and the sources of that support are mentioned,—first fruits of the winepress, threshing-floor, oxen and sheep, wine and oil, silver and raiment,—which seems to indicate fairly copious private resources (chapter xiii). Wayfarers must be helped, if necessary, for a brief time. If they wish to settle, they must work at their trade; if they have no trade they must work at something, 'for no Christian shall live idle among

[1] Besides the books mentioned above the reader will find this special theme in Funk, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*, 3 vols. 1897–1907; Sommerlad, *Das Wirschaftsprogramm der Kirche des Mittelalters*, 1903; Seipel, *Die Wirschaftsethischen Lehren der Kirchenväter*, in *Theo. Studien der Leogesellschaft*, 1907; Schilling, *Reichtum und Eigentum in der Altkirchlichen Literatur*, 1908 (see bibliography, pp. ix.–xii); and a brief but excellent survey in the last chapter of Bigelmaier, *Die Beteiligung der Christen am Öffentlichen Leben in Vorconstantinischer Zeit*, 1902, pp. 293-330.

you' (chapter xii.). That there were even then idle Christian tramps living on the kindly feelings of their brethren is apparent from the coining of a most expressive word to characterize them. 'If he will not act thus he is a χριστεμπορός (a Christ-trafficker). Beware of such' (xii. 5). The Didachist takes Paul's words as normative, 'If any will not work, neither let him eat' (2 Thess. iii. 10). In his notes on the *Didache* Harnack well says, 'How emphatically the duty of work is insisted upon, as well as the solidarity of all the members of the society.'

The Epistle of Clement to the Romans, A.D. 97: 'The good workman receiveth the bread of his work with boldness, but the slothful and careless dareth not look his employer in the face' (34). 'Let not the strong neglect the weak; let the weak respect the strong. Let the rich minister aid to the poor; and let the poor give thanks to God because He hath given him one through whom his wants may be supplied' (38). Here the standpoint of Paul in 1 Cor. viii. 12–15 is represented in a state of society where rich and poor are taken for granted.

The Shepherd of Hermas (about 140), through which runs a prophetic apocalyptic strain, thinks Christians should sit loose to earthly cares, despise riches, and prepare for the coming kingdom.

> Ye know that ye who are the servants of God are dwelling in a foreign land; for your city is far from this city. If then ye know your city in which ye shall dwell, why do ye here prepare fields and expensive displays of buildings and dwelling chambers which are superfluous? He, therefore, that prepareth these things for this city does not purpose to return to his own city. . . . Take heed, therefore, as dwelling in a strange land, prepare nothing more for thyself than a competency which is sufficient for thee. . . . Take heed, therefore, ye that serve God and have Him in your heart, work the works of God. . . . Therefore, instead of fields buy souls in trouble as each is able, visit widows and orphans and neglect them not; spend your riches and all your displays which ye received from God on fields and houses of this kind. For to this end the Master enriched you that ye might perform these ministrations for Him. It is much better to purchase fields and houses of this kind. . . . The expenditure of the heathen practise not, for it is not convenient for you, the servants of God. But practise your own expenditure, in which ye can rejoice

and do not corrupt, neither touch that which is another man's, nor lust after it; for it is wicked to lust after other men's possessions. But perform thine own tasks, and thou shalt be saved (Sim. i.).

This passage bears out Brentano's contention of the simple, naïve, self-renouncing view of wealth represented by Christ and the Apostles. In another passage (Sim. ii.) the rich man is represented as being 'poor in the things of the Lord, being distracted about his riches, and very scanty in his confession and intercession with the Lord.' But he gives to the poor man, who in turn intercedes to the Lord for him, and this restores the balance somewhat in favour of the rich, for the 'intercession of the poor man is acceptable and rich before God.' Thus each helps the other, and the rich man is blessed of the Lord. But it is only as their riches are cut away and their hearts released to serve God that they can be built into the tower of the Church (iii. 6); though even the rich can be and have been true servants of God, and this cutting away of their possessions is only partial so that the rich can do some good with the remainder (ix. 30).

The Epistle of Barnabas (A.D. 70–132) has only simple recommendations, quite in the spirit of the gospel. 'Thou shalt not be found coveting thy neighbour's goods; thou shalt not be found greedy of gain. . . . Thou shalt work with thy hands for a ransom for thy sins (these last words are not in the spirit of the gospel). Thou shalt not hesitate to give, neither shalt thou murmur when giving, but thou shalt know who is the good paymaster of thy reward' (19).

The statement of Justin Martyr to the effect that 'we who (while heathen) valued above all things the acquisition of wealth and possessions now bring what we have into a common stock' (1 *Apology* 14, A.D. 139) cannot be taken as meaning a universal communism, but contributions on special occasions, as he speaks of the honesty of Christians in transacting business with heathen (16), and of their readiness in paying both ordinary taxes and special state

assessments (17), both of which courses are possible only by those having private property. 'The wealthy among us,' he says again, 'help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied we bless the Maker of all through His Son, Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. . . . And they who are well-to-do and willing give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows and those who through sickness or any other cause are in want, and those who are in bonds and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need' (67). Here we have freewill offerings for a tremendous scale of help.

The same general view is in the entrancing pamphlet of the unknown (Aristides ?) author of *The Epistle to Diognetus*. 'They (the Christians) have a common table, but not a common (bed). They are in the flesh, but do not live after the flesh. . . . They are poor, yet make many rich (5). It is not by ruling over his neighbour, or by seeking to hold the supremacy over those that are weaker, or by being rich and showing violence toward those who are inferior, that happiness is found; nor can any one by these things become an imitator of God. . . . On the contrary, he who takes upon him the burden of his neighbour; he who is superior is ready to benefit the deficient; he who distributes what he receives from God to the needy; —he is an imitator of God' (10).

The brilliant *Apology* of Minucius Felix (probably 180–192) breathes a fine spirit concerning poverty.

> That many of us are called poor is not a disgrace but a joy; for as our mind is relaxed by luxury so is it strengthened by frugality. Yet who can be poor if he does not want, if he does not crave for the possessions of others, if he is rich toward God? He rather is poor who, although he has much, desires more. . . . These creatures [birds, cattle] are born for us, all of which things if we do not lust after we possess. Therefore, as he who treads a road is happier the lighter he walks, so happier is he in this journey of life who lifts himself along in poverty and does not breathe heavily under the burden of riches. If we thought

wealth useful to us, we should ask it of God. He could indulge us in some measure, whose is the whole. But we would rather despise riches than possess them. We desire rather innocency, patience, being good to being prodigal (36).

Irenaeus (170–189) justifies from Ex. iii. 19 the use by Christians of goods obtained as heathens, but at the same time holds as unrighteous any trade carried on for avarice or pure gain (iv. 30, 1). A simple livelihood is the only proper object of trade. What was reprehensible in the rich man of Luke xvi. 19 was not his riches, but his 'luxurious life, worldly pleasures and perpetual feastings, slavery to his lusts, and forgetting God' (iv. 2, 4), though probably Irenaeus could not imagine a pagan rich man living in any other way. Christians 'set aside all their possessions for the Lord's purposes, bestowing joyfully and freely not the less valuable portions of their property, since they have the hope of better things; as that poor widow (Luke xxi. 14) who cast all her living into the treasury of God' (iv. 18, 2). But in these offerings Christians stand as free men, not under bondage to tithe or other laws. 'Instead of the law enjoining tithes (he told us) to share all our possessions with the poor,' not out of necessity but out of kindly disposition (iv. 13, 3). While Irenaeus does not prescribe communism, it is evident that his whole feeling toward worldly possessions in the light of Christ's love is entirely in the spirit of Acts ii. 44.

The philosopher-litterateur, Clement of Alexandria (A.D. 200), kept fairly true to the early Christian depreciation of riches, yet making a place for men of wealth in the Christian Church. His general principle is: The good man treasures up his wealth in heaven. 'Wealth seems to me to be like a serpent which will twist around the hand and bite; unless one knows how without danger to lay hold of it by the point of the tail' (*Paed.* iii. 6). One must crush it by the charm of the Word. The Word abjures luxury, calls self-help a servant, and praises frugality, the child of temperance. It is in the soul that riches are (*ib.*).

Fill not your own stores, but communicate to them in need. Having the Word you have all things (iii. 7). It is not the rich but the covetous that destroy their souls, not property, but inordinate affection of it which excludes from the kingdom (*Strom.* iv. 6). Christ reckons one rich not by his gifts, but by his choice. If we wish to relieve the poor and do good, but have not the means, God will honour us just the same (*ib.*). The things of the world are not our own, not in the sense that they are bad and not to be used, but 'because we do not continue among them for ever,' because they pass from one to another by succession, belonging to us for use as long as necessary, only excess and inordinate affection being barred (iv. 13 at end). Clement wrote a special treatise on the subject of the salvation of the rich, τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος (*Quis Dives Salvetur*), in which the same thought as in *Stromata* iv. 13, is elaborated, viz. that it is not riches in themselves that are condemned. It is the use and love of them which are determinative. Even the advice of Christ to a certain man to sell his possessions is not to be taken literally. What Christ meant was to banish from his soul engrossing and evil thoughts about wealth, excitement and morbid feeling about it, and the anxieties which are the thorns of existence which choke the seed of life (11). Nor is the mere giving to the poor praiseworthy, as the heathens did that for glory. But you could not do even that if you divested yourself of your possessions. You would then have nothing to do good with (13). Evil passions are to be destroyed, but not riches. 'He who holds possessions and gold and silver and houses as gifts of God, and ministers from them to the God who gives them for the salvation of men; and knows that he possesses them more for the sake of the brethren than his own; and is superior to the possession of them, not the slave of the things he possesses; and does not carry them about in his soul, nor bind nor circumscribe his life within them, but is ever labouring at some good and

divine work, even if he should necessarily be at some time deprived of them, is able with cheerful mind to bear their removal equally with their abundance. This is he who is blessed of the Lord, and called poor in spirit, a meet heir of the kingdom of heaven, not one who could not live rich' (16).

The idea of Clement is that riches belong to God, and, therefore, to all God's creatures, and must be used so. That is what he means in Chapter xxxi., when he quotes Luke xvi. 9 (Make to yourselves friends by means of, &c.) and adds: 'showing that by nature all property which a man possesses in his own power is not his own,'—not his own to use as he likes, but to win everlasting habitations. And so in *Paed.* ii. 13, when he says that 'God made all things for all. All things are, therefore, common, and not for the rich to appropriate an undue share. That expression, therefore, "I possess, why should I not enjoy," is not suitable to man nor to society. But more worthy of love is the expression, "I have, why should I not give to those who need?" For such a one, one who fulfils the command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," is perfect. For this is the true luxury, the treasured wealth. But that which is squandered on foolish lusts is waste, not expenditure. For God has given to us the liberty to use, but only so far as is necessary; and He has determined that the use should be common. It is monstrous for one to live in luxury, while many are in want.' By this, Clement does not mean to teach the obligation of communism, as he elsewhere pre-supposes private property among Christians. He is thinking of God's ownership of all things, the Christian being a steward, who therefore must use his wealth, not in selling it all into a common pool, but in doing good. For he goes on: 'How much more glorious it is to do good to many than to live sumptuously! How much wiser to spend money on human beings than on jewels and gold!' He refers to voluntary beneficence by those who have, not farming out from a common stock.

In regard to trade, Clement held it was all right if conducted decorously. 'Let not him who sells and buys name two prices for what he buys and sells; but stating the net price, and studying to speak the truth, if he get not his price, he gets the truth, and is rich in the possession of rectitude. But above all, let an oath on account of what is sold be far from you. And let swearing, too, on account of other things be banished' (*Paed.* iii. 11—ANF 290). He quotes Ex. xx. 7, and says that Christ cast out the liars and hypocrites in trade. Schilling quotes Plato's *Laws* to similar effect:[1] 'Let the seller of anything in the market-place never mention two prices of what he is selling; but after mentioning a simple one, if it is not accepted, let him take the article back again, and justly so, nor value it for that day at a greater or less sum. Let puffing (ἔπαινος) and oaths be absent in the case of everything sold' (xi. 3, Bohn v. 463). I might add that Clement was the enemy of luxury, and urged strongly to simplicity, modesty, frugality, purity in all things. We shall trace the course of opinion in the third century in another article.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

[1] Schilling, *Reichtum und Eigentum in der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freib. im Br. 1908, 45, gives full and fair canvas of Clement, 40–47.

A POET OF THE PEOPLE

NOT much is known of Ramprasad, the most popular poet of Bengal. He was born at Kumarhati, near Halisahar, in 1718. His birthplace is in the district of Nadia, a district which is the very heart and metropolis of Bengal's life and history. From here it was that Lakshman Sen, its last independent king, fled before the approach of a handful of Musalmans; and it was in this district that the great court of the Rajas of Krishnagar kept art and poetry alive. Shilleida, the favourite retreat of Bengal's most famous poet to-day, is in Nadia.

Ramprasad was the son of Ramram Sen. His descendants to-day are Baidyas by caste; but it is not clear whether the poet was Brahmin or Baidya. He received some education; he was versed in Sanskrit, Persian, and Hindi; and, when a very young man, he obtained a post as copyist in Calcutta, with Bakulchandra Ghosal, the dewan (manager) of an estate. Like other poets before and since, he found office work irksome, and he filled his books with scribbled verses. His employer discovered this, and was angry; but when he read, 'I do not want this copyist's work. Give me your treasuryship, Mother,' his sense of humour or his sense of piety overcame his annoyance. He became a generous friend and patron, settling on the poet a pension of Rs. 30 (£3, according to the reckoning of John Company days) a month, and introducing him to the Krishnagar Court. Here Ramprasad rose in favour, and won the title of Kabiranjan or 'Entertainer of Poets.' He had a rival, one Aju Goswami, a Vaisnava. We do not know much about their relations with one another, but they seem to have been kindly. Ramprasad wrote, on one occasion, 'Free me from the net of Maya (Illusion), Mother'; to which his far from ascetic compeer replied with the prayer, 'Bind me in its wide chains.'

He married, judging from references in his poetry and the fact that there are to-day those who claim to bear his blood. His fame was well established in his lifetime, and there are many legends about him. Some are obviously invented to explain the genesis of this or that poem. For instance: he met a woman on his way to the Ganges, who asked him to sing to her. He told her to wait at his house, till he returned from bathing. When he arrived, and asked for her, he was told that she had gone, but had left a note for him in the family temple. This note informed him that the goddess Kali had come from Kasi (Benares) to hear him sing, and now commanded him to go to Kasi. He set out, but fell ill on the road; whereupon he composed the song, 'I cannot go, but your feet shall be my Kasi.' Recovering he tried to go on, but fell ill again, and saw Kali in vision, telling him to forgo the journey. He obeyed her, making the song, 'Why should I go to Kasi?'

This legend is an obvious and very innocent attempt to explain the occasion of the song it represents as its outcome.

Ramprasad had friends and patrons in Calcutta, and often visited the town. He died in 1775. The night of his death, we are told that he worshipped Kali and composed the song, 'Tara, do you remember now?' He is said to have died singing, like Saxon Caedmon; with the conclusion of the lyric, his soul 'went out through the top of his head,' and passed to the World of Brahma, whence there is no return to this cycle of births and deaths.

His chief works are the *Bidyasundar*, *Kalikirtan*,[1] *Sivasankirtan, and Krishnakirtan*. Their themes illustrate his catholicity; for he praised Krishna no less than Siva and his Consort, and indeed Vaisnava references are not unusual even in his *sakta* poetry. But it is by his praises of Kali that his name lives. The Bidyasundar may be briefly dealt with. A poem of the same theme and title was written by his famous contemporary, Bharatchandra Ray, the *rajkabi*

[1] Kirtan means a processional song or hymn.

or chief poet of Krishnagar. But Bharatchandra's treatment is frankly erotic. Ramprasad allegorizes the story; even so the poem is not one of which his admirers are proud.

But the *sakta* poems are a different matter. These have gone to the heart of a people as few poets' work has done. Such songs as the exquisite 'This brief day will pass, mother, surely pass,' I have heard from coolies on the road or workers in the paddyfields; I have heard it by broad rivers at sunset, when the parrots were flying to roost and the village folk thronging from marketing to the ferry. Once I made the experiment of asking the top class but one in a mofusil [1] high school to write out a song of Rabindranath Tagore's; only two boys out of forty succeeded, a result which I consider showed the very real diffusion of his songs, as will be admitted by any one who makes a similar test with English poets upon English boys. But, when I asked for a song of Ramprasad's, every boy except two responded. Truly, a poet who is known both by work and name to boys between fourteen and eighteen, is a national poet.

There is no need to compare Ramprasad with Blake, as Sister Nivedita did (to Blake's disadvantage, of course). He is great enough, and original enough, to be looked at in himself; and his work does not need any prop of irrelevant comparison. In different ways he suggests Burns and Herrick; Burns by his raciness and immense popularity, Herrick by his quaint self-consciousness and his abstracted habit of looking at himself from outside. But these are only casual and partial affinities. His lyrics at their simplest often have the quality of a snatch of nursery babble, and sing themselves into the memory of an illiterate folk by a riot of punning sound and alliteration, a musical toss and play of similar syllables.[2] 'Peter Piper picked a peck of pickled pepper.' There is no doubt that Ramprasad took

[1] Roughly, rural as opposed to urban or metropolitan. Anglicized in India, and spelt accordingly by me.

[2] This, of course, cannot be kept in translation.

a childlike pleasure in such things; and that untrained literary instinct out of which folklore and folksong are born takes the same pleasure and has heard him with rapture. Much of the imagery of his poems is fanciful and conceited, and of anything but universal validity; yet even this has a charm, examined with patience and sympathy. The student of his poetry will be rewarded with a wealth of local thought and custom and of such stories as flower in the undergrowth and byways of authorized legend. This 'local habitation' of Ramprasad's mind is strength as well as sometimes weakness. If he falls short on occasion, because so much of *tantric* doctrine and story is puerile and worthless, he rises greatly again when he touches Earth, that Universal Mother. His illustration is racy, from the soil and of the soil; it comes from the life of an agricultural people. In Bengal, 'every schoolboy' (as a matter of plain, literal fact) knows his sublimely simple reproof to his soul, in a moment's shrinking from death, 'Thou, a snake, fearing frogs!' 'Shall such a man as I am flee?' asked the Jewish patriot. And this beautiful wealth of metaphor, plucked from a simple life and society, will meet the reader on every page. His mind has been 'an idle farmer'; he is treading the Round of Existence, like the blindfolded ox that serves the oilman, chained to 'the log' of the World; the *Six Passions*, like crocodiles haunting the bathing-*ghat*, watch for his soul; once upon a time—to quote from another song that every boy knows—he had home and friends, he earned money and was popular, but now he is a beggar and forsaken.

To the student of thought, and especially to the Christian student, it is profitable to study the attitude of the remarkable poets of the people which every century has produced, representing every part of India. Indian philosophy has reasoned out certain conclusions; its typical manifestation, as every one knows, is the *Vedanta*. No one who has made any attempt to find the facts would deny that even

the thought of the illiterate has a pantheistic tinge. This has often been pointed out. Perhaps too much has been made of it; men forget how St. Paul confidently looked to find at least this tinge, alike in the thought of idlers in the market-place at Athens and in that of the Lystra peasants. And, if we study the folk-poets, and through them the mental outlook of the simple folk of India, we find vulgar thought often in absolute revolt from those findings of the philosophers so readily and dogmatically put forth in Europe as 'Indian' belief. Tennyson has not expressed more incisively than Ramprasad the rejection, by the mind that has loved, of the doctrine of loss of personal life in the Deity. What is the use of Salvation to me, cries Ramprasad, if it means absorption? 'I like eating sugar, but I have no desire to become sugar.' No thought anywhere, aware as he was of Sankaracharyya's monism and in sympathy as some of his moods show him to be with pantheistic teaching, is more emphatically theistic than his normally is, or rests more decidedly upon interchange and intercourse between a personal goddess and a personal suppliant and worshipper. Yet with popular religion's idolatry, and especially its crudities and cruelties, he has no part. He scoffs at pilgrimage, and offerings to images. 'I laugh when I hear that a worshipper of Kali has gone to Gaya.' None of his moods is more consistent than this, towards pilgrimages. And, in a passage famous with his countrymen, this poet and lover, half-a-century before Rammohan Ray began to build up Humanity's indictment of the religion which sanctioned sacrifice and *sati*, looks past the blood-stained image which represents his 'Mother' to the many, sees with revolt the butchered victims and the red stains upon the flowers of worship, and cries out to that World-Mercy which he has found for himself and which he adores, that he will sacrifice not living, quivering flesh but the *Six Passions*, the sins of his heart and mind. This passage has never been forgotten by his countrymen; and, though

some have disingenuously used it to buttress up the bloody system it condemns, representing their sacrifices as an acted allegory, the victims being the sins and passions, yet the naturally merciful thought of most has seen his literal meaning, and has felt judged and unhappy, even though the slaughter may continue. No thoughtful Hindu is easy in his mind about sacrifices; and this is largely due to Ramprasad, who worshipped but refused to dishonour.

It is strange to think of him living through that time of anarchy before Clive came, when Bengal was at the mercy of thieves and oppressors of every race and sort, and keeping his vision of Divine Mercy, his passionate trust in Divine Love that was good despite all opposite seeming. It is strangest of all to think of the source from which his inspiration came. Kali dancing on her lord, Kali festooned with skulls, her tongue lolling out black with blood, her dripping weapons uplifted, her menacing eyes, is not a figure with which one would naturally associate such love as Ramprasad's. Nor does it help to remember that he thinks of her as *Sakti*, the personification of strength, the life-bearing strength that is feminine. For with this worship is linked that most debasing of all forms of Hinduism, the *tantric* rites, with their insistence on blood, especially human blood, and intoxicating drink, and the prostitution of maidenhood. These rites, and the human character built upon them, have been pictured for us by Bankim-chandra Chatterji, in a book which is one of the master-examples of the shorter novel, *Kapalakundala*. The picture is drawn, without revolt or sympathy, in the detached spirit of Art, by one who was in other things a reactionary Hindu. Yet Ramprasad was a *sakta*, and the *tantras* were his text-book. But the degrading and cruel, lustful side of *tantric* worship he left apart; and his mind, when it touched at all—as it did not infrequently—upon the sterner aspects of the *sakti* cult, leapt to those features that in their terror were sublime, though in lurid fashion. He sees Kali in the

red flames of the burning-*ghat*, flickering and dancing in the breeze; in the flash of the lightning, and coming with the black, matted cloud-locks of the storm. Justice has been done to this intense and imaginative vision of the poet by Babu Dineshchandra Sen, in his *History of Bengali Literature*. And something of this terror, leading to imperfect trust, often intrudes even into his love of Kali as Mother. Though she beat it, he says, yet the child clings to its mother, crying out 'Mother.' This is moving and beautiful; yet the world's pain is little lightened if we can think of it as inflicted by a Hand external to it. A deeper conception sees God identified with His children's sorrow, in all their afflictions afflicted, and broken for them and with them; so that Paul could cry that he filled up in his body that which was 'lacking' of the sufferings of his Master, and our dying in Flanders or on Gallipoli beach have been able to know Another wounded within them and beside them. Of this deeper conception there is no hint in Ramprasad, and he falls short of such poets as the Musalman mystic who said, 'My friend does me no wrong; the cup which he gives me to drink, he has drunk before me.' But, though his conception fails to reach this depth and strength, yet how much of purity and tenderness, of love for the 'Mother' he has seen, is in his songs!

My mind, why so fretful, like a motherless child? Coming into the world you sit brooding, shivering in the dread of death. Yet there is a death[1] that conquers death, the Mightiest Death which lies beneath the Mother's feet. You, a serpent, fearing frogs! What terror of death is this, in you the child of the Mother-Heart of all? What folly is this, what utter madness? Child of that Mother-heart, what will you dread? Wherefor brood in vain sorrow?

Utter without ceasing Durga's[2] name. As terror vanishes with waking, so will it be with you.

The twice-born Ramprasad says: Mind, quit you like mind! Act the

[1] Siva the Destroyer. He has conquered death, being himself that Destruction in which all lesser destructions merge; yet he is represented as lying beneath Kali's feet, while she dances on his prostrate body.

[2] A name of Kali.

truth your teachers showed you. What then can the Child of the Sun[1] do unto you?

Nor should any Christian, if he is a Christian in truth and passionate experience, marvel at the mercy which came to this man through such strange paths. For God, says St. John, is Love. And Love, says an old song, 'will find out a way.'

A few quotations may be added:

By time's passing I have lost my work. The day is spent in idle joyfulness. When I earned money, I wandered freely from place to place. Then I had friends, brothers, wife, and children. But now all that is over, for I am no more a wage-winner. Those friends and brothers, wife and children, seeing me penniless, scold and grow wrathful. When Death's Messenger, seated by my pillow, makes ready to grip me by the hair, then, preparing my bier of wood, my pitcher of water, and my shroud, they will bid farewell to the man in the ascetic's garb. Shouting Hari, Hari,[2] they will fling me on the pile, and each go his ways; Ramprasad is dead, the weeping is done, and they will fall to their meal very cheerfully.

. . . . . .

This brief[3] day will pass, surely pass, and only rumour linger. Countless men will speak reproach against Tara's name.[4] I came to the market of the World, and by its bathing-*ghat* I sell my wares. Mother, the Sun our Lord is seated on his prayer-mat,[5] the ferryman has come. The load of the many fills the boat, he leaves behind the wretched one. They seek a cowrie[6] from the poor; where shall they get it?

Prasad says: Stony-hearted Girl, look back, and give me a place, O my Mother! Singing thy glory, I will plunge in, into the sea of the World.

. . . . . .

Tara, do you remember now?[7]

Mother, as I have lived happy, is there happiness hereafter? Had there been any other place I had not besought you. But now, Mother, having given me hope, you have cut my bonds, you have lifted me to the tree's top.[8]

Prasad says: The mind longs for the boon.[9] Mother, my Mother, my all is finished,[10] I have got my boon.

---

[1] Yama, God of Death. In the Puranic mythology, he is Child of the Sun.

[2] A name of Vishnu; the funeral cry in Bengal.

[3] Brief, obscure and darkened, wretched. All these meanings are in the adjective *din*. The adjective and noun are practically identical in pronunciation, the word for day being also *din*; the *i* of the adjective is theoretically longer than the *i* of the noun.

[4] Because she did not save her votary. [5] It is sunset; the day is over.

[6] The shell, the coin of the extremely poor. Sixteen cowries are reckoned to the pice (farthing). [7] Ramprasad's last song. [8] To a position of isolation and peril. The next step will be into Emptiness.

[9] The priest's gift when worship is ended.

[10] Literally, my claims are settled (adversely), dismissed. 'I have nothing; but in that nothing I have all I need.'

E. J. THOMPSON.

CAVES, PITS, AND SHEOL

THE late Dr. Gwatkin possessed a remarkably complete collection of snails, and when we were told that his knowledge of these animalcule was of considerable value in his historical research, most of us asked, What connexion is there between snails and history? How can the one study shed any light on the other? And so there may appear at first sight to be no connexion between caves and religious beliefs. One can scarcely conceive of two subjects that are wider apart; the former may be interesting to the archaeologist, but what possible interest can it possess to the student of religion? Yet there is a connexion between the two; and it is for the purpose of indicating what this is that the following article has been written.

The ordinary sources of information require supplementing so far as their treatment of the subject of the caves of Palestine is concerned. Neither in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, nor in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* is there any reference, so far as we can discover, to the work of excavation carried out by Prof. Macalister and his colleagues, an account of which is to be found in the volumes published by the Palestine Exploration Fund. The late Prof. Driver, in his Schweich Lectures of 1908, on *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*, makes some mention of these interesting underground discoveries; but a much fuller description is to be found in Mr. P. S. P. Handcock's *The Archaeology of the Holy Land*, published in 1916. It is to this writer that we are indebted for the information contained in the following paragraphs.

Mr. Handcock gives us a lengthy description of certain caves at Gezer, an ancient site on the border of the Philistine country between Joppa and Jerusalem, close to the railway

now connecting the two places. These caves consist of subterranean chambers of considerable size, partly natural and partly artificial, the chambers communicating one with another by tunnelled ways or corridors of varying lengths. The entrance is generally through a hole in the ground, and a rough staircase, straight or winding, leads down into the cave; or sometimes instead of the staircase there is a sloping passage; while in other caves there is neither staircase nor sloping way, the visitor having to climb in and out of the hole as best he can. Such underground chambers belong to the same class of subterranean dwellings as those in Armenia described by Xenophon: 'The houses,' he writes, 'were underground, with entrances like that of a well, though they were spacious below. The entrances for the animals were dug out, but the men descended by means of ladders. In these houses there were goats, cows, and poultry.' Similar excavations have been found in South Tunisia, and there is an artificial system of underground ways on an islet in Lough Derg, Donegal, which is known as St. Patrick's Purgatory (see *Encyclo. of Rel. and Ethics*, art. 'Caves'). The large cave at Gezer excavated by Prof. Macalister has some seven or eight chambers of varying size. In several of these chambers cisterns have been discovered, one of them being of a depth of 24 feet, and another of a depth of 11 feet; while in the southern caves of the group a skull and human bones were unearthed, also a jar containing bones of an early Semitic type, some belonging to children and some to adults.

The caves at Gezer were doubtless commenced in pre-Semitic times, part of them being the work of the Troglodytes or cave-men. They were the dwellings of the neolithic inhabitants of Palestine. When the Semites came upon the scene they used these underground chambers as cellars, store-rooms, cisterns, or refuges from the heat of the sun. They may also have been adapted as places of worship, prisons, traps, hiding-places, and perhaps even as stables,

certain marks indicating that cattle were tethered in them. In the third stage of their history the southern chambers in this extensive system of caves were transformed into a burial-place. The owners of the northern chambers blocked up the communication passage lest the spirits of the dead should escape and do them harm. These northern chambers were apparently little frequented, and were used as places for hiding treasures, as the relics discovered in them prove. The interment period in the history of the caves is about 1800 B.C. to 1600 B.C., i.e. some two or three hundred years later than the time of Abraham.

Gezer is not the only place in Palestine where subterranean chambers have been discovered. They are of frequent occurrence in the long strip of low-lying hills known as the Shephelah, situated between the central highlands and the Philistine plain. In one locality in this district—Tell Sandahannah—there are some four hundred caves grouped together in sixty sets, which are thus described by Mr. Handcock: 'The chambers are as a rule more or less circular in shape, and have a diameter of from about 39 to 48 feet. The walls curve inward, the roof being dome- or bell-shaped. There is usually only one entrance, which consists of a hole in the roof. In the majority of cases safe access from the opening in the roof to the floor can only be gained by means of a rope, and in these cases the caves can hardly have been used as habitations.'[1] In other of the caves we are told there are side entrances or spiral staircases from the roof to the floor. 'The passages which connect the chambers of a system vary in length from about 10 to about 114 feet. In almost every chamber are small triangular niches, used, it is thought, for lights, which these dark subterranean rooms and passages would, of course, obviously require.'[2]

In close proximity to the mouths of the caves, and sometimes, as at Gezer, within the chambers themselves,

[1] *Op. cit.*, *p.* 49. [2] *Ib.*, p. 50.

are to be found bowl-like depressions in the ground usually described as cupmarks. They are of artificial construction, and what purpose they served is uncertain. The most probable theory is that they were employed for some religious rite or sacrifice. It is interesting to note that of the Shephelah caves Mr. Handcock remarks, 'Some of these were certainly used as temporary places of refuge, if not as permanent places of abode at some period—for in the *souterrain* at Tell Zakarîya some of the doorways were arranged for the doors to be bolted on the inside.'[1]

A diagram is given of one of these caves—at Khurbet-el-'Ain—which shows it to have been of most elaborate construction.[2] Its main feature is a spacious hall some 46 feet long and about 18 feet broad, and originally about 14 feet high. Around this hall was a series of rooms, connected by a gallery with other chambers. A double doorway admits to an irregular cavern measuring about 18 feet by 6 feet. There is also a flight of steps leading to two long galleries. The cave presents, in fact, quite a warren of underground passages and chambers, and must have been capable of accommodating, if necessary, a large number of people.

These details of archaeological research are of considerable value to the Bible student, in so far as they help him to reconstruct more perfectly the scenery and landscape of certain of the sacred narratives. Few of us have taken into account this feature, these numerous subterranean burrowings, these pits, and holes, and shafts, and underground chambers. In the Shephelah alone there were, as we have said, no less than sixty systems of tunnellings and caves; most of them being in existence in the days of the patriarchs. A souterrain like this is unknown to us in our own country, but henceforth we must take it into account in our endeavour to reconstruct the topography of the land in which the Bible was written. And further, these discoveries of the excavators compel us to modify the conception we

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 49. [2] *Ib.*, pp. 51, 52.

have formed of such caves as are mentioned in the Scripture narratives. The word 'cave' to an English reader suggests a hole in the rocky hillside, or a cavern in the sea-cliff, such as we are familiar with in our own country. But is this idea correct? Is it not much more probable that the caves of which we read in the Scriptures were rather of the nature of extensive subterranean caverns similar to the one at Gezer? Let the reader think of them thus, and he will discover that the narratives gain considerably in picturesqueness and interest.

We will give one or two illustrative examples of the way in which this new feature in the topography may help to a better understanding of the sacred story, and not be without value to the expositor of biblical truth.

(1) An early instance of a cave used for interment is that of Machpelah at Hebron, purchased by Abraham as a burial-place for Sarah (Gen. xxiv.). This, we are told, is 'the one ancient burying-place which has been handed down with certainty as a genuine site.' *Hastings' Bible Dictionary* (art. 'Machpelah') contains a description of the mosque and the cenotaphs of the patriarchs which occupy the site to-day. The cenotaphs are surrounded by a high wall, but beneath the floor of this enclosure are certain underground chambers into which no one is permitted to enter. The writer of the article quotes the statements, how far reliable, we cannot say, of several mediaeval travellers who succeeded in obtaining admission to these caves. Benjamin of Tudela (1163 A.D.) writes: 'But if any Jew come, who gives an additional fee to the keeper of the cave, an iron door is opened, which dates from the time of our forefathers who rest in peace, and with a burning candle in his hand the visitor descends into the first cave, which is empty, traverses a second in the same state, and at last reaches a third which contains six sepulchres, those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebekah, and Leah, one opposite the other.'

Another mediaeval traveller, David the Reubenite (1523 A.D.), is quoted as follows. Being shown the cenotaphs of the patriarchs, he said: 'These are not true; the truth is that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are in the cave underground; and I told them to show me the cave. So I went with them, and they showed me the opening of the door of the cave in the mouth of the pit; and they let down the lamp into the pit by a rope, and from the mouth of the pit I saw the opening of the door about the height of a man, and I was convinced that it was under the cave. Then I said, This is not the opening to the cave, there is another opening; and they answered me, Yes, in ancient times the opening of the cave was in the middle of the Great Church, in which is a cenotaph of Isaac.'

With reference to this quotation, we are inclined to question whether David the Reubenite was right when he denied that the pit with the door below was the opening into the cave.

As the supposed entrances to the caves within the enclosure are jealously guarded, little is known for certain concerning the chambers beneath the floor of the mosque. They are not open to investigation. With respect to the site itself on which the buildings stand, Conder states that on all sides of the mosque there is lower ground; but another traveller tells us, 'The buildings stand on the slope of the eastern hill; the rocks having been excavated along the upper side, in order to lay the foundations.'

This information, uncertain and even conflicting as it is, is sufficient to warrant us in surmising that Abraham's burial-place at Machpelah was of the nature of the subterranean chambers at Gezer, &c., converted by the Semites into places of interment. The newly acquired knowledge, which we owe to the excavator, of the underground caves of Palestine, enables us to form a realistic picture of a burial-scene in patriarchal times. The conventional idea of a more or less shallow cavern in the hillside must be abandoned.

Instead of this the funeral procession is to be thought of as halting at a hole in the ground, the entrance to a dark shaft down which a sloping way or a rough stone stair, such as the one reproduced in the illustration in Mr. Handcock's volume,[1] leads into an underground chamber. Into this gloomy vault, fitfully illuminated by lights placed in niches in the walls, the funeral cortège bearing its dead would with difficulty descend. A long, low passage, cut through the rock, would conduct them into another subterranean chamber, and the procession might proceed in similar fashion into a third; the wailings of the mourners startling the echoes of the narrow, gloomy, tunnelled ways. How melancholy a sound it would be, this shrill, distant wailing, coming out of the bowels of the earth, in the hearing of those who were waiting in the open air without! Here in this third chamber, silent and dark, they would leave the dead, possibly walling up the passage on their return through it. What funeral rites would be performed we do not know, but no more weird scene of its kind can be imagined than this arduous and gloomy pilgrimage down broken steps and through narrow, subterranean passages and low-roofed, underground chambers, with flickering lights casting strange shadows on the walls, till the last resting-place of the dead was reached. Thus Sarah, and Abraham, and Jacob were buried.[2]

(2) When King Saul consulted the wise woman of Endor, she said, 'I see a god coming up out of the earth' (1 Sam. xxviii. 13); and again, 'an old man cometh up, and he is covered with a robe.' The discoveries of the excavators enable us to see more clearly what this woman saw in her trance thousands of years ago; 'a god,' or 'gods,' 'coming out of the earth.' Her vision revealed to her one of the dark holes or shafts of which a description has been given

[1] P. 34.

[2] For an account of "Burial Customs" see ch. viii. in Mr. Handcock's volume.

above, with the flight of stone stairs leading down into the place of underground chambers and corridors where the dead lay. Up the staircase and through the cavity of the shaft she saw emerge strange shadowy forms, a ghostly procession, the spirits of dead men or the denizens of the underworld; and among them was the figure of the prophet.

(3) A bold exploit is related in 2 Sam. xxiii. 20, where is described the adventure of Benaiah, one of David's mighty men; 'he went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow.' The word 'pit' in this passage is more correctly rendered 'cistern.' What sort of cistern was it? In Benaiah's time these receptacles were not large, especially in country villages. And a cistern, unless it was of considerable size, and had been long disused, so that its walls were perforated with holes and its bottom strewn with broken masonry, would scarcely be the sort of place where a wild beast could find much of a refuge. But cisterns of a considerable size are quite common in the underground chambers at Gezer and elsewhere, and even when these caves were no longer used for human habitation the Semites found them convenient places for storing water. It was probably in such a place that the lion referred to in 2 Sam. xxiii. took refuge. Surprised by an early fall of snow, the beast crept down the sloping way of one of these ancient underground dwellings into the dark caverns and passages below. Benaiah followed him into this labyrinth of tunnels and subterranean ways, and at last hunted him down and cornered him in an empty cistern, such as those described by Prof. Macalister, and there he slew the beast. A bold and perilous exploit indeed, if performed under such circumstances as these.

(4) Perhaps the best known cave of the Old Testament is that of Adullam, where David and his four hundred men took refuge. Adullam was situated in the Shephelah, in the very district where so many subterranean caverns have been discovered, most of them large enough to serve

as a hiding-place or stronghold for more than four hundred men. Let the reader turn to the description given above of the souterrain at Khurbet-el-'Ain with its hall and rooms and galleries, and he will have a good idea of the sort of place Adullam was. We have already referred to the 'cupmarks' discovered at the entrance to most of these subterranean chambers, which are generally regarded as having been used in some sort of religious rite. May it not have been into one of these cupmarks, or into more than one, that David poured out before the Lord as a sacrificial offering the water which the three mighty men had brought at the risk of their lives from the well at Bethlehem's gate?

(5) Finally we would inquire how far the Hebrew conception of Sheol and the underworld of the dead was affected by the existence of these numerous underground caves and systems of caves in Palestine.

(*a*) In later Hebrew thought at any rate there are indications of a tendency to regard Sheol as consisting of more than one subterranean pit. A passage in Psalm xvi. 10 may be quoted as an illustration :—

> For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol,
> Neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption.
> (*Shaḥath*, R.V. mg. *the pit*).

Dr. Briggs writes: 'The Pit is not the tomb, but is synonymous with Sheol, usually understood as another name of Sheol itself as a pit or cavern under the earth; but usage favours the opinion that it is a pit in Sheol, as a deeper place in Sheol, synonym Abaddon, the dungeon of Sheol. The psalmist will see Sheol, but he will not be abandoned there; he will not see the pit, the dungeon of Sheol, the place of the wicked. The pious could hardly go there.'[1]

Now the origin of this idea of the Pit, or Abaddon, is probably to be found in the conviction that the righteous

[1] *Inter. Crit. Comm.*

and the unrighteous are not treated alike after death. But may not the development of this belief have been largely helped, in popular thought at any rate, by the fact that in the actual underworld of the souterrain of Palestine there was cave behind cave, the inner ones reached by long and dark and narrow tunnels, into which few cared to explore. We have already pointed out that there is a souterrain in Ireland, which is popularly known as St. Patrick's Purgatory. In a similar way popular Hebrew thought may have identified the actual underworld, the caverns and subterranean chambers of the Shephelah and other districts, with Sheol and the abode of the dead. If, then, it was known that in the former there were caves behind caves, some of them darker and more dismal than others, may not this have helped to confirm the notion that death does not mean the same for all, that to some it brings a more dreadful fate than to others, an abode in the underworld more awful than the first or outer chamber of Sheol? There was a time in the religious history of Israel when this was a new thought. Now, new religious ideas are not easily established in the popular belief of any age; a few may accept them, but if they are to become generally prevalent something else is needed in addition to the arguments that appeal to the thoughtful man. For popular belief is influenced more by the concrete and visible than by abstract ideas and theories. We do not, of course, suggest that the conception of Sheol and Abaddon had its origin in the existence of underground caves and burial-places of this kind in Palestine. Such a statement, for reasons which we have no time to enter into, would be indefensible. Our contention is that this idea obtained popular currency owing to the fact that in the actual souterrain of Palestine there was presented a visible and concrete corroboration of such a conception of the underworld. And the belief that the righteous and unrighteous are not treated alike would have had little chance of becoming the belief of the people generally,

if it had not been supported by the actual existence of caves corresponding to Sheol's gloomy dungeon of Abaddon, or the Pit, in the ancient burial-places of Palestine. Thus the subterranean chambers we have described may be said to have played some part in the development of the doctrine of the future life from an undifferentiated Sheol to the Christian belief in Heaven and Hell.

(*b*) The underworld was also regarded as the home of evil spirits from which they issued to work mischief among mankind. This idea is prominent in Jewish apocalyptic literature, and traces of it are to be found in the New Testament. It occurs notably in the book of Revelation;[1] the demons in Luke viii. 31 are described as entreating Christ not to command them to depart into the abyss, i.e. into the lowest depth in Sheol. In the Apocalypse this abyss is represented as a pit under the earth with a shaft (φρέαρ) leading down into it, and an entrance capable of being closed. With it, as emerging from it or driven down into it, are associated the grim figures of Abaddon or Apollyon, the Wild Beast, and the Dragon. The key of the entrance is at one time in the possession of the angel of the abyss, a malign power; and at another time in the possession of an angel of divine appointment, deputed by God to secure and imprison the Dragon or Satan in his own abode, so that he cease to trouble the earth for a thousand years.

Much of this is, of course, mere imagery or metaphor to the modern reader, but we are inclined to think that it was rather less imaginary to those for whom the words were first written. Some of the holes and shafts of the Palestine souterrain, after the caves had ceased to be used for the interment of the dead, might very naturally have come to be regarded as demon-haunted, as the exit ways by which evil spirits passed from out of some subterranean region into the world inhabited by man. It was easy for any one who held such a view to believe that somewhere there was

[1] Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11; xi. 8; xvii. 8; xx. 1.

an actual, great highway down into hell, and that one day this was to be closed and fastened and locked, after the arch-fiend had been driven down it fettered and impotent. The author of Revelation was enforcing the great truth that some day the power of evil is to be fettered and rendered incapable of further harm; and he expressed it in terms that were suited to the thought of the times, and therefore in terms that would appeal most forcibly to those for whom the words were written.[1] His imagery was suggested by what we know to have been a superstition; the source of his ideas of shaft, and pit, and locked entrance is to be found in the souterrain of Palestine, in which the excavator has discovered these very features. The ideas referred to are therefore accidental and of quite secondary importance. Their explanation is to be found in thoughts suggested by such caves as the one discovered at Gezer. It is no small advantage for the expositor of the Scriptures, when certain features of Apocalyptic vision or parable can be traced to their origin in the popular, and possibly mistaken, notions of the time. He is then better able to guide to a spiritual interpretation of the prophecy, and to show us what to discard as belonging to the superstitious thought of the age, and what to retain as possessed of eternal truth.

ARTHUR T. BURBRIDGE.

[1] It does not, of course, follow that the Book of Revelation was written for Palestinian Jews. Ideas which had their origin in Palestine were not necessarily confined to the land of their birth. They must have been prevalent among the Jews of the Dispersion, and through them they influenced the thought of early Christian communities in Asia.

THE CHANGED SITUATION IN THE EAST

Political Frontiers and Boundary Making. By Col. Sir THOMAS H. HOLDICH. (Macmillan. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.)
In Far North-East Siberia. By I. W. SHKLOVSKY ('Dioneo'). Translated by L. Edwards and Z. Shklovsky. (Macmillan. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.)
The War and the Baydad Railway. By MORRIS JASTROW, JR. (Lippincott. 6*s.* net.)
Syria and the Holy Land. By the Very Rev. Sir GEORGE ADAM SMITH. (Hodder & Stoughton. 1*s.* net.)
Japan Moves North. By FREDERIC COLEMAN. (Cassell. 5*s.* net.)
Fifty Years of New Japan. By Count SHIGENOBU OKUMA. (Smith, Elder & Co.)

I

NOT until one comprehends the complex part that Russia of the Czars played upon the Eastern stage does one realize what her collapse means to Asia. She was an aggressor who respected no law of God or man to satisfy her hunger for land, which grew as it was fed. But her very ambition to expand in the East and South made her the watchdog of Asia. She was constantly on the alert, wary of each move that any Power made for aggrandizement in any part of Asia. Before she fell upon evil days no Power considered it expedient to challenge the veto that she chose to place upon any scheme of expansion that she thought to militate against her own programme of aggression.

A fine instance of how Russia compelled others to alter their Eastern policies is to be found in the annals of the railway that Germany planned to dominate the Middle East and to make the stepping-stone to a great Eastern Empire. In 1871–73 Dr. Wilhelm von Pressel, a German engineer, built for Sultan Abdul Aziz (deposed in March, 1876, for extravagance and reaction) a stretch of railway 91 kilometres long, from Haidar Pasha (facing Constantinople across the narrow Bosphorus) to Ismid (on the sea of Marmora), where that Sultan had his shooting-box. Later this line was sold to the *Société du Chemin de*

Fer Ottoman d'Anatolie (the Anatolian Railway Company), converted, in 1903, into the *Société du Chemin de Fer de Bagdad* (the Bagdad Railway Company), and in 1889–93 von Pressel built an extension to Angora. He projected a railway from Angora through Caesarea and Diarbekr, thence along the Tigris to Mosul, Bagdad, and the Persian Gulf. Russia saw in the projected line through Northern Asia Minor a menace to her interests in the Middle East. Germany considered it inexpedient to ignore Russian opposition, which also meant French opposition, for France and Russia had entered into a solemn alliance in 1891. The northward route to Bagdad was abandoned in favour of a transverse route through Mesopotamia. Dr. Von Pressel had, in 1896, extended the line stretching from Haidar Pasha to Eskishehr (on the way to Angora) to Konoia. It was decided to continue that line through Mosul, Bagdad, and Basra (on the Shatt-el-Arab, or the navigable part of the Tigris).

The Russian diplomats felt highly pleased with their performance. Apparently they had every cause for jubilation. They had forced the Wilhelmstrasse to keep its hands off their preserves—and in doing so they had made it to eat humble-pie. They had, moreover, hoodwinked France to act against her own interests, for the new German railway put an end to the French ambition to extend their lines in Syria through Mesopotamia to the Persian Gulf. They had, furthermore, made Germany and Britain collide in the Middle East. As far back as 1857, Sir William Andrew, who had spent many years of his life as a railway official in India, had published a *Memoir on the Euphrates Valley and the Route to India*, urging his people to build a railway through Mesopotamia to strengthen their position in India. The British Company that had built the railway line from Smyrna to Ergerdir—the oldest railway in Asia Minor—without any guarantee from the Turkish Government, asked that Government, in 1891, for permission to extend the line

through Mesopotamia to the Persian Gulf, but such permission was refused, presumably at German instigation. The convention that the Turkish Government made with the German syndicate gave that syndicate the right, during the period of railway construction, to navigate the Shatt-el-Arab and the Tigris, which theretofore had been the exclusive privilege of the British. The German terminus on the Gulf, left undetermined for the time being (possibly Kuweit or Fao), would constitute a permanent menace to India. The accentuation of hostility between Britain and Germany pleased Russia of the Czars, which, at that time, was at loggerheads with Britain and was using every means in her power to limit and to weaken British influence in Asia.

In setting France and Britain against Germany in the Middle East, Russia prepared the way for the present conflict. Dr. Jastrow, Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, a patient student of Middle Eastern affairs, observes in *The War and the Bagdad Railway*—an eminently impartial account of a highly controversial subject:

> 'Had the northern route to Bagdad been followed by the German syndicate and left a southern route free for a second line in the hands of England or France, the railway projects of Asia Minor and Syria might have remained purely commercial undertakings of great cultural value, marking the economic progress of contact between East and West. The political aspect of railway plans in the Near East might have been permanently kept in the background. The European situation would have assumed an entirely different colouring, if England and Germany had not clashed in the East over the Bagdad Railway, as happened immediately upon the announcement of the convention of 1902-1903' (page 89).

Russia of the Czars interfered in the Far East in exactly the same way as she did in the Middle East. The termination of the war between China and Japan gave her an exceptionally good opportunity to carry on her programme of expansion by exploiting international jealousies. In the treaty signed at Shimonoséki (Japan) on April 14, 1895, the Chinese agreed to cede the Liaotung peninsula (with Port Arthur) and the adjacent waters, besides ceding Formosa and the Pescadores, recognizing the complete

independence of Korea, paying an indemnity of 200,000,000 taels, and opening the Yangtse-kiang to navigation, and Shashih, Chungking, Suchow, and Hangchow to trade. The Russian autocrats were alarmed. They believed that if Japan was permitted to gain a foothold on the mainland of Asia, she would resist the Russian plans of expansion in the Far East. They were anxious for a good harbour and port on the Pacific Coast, to which they could extend the Trans-Siberian Railway. They knew that Port Arthur would serve their purpose exceedingly well, and, therefore, they could not permit Japan to acquire it. Six days after the treaty was signed between China and Japan, the Russian Ambassador at Tokyo presented to the Japanese Foreign Office a memorandum, urging Japan to renounce possession of the peninsula of Liaotung.

France was Russia's ally, and joined in the protest. But her agent in Tokyo made it quite clear that no other motive than allegiance to her treaty obligations actuated her. Count Soyéshima says, in *Fifty Years of New Japan*, that Germany, which acted in concert with both these Powers, was believed at the time to have instigated the action. The late Count Hayashi, Foreign Minister of Japan, found the German Ambassador exceedingly obnoxious, whereas the agents of Russia and France had been quite courteous.

Time soon revealed why Germany acted in this manner. In 1898 the Wilhelmstrasse obtained from the Chinese Government the lease, for a period of 99 years, of Kiao Chao (193 square miles in area), with adjacent waters. She further secured a 'sphere of influence' extending 50 kilometres (about 31 miles) from all points of the leased territory, and mining and railway concessions in the province of Shantung (about 2,750 square miles, with a population of 84,000 persons).

Russia was not in a position to prevent Germany from establishing an outpost of empire in the Far East. She

had acted in concert with her in humbling Japan, and was, at the time, making preparations to seize Chinese territory. A month after Kiao Chao had been leased by Germany, the Russian Pacific squadron entered Port Arthur and compelled the Chinese to lease the Liaotung peninsula with its littoral for a period of twenty-five years. Soon afterwards Great Britain obtained the lease of Wei-hai-wei, and France secured a twenty-five-years' lease of Kuang-chow. In 1901 Russia used the Boxer rising as a pretext to occupy Manchuria. The Russian programme of expansion led to war with Japan, which, ending disastrously for Russia, compelled her to turn over to Japan the lease of the Liaotung peninsula, and, with the consent of the Chinese Government, the railway between Chang-chun (Kwang-chengtsze) and Port Arthur and all its branches, along with coal mines in that region belonging to or worked by the railway, the whole area being 1,219 square miles, with a population of 540,835 persons, 49,021 of them Japanese.

Soon after the cessation of hostilities between Russia and Japan, a convention was concluded between Russia and Britain delimitating their respective spheres in the Middle East. That convention was followed by the establishment of the *entente cordiale* between France and Britain.

Germany did not look with favour upon the elimination of discord between Britain, France, and Russia, for she knew that these Powers, acting in concert, would not permit her to dominate Europe or the Middle East or Far East. No wonder that the Kaiser and his advisers found a pretext to precipitate the present struggle to crush these Powers.

The war knit together the European Allies. It threw Japan and Russia into each other's arms. They readily composed their differences. Since, unlike Russia, Japan was industrialized, she undertook to manufacture large quantities of munitions for use on the Eastern front, and supplied them to Russia, largely on credit. Japan also helped to extend and to improve the Siberian railway system

that formed a link between the Far East and European Russia. Out of this camaraderie was born the Russo-Japanese Alliance, of which I wrote in this *Review* for October, 1916. With Japan acting in concert with Russia, Britain, and France, Germany could cherish no hope of expansion in the Far East.

The operations carried on by Indo-British forces in Mesopotamia spelled the doom of German ambitions in the Middle East. Before the end of 1917 the portion of the German railway from Bagdad to Samarra was being used against their allies, the Turks. It seemed that the German desire to establish supremacy over the Middle East would never be fulfilled.

When the situation appeared brightest, Russia collapsed, and upset all calculations. With the disappearance of the Eastern front, Germany was able to strengthen her hand in France and Italy. She found all obstacles removed from the roads leading to the Far East and the Middle East. Russia, so long as she remains disorganized, cannot prevent her from making whatever use she may wish to make of the railway system that Russia built to the Pacific Ocean, and the one to the Afghan border, thereby imperilling practically all Asia.

II

The Siberian railway is the longest in the world. The line from Petrograd to Vladivostok stretches over 6,700 miles, while the one connecting Petrograd with Port Arthur extends over 6,900 miles. It was built by Russians with rails manufactured in Russia. The engineers carried it over the Ural mountains through the snow-swept plains of Siberia. The line that skirts the southern extremity of Lake Baikal proved to be the most difficult portion to construct. Only 156 miles long, it has 33 tunnels and 250 viaducts and bridges, and cost £6,000,000. It has, however, obviated the necessity of using a ferry across the lake.

Siberia has never been properly surveyed, but it is computed to have an area of something like 5,000,000 square miles. Its possibilities in agriculture, horticulture, stock-breeding, dairying, forestry, fisheries, and mines are almost limitless. Colonel Holdich writes in his *Political Frontiers and Boundary Making*—a work that deserves to be read most carefully—that Siberia has 'almost every conceivable variety of climate and orography short of that which we call tropical.' As M. I. W. Shklovsky ('Dioneo') says in his fascinating work *In Far North-East Siberia*, 'Siberia was not conquered by one great army, but by a few score of trappers and beaver-hunters.' Thus almost without any expenditure of blood or money, Russia gained this vast expanse of uplands, lowlands, and steppes, to which large additions have been made from time to time by compelling China to cede or to lease territory.

Germany would like nothing better than to annex this 'Canada of the future.' Besides acquiring the opportunity of accumulating immense wealth, she would be able to fasten her strangle-hold upon China, Japan, and other Asiatic countries. Just at this time a rich reward awaits her at Vladivostok, owing to disorganization on the Siberian railway. Mr. Frederic Coleman, the author of *Japan Moves North*, an American writer and motorist, found, during a recent visit, 674,000 tons of cargo 'piled promiscuously here and there in the open spaces and fields.' The greatest congestion, he writes, was caused by 'railway material, nitrate of soda, barbed wire, tea, phosphates, and munitions.' Next, he continues, 'came metals, rice, cotton, machines and lathes, tanning extract, oils, rubber, tallow, gunnies, and motor cars.' These goods had been sent from Japan and the United States, and most of them lay in the open, not even covered by tarpaulins.

The enemy has lost no time in sending agents to carry on the work of disintegration in Siberia. Mr. Coleman came across constant traces of German intrigue in that

country. He, moreover, found the Russians inhabiting that land very susceptible to German propaganda. He gives a striking instance of their gullibility. One day before the peace treaty had been signed at Brest-Litovsk, a young Russian sailor asked a British officer if he was wearing the uniform of a Turkish general or of an American lieutenant. The officer belonged to the Black Watch, and wore the British uniform. On expressing surprise at a Russian asking such a question when Turkey was at war with Russia and no Turkish general could be in Vladivostok, the sailor informed him that a revolution had taken place in Turkey, which was no longer at war with Russia, and was governed by committees of soldiers' and workmen's deputies. The British officer was taken to the barracks, where he saw a sheet printed in Russian giving a circumstantial account of a Turkish revolution that had never taken place. Mr. Coleman writes again and again that the Russian visionaries in Siberia, whether in German pay or not, are playing the German game in the Russian Far East.

III

The danger to the Middle East is even greater than the peril to the Far East. As Sir George Adam Smith reminds us in his timely and lucid brochure, Syria has witnessed the march of nearly all the world's conquerors. The same truth is brought home by Dr. Jastrow in his book. Germany realized the importance of the road to the East long before she obtained the concession to build the Bagdad Railway. It is not likely that she will permit the Turks to be defeated indefinitely in Palestine and Mesopotamia, and as soon as her commitments in the West allow her to spare forces, she will threaten both those theatres of war. It is indeed very significant that, weeks ago, the Turks crossed the Persian border. Their objective seems to be the road that Russia was taking southward to join hands with the Indo-British expeditionary force

operating in Mesopotamia. Competent military authorities admit the possibility of a flank movement in the Eastern theatres of war.

In my opinion, the greater the German failure in the West, the greater the fury with which the German hosts will pounce upon the Middle East. So far German successes have all been won in the East. Russia and Rumania have been knocked out of the war. Serbia and Montenegro have been crushed. These victories have given a prestige to Hindenburg that no German general ever had. By patient survey he has made himself master of Eastern strategy. It would not be at all surprising if, on finding himself checkmated in the West, he should seek to gain a speedy victory in the East to impress the German imagination.

The German press is making no secret of the final objective of the German effort in the East. It is India. For a long time the German mouth has watered for that country. The Bagdad railway was built to conquer that land. With Russia and Rumania out of the way, Germany greedily gazes upon the roads leading through southern Russia, the Caucasus, Persia, and Afghanistan to India's north-west frontier.

In an article entitled 'The Menace to India from Without,' that recently appeared in the *Vossische Zeitung*, the writer urged the promotion of a German policy in Afghanistan, and sought to bribe the Amir by offering him 'an Afghan port on the coast of Mekran (British Baluchistan).' That would introduce a wedge, he said, between India and British predominance on the Persian Gulf with the intended permanent establishment of Britain in Mesopotamia. India, he considered, was not 'in a position to meet the military needs which (would) arise from' an invasion from the north-west, and she would become too weak to 'master her own internal perils—perils which would fully ripen in the event of a further reduction of the men that still remain at her disposal.' He gave it as his opinion that Britain

'can be forced in a very short time to withdraw her forces from Mesopotamia,' and the greater the pressure exerted upon Britain the sooner Germany would have 'a free road via Bagdad to the Persian Gulf.' He concluded by saying that 'to-day, when India is threatened from without and within, it is our business to make the revival of this peril in a more acute form England's real and growing nightmare.' (*The Times*, May 18, 1918.)

The regions through which the roads to India pass are rich in food for men, fodder for cattle, and petrol for transport. They are mostly inhabited by sturdy tribes who profess Islam, and among them Germany has been, for years, posing as the protector of Islam, in alliance with the Caliph. The Viceroy and Governor-General of India recently declared that German agents of disintegration were at work perverting the simple tribesmen.

IV

The Eastern Allies possess abundant materials to enable them to prevent German penetration of the Extreme East. Japan has a large Army and Navy, which have proved their efficiency and are susceptible of rapid extension. She also can manufacture vast quantities of munitions of all sorts. China can supply her easterly neighbour with all the raw materials that she may need for the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and war-equipment. She has large deposits of iron, copper, and antimony, which enter largely into munition-making. She can, moreover, provide Japan with abundant labour to convert these materials into munitions. The Chinese, if properly trained, make efficient fighters, and a far larger army can be raised from among them than would be needed to defeat German designs in the Far East.

India's man-power is only second to that of China. According to the last census, there were 73,818,558 men between the ages of 18 and 51, or fighting age as now inter-

pected in this country. Even if the area of recruitment was limited to the 9,000,000 of them belonging to classes officially labelled as martial, yet a far larger force could be organized than would be needed to meet the German menace. General Sir James Willcocks, who commanded the Indian Corps in France in 1914–15, told me, in the course of a conversation last year, that the Garhwalis, whose very existence as fighters was unknown a few years ago, fought no less gallantly than men belonging to the Indian races, classes, and castes famed for their fighting mettle from time immemorial. The Bengalis, who have been stigmatized as cowards since Lord Macaulay penned his wicked diatribe, have faced fire with a nonchalance worthy of the bravest fighters. To pursue the policy of excluding the bulk of Indian population from the Army would be unfair and unwise—unfair because Indians officially classed as 'unmartial' can, and do, make good fighters; and unwise because men who would be willing to shed their last drop of blood in defence of their motherland would be excluded from the defence force.

In addition to men, India has almost inexhaustible quantities of materials for munitions. Even persons who claimed to know her potentiality have been surprised at the manner in which she has munitioned almost entirely the operations in Mesopotamia, and has supplied other theatres of war with *matériel*. Nevertheless, not much more than a beginning has been made in this respect. Even to-day, when shipping space is at a high premium and there is a great shortage of labour in Britain, vast quantities of raw materials instead of manufactured goods are leaving India. The Government of India is, however, taking vigorous measures to expand India's manufacturing capacity.

No time should be lost in organizing the Eastern resources to meet the German menace to the Far East and the Middle East. Japan, China, and India are willing—nay eager—to take active measures. Japan and China have already

made a military pact to defend their mutual interests against aggression. The text of this treaty has not yet been issued; but it is clear from the details that have been published that China will have the benefit of Japan's experience in raising and equipping armies and in manufacturing munitions.

Up till the time of writing the Eastern Allies had not come to any definite understanding with the European Allies on the question of taking joint action in the Far East. The cause for delay is not far to seek. Russia is in travail, and none of the Allies, Eastern or Western, is anxious to add to her troubles. Germany is certain to misrepresent any move that the Allies may make in the Extreme East, in order to incite Russia against the Entente Powers. The Russian Far East is, moreover very anti-Japanese. Mr. Coleman writes that he heard from many quarters in the Pri-Amur district that 'the Japanese would come to Siberia aggressively some day.' He adds that much of this animus was created by Nikolai L'vovitch Gondatti, Governor-General of Siberia at the time the Revolution broke out. These difficulties notwithstanding, I, for one, feel that in course of time a *modus vivendi* will be found to enable China and Japan to concentrate their resources upon preventing German penetration of the Far East.

The organization of Indian resources to meet the German menace to India and to India's fronts—Mesopotamia and Palestine—is a much simpler matter than the organization of forces to fight the German peril in the Extreme East. In India the remedy lies altogether in British hands, and they do not have to obtain leave from anybody. Indians themselves are alive to the danger and anxious to strengthen the British hand in every possible manner. Indeed, they have been agitating that sufficient use has not been made of India's man power during the war. It is evident that their complaint is not without foundation when it is recalled that only one out of every 161 males in India has so far

seen active service, whereas in Britain rather more than one out of every four males has enlisted in the Army.

Two great difficulties have prevented the adequate use of India's man power. First, the population has been artificially divided into martial and non-martial classes. Practically all Indians who were capable of understanding Britain's war aims were placed in the latter category. Second, Indians have been all but technically excluded from holding the King's commission. The latter racial bar has prevented the organization of new divisions, because there has been a great paucity of Britons who knew Indian vernaculars well enough to command Indian regiments. The removal of the racial bars that exclude certain Indians from the Army and the bestowal of commissions upon Indians with a liberal hand would not only enable the authorities to raise and officer large armies, but would also stimulate Indian martial enthusiasm and imperial pride. Signs are extant that inspire hope that the authorities in Britain and India will rise to the occasion.

All Asia has been horrified by German outrages in Europe and Africa, and is united in the resolve to protect itself against Germany. It remains for the Allies in Europe and the United States of America to enable the East to avert the menace. Time is pressing. The task in hand in the Western theatre of war should not be allowed to obscure the Eastern menace that is rapidly, though silently, growing.

ST. NIHAL SINGH.

Notes and Discussions

JAMES HOPE MOULTON

MANY appreciations of James Moulton have been given to the world since his tragic and untimely death. Friends, relatives, pupils, peers and collaborators in his great work of Christian scholarship, authoritative members of his own and of other Churches, have all paid their tribute. It may seem presumptuous to think that I can add more to so much. Yet I confess that I have the daring fancy that I may be able to convey an atmosphere that has not yet been carried, and to speak of my friend from a side from which few others knew him. I was not so close a relative as not to be able to criticize—far as I am from being able to be coldly impartial—but I was near enough to him for many years to see him in a thousand aspects, and to be bound to him by a thousand invisible ties. For two years I lived in daily association with him under the same roof; for thirteen I was his colleague in the same school; and, though after he went to Manchester I naturally saw much less of him than before, yet I remained in close touch with him, and knew what he was doing and how his mind was growing. As, further, I do not think I agreed with more than a tenth of his opinions, and argued with him freely on every subject under the sun, I fancy I knew his mental equipment as well as most.

It was easy for anybody to differ with James Moulton; but it was singularly hard to quarrel with him, for his disposition was as open and simple as that of Charles Fox himself. He was gifted by nature with a sunny and charming manner, which was far indeed from being manner only; and few were those who could resist it. At the end of a vigorous argument, one always felt as Carlyle felt after a similar bout with John Sterling, that 'We had been agreeing in everything but opinion.' If he were in the least in the wrong, he owned it with disarming candour; and no discussion ever left the slightest bitterness behind.

It was not long before I saw what were the two foundation-principles in Moulton. He was a Christian and he was a student—both of them through and through. His religion was instinctive, and reposed on the deepest certainties of his being. Intellectually, of course, he was inclined to absolute freedom of thought, and would have felt it a disgrace if he could not have proved and tested everything whatever; but there was no doubt that on certain points he was a rock. It was this perfect certainty on fundamentals, indeed, which allowed him such freedom in the less essential dogmas, and further made him able to meet members of other Churches with such charity and sympathy. Once only, in all my intercourse with

him, did I hear him give expression to those passing doubts which, I suppose, come occasionally to all believers. 'What should I do if at any time I went so far as to be unable to subscribe to the Methodist creed?' But that time never came; he never had to face that terrible conflict, between love of truth and love of a mother, which some have had to meet.

But he was also a student. Steadily and persistently he worked on, in term-time and in vacation, *ohne Hast, ohne Rast*. I do not regard him as a good schoolmaster—his primary interest was not in the boys he taught, but in what he taught them. As soon as his hours of teaching were over, he was back at his desk, studying, writing, extracting. He told me once that he thought his average of study, apart from teaching, came to six hours a day for three hundred and thirteen days in the year. Good eyesight and good general health enabled him to get the utmost out of each of these hours; he did not flag after an hour or two as most men must.

Not being naturally made for a school teacher, he did not 'find himself' till he left Cambridge and went to Manchester. Contact with a wider air than that of academies was precisely what he needed to enlarge his mind and enable him to produce his best. Nothing in a man's university career becomes him like the leaving of it. There was a danger that Moulton would sink into the mere Dry-as-dust scholar. From that he was saved by being taken out of the home of scholarship and put down in a great industrial centre. After a few months of bewilderment, he discovered his new bearings, and settled down. He learned much in Manchester; chiefly that, even for scholarship itself, scholarship is not enough. He discovered, as he told me, greater natural brain-power among Lancashire artisans than he had met with in Cambridge; and he took the discovery to heart. One of his old friends used to say that what Moulton needed was 'a year in Paris'; his years in Manchester did more for him than any length of time in France could have done. Thenceforward, though he never ceased to pore over books, he learned the more important subject of human nature, and his studies themselves gained immeasurably. Had he stayed in Cambridge, he would have written books with the same titles, but the books themselves would have been altogether duller, staler, and less profitable. It was Cambridge, in a word, that gave him knowledge; it was Manchester that made him able to impart it.

How much indeed he owed to Manchester it would be difficult to calculate; for he was not naturally either what is specially known as a 'thinker' or a practical man of affairs. As so often happens with solitary students, his incursions into polities were hasty and impetuous; nor in council did he carry a weight at all proportioned to his knowledge. He gave the impression of having seen but one side of the case, and of having ignored all difficulties. He was too apt to fancy that those who saw another side were the victims of some moral obliquity. Contact with men, and with Lancashire men, helped to cure this weakness. But it helped his

scholarship also, as Gibbon's Parliamentary career improved the *Decline and Fall*. Milton, as we know, 'did not presume to sing high praises of heroic men or famous cities, till he had within himself the experience and the practice' of political life; and we should have had no 'Samson Agonistes' if Milton had not been a Latin Secretary. So, in its lesser way, the familiarity with men and manners which Moulton could never have acquired in Cambridge made a better thing even of his scholarship itself.

Of that scholarship there is no need to speak. It has been characterized by those who were far more competent to appraise it than I. It was, indeed, of that high order which can only be adequately judged by the few; and, like a freeborn Englishman, can proudly claim to be tried only by its peers. In Greek Testament grammar he had perhaps but one equal—Deissmann; and Deissmann, though sundered by a national quarrel, has done him justice. In Persian, which he studied for years under Professor Cowell, he has won equally high suffrages. But, though I am not qualified to criticize it, yet I was privileged to watch it grow; for Moulton was wonderfully communicative, and his friends could almost observe the successive additions as they were made to his store of knowledge.

Of the two kinds of scholarship, which may be typified by the great names of Bentley and Porson, Moulton unquestionably belonged mainly to the latter. Everybody remembers Macaulay's brief contrast between the two minds—'Porson's the more sure-footed, more exact, more neat; Bentley's far more comprehensive and inventive.' Moulton was the Porson of Greek Testament study; he made no great discoveries, and hazarded no wide and sweeping generalizations; his was a scholarship of detail, amazingly accurate, neglecting nothing, marking everything. His scholarly instinct was always awake. For example, he had persuaded himself that the word λόγιος, applied by Luke to Apollos, ought to be translated not 'eloquent' but 'learned,' and he therefore used it most appropriately, along with δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς, 'mighty in the Scriptures,' for the monument to his father. But later, when the Papyri had revolutionized the whole study of Hellenistic Greek, he became convinced that he had been wrong, and that λόγιος, in Luke's time, meant 'eloquent' after all; and he seriously thought of trying to have the inscription altered. For, as he said, Dr. Moulton was most emphatically a learned man, but eloquent he was not. It was useless to point out that not a hundred in ten thousand inspectors of the inscription could read it, and that of those hundred not five would have an opinion as to λόγιος. Accuracy was to him its own law. Most characteristic of him was the very last letter he ever wrote to me. I had quoted a Greek sentence, and had either omitted, or misplaced, an accent. From a distance of ten thousand miles he corrected the little error, as Browning's grammarian, with his last breath, properly based his particles.

This accuracy was exhibited everywhere and at all seasons. His quotations from the New Testament, where it was not possibl

to make them from the original Greek, were from the Revised Version, and preferably from its margin—unless he considered the Revised Version wrong, and then he gave us his own. His preference for the Revised was indeed almost a by-word. He once caught a boy in the act of throwing a Testament across a room. 'Jones, Jones!' he said in a pained tone, 'is that a Bible?' 'No, sir!' said the boy, who had a ready wit, 'not a Bible, only a Revised Version!' It is safe to say that any instructed person could detect, from listening but to one of Moulton's extempore prayers, or to five minutes of one of his sermons, that he was the most fastidious and precise of New Testament students. If St. James uses two words for 'boon' in his famous hexameter (*James* i. 17), Moulton was careful to mark the distinction—'Every good gift and every perfect *bounty*' he would say. And, like John Wesley, he preferred 'garrison' or 'guard' to the colourless 'keep' of the Authorized Version as a rendering of φρουρέω. A careful hearer would notice that Moulton was inserting an article here, or a little change of tense there, in a passage from a gospel or an epistle, which showed quite plainly that he was always thinking of the original, and saw no reason why he should be slipshod even when most devotional. This scrupulous accuracy he had learnt in the best of schools; for not only was he his father's son, but he had watched his father working with Westcott and Hort, during all those years of toil which at last produced, in the Revised Version of *Wisdom*, one of the greatest pieces of translation ever done in the English language. To see such men at work, he used to say with truth, was in itself a liberal education; an incentive to the diligent and a rebuke to the slovenly.

With all this he was no pedant. This needs no proof for those who knew him; for those who did not know him it is sufficient to refer to his *Prolegomena*, than which it is impossible to conceive anything less pedantic. It is, indeed, one of the most readable books of pure scholarship ever written; accurate and exact down to the smallest footnote, it is as interesting as a chapter of Froude or a battle-piece by Marbot; so interesting, indeed, that it takes a certain measure of scholarship to see what a vast amount of knowledge is packed in those unpretentious paragraphs.

Like almost all great students, Moulton was intensely appreciative of the ability and achievements of others. Knowing what it meant to be learned in any sphere, he reverenced those who had attained learning, and was as free from petty jealousy as Dr. Johnson or Sir Walter Scott. If I were asked what was to me the most attractive side of my friend's most attractive character I think I should put this aspect first. His attitude towards men like Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, and their kind, was instinctively and habitually that of a Moses upon holy ground. When so many were the objects of this feeling, it is hard to select examples; but I may choose two or three as types by which the rest may be judged. Most highly of all, perhaps, did he regard that most modest and retiring of

teachers, Edward Cowell—to whom, as the instructor of FitzGerald, the world owes the *Rubaiyyat of Omar Khayyam*, and who, as Moulton's preceptor in Persian, was the ultimate inspirer of those books and articles upon Zoroastrianism which are perhaps Moulton's most lasting contribution to knowledge. Every Saturday, for many years, he attended Cowell's Persian class, and in later days he often mentioned his teacher, never without affection and high admiration. For Sir James Frazer, the illustrious author of the *Golden Bough*, again, whom he knew both as friend and as coadjutor in the study of comparative religion, he never failed to express his admiration. On one occasion he was asked to stand for a Professorship of Comparative Religion. He wrote at once to say that nothing would induce him to put himself into competition with the world-famous author of the *Golden Bough*; but that if Frazer did not choose to take it, he might be induced to stand. The knowledge, ingenuity, and extraordinary mental alertness of Dr. Rendel Harris, also, he reverenced with the competence of a man and the simplicity of a child. Dr. Harris's books, indeed, he knew nearly by heart; on one occasion he gave me, in a two hours' walk, a full analysis of the *Dioscuri*; and when I saw the book I found very little that I had not heard already. But it was not merely these great and proved scholars that enjoyed Moulton's respect. Anybody who did any sincere and original work, however small, was sure of his humble gratitude and applause. Some of his own pupils, at Didsbury or at Manchester, gave him suggestive thoughts: he remembered for years their names and their ideas, giving them perhaps some of the credit that was really due to himself; and yet perhaps, as we have hinted above, he owed to them in other ways as much as they to him, for it was Lancashire that saved him from being a 'prig.'

If, in fact, any one whose ways of thought and work lie outside those of Moulton wishes to have assurance of his scholarship, I can give him no better and no more visible proof than this, that he thus reverenced other scholars. He had a just estimate of his own calibre, and was not so foolish as to undervalue his own position. Some people who did not know him might mistake this confidence for conceit; but those who did know him recognized it for what it was—a reasoned calculation of his own rank. 'Self-love,' as Shakespeare says, 'is not so vile a sin as self-neglecting'; and Moulton certainly did not sin in the viler fashion. But combined with a just estimate of himself went, as so often, a generous appreciation of others. It has been observed of Bentley—who had assuredly most of the faults of a scholar—that he scarcely ever mentions one or other of his truly great predecessors without some word of praise; and this was to be observed in Moulton also. He had also the allied virtue of being willing to consult others on subjects of which they knew more than he; and his humility and teachableness were on all such occasions most marked. Often did I think, when with him, of Chaucer's clerk of Oxenford—that portrait which remains eternally to show the unchanging features of the true student—

'Souning in moral vertu was his speche,
And gladly wolde he lerne and gladly teche.'

As a result of endlessly learning and teaching, James Moulton had made himself at fifty one of the two or three highest names in Europe among scholars in his special branch, and had achieved, as few men do achieve, the ambition of his youth. There are higher things than scholarship, and reputations more lasting than that of a Bentley or a Scaliger. But such as his aim was, Moulton had reached it.

This high scholarship, of course, was not won without loss. Great aims, as George Eliot says, 'must be wooed with industrious thought and patient renunciation of small desires'; and this renunciation must have been particularly painful to Moulton, for he was more variously endowed by nature than most men, and he felt keenly the necessity of checking the impulse to satisfy his intellectual and artistic longings. But he made his choice, and sternly held to it, repressing all vain regrets. 'Entbehren sollst du, sollst entbehren.' He had some mathematical gift, inherited directly from his father, and collaterally from his distinguished uncle; but after his schooldays he left mathematics on one side. In his youth he performed creditably on the violoncello; later, as the claims of scholarship became more insistent, he ceased to practise, and finally the instrument was entirely laid aside. Whole branches of knowledge, for which he was not without aptitude, and which are familiar to the ordinary man of education, he neglected altogether. The result of this neglect was sometimes amusing. For instance, on one of his Scottish excursions he convulsed his fellow travellers by naïvely asking when the *train* would reach Rothesay; and, despite his intense love of Scotland, he knew as little of her history as of her geography. On one occasion I happened to quote to him Milton's grim jest at the expense of James I, that his only claim to be called the British Solomon was that he was the son of David—an obvious, if somewhat unfair, allusion to Rizzio. Moulton enjoyed the witticism amazingly—and, ten minutes later, said, 'Let me see, what *was* Darnley's Christian name?' From that day to this I have wondered what was the point of the joke as it presented itself to him.

On other countries he was as ignorant as on Scotland. He had never heard of the Diamond Necklace; and his ideas as to Marlborough's campaigns would have secured him a 'plough' in the London Matriculation. For Frederick the Great he had a sound and wholesome contempt; but he certainly did not know the difference between Katte and de Catt, and he was uncertain whether Kunersdorf was a victory or a defeat. A conversation on the war in the Netherlands revealed the fact that he confused Spinola, the conqueror of Ostend, with Spinoza the philosopher. Talk once turned upon Bismarck. The German master remarked, 'My early prejudices were all against Bismarck, for he annexed my

country.' 'What, annexed Germany!' cried Moulton. 'I am from Hesse,' said the German. It was plain that this conveyed no idea to Moulton's mind—to him Germany had always been Germany, with Berlin as certainly its capital as London is the capital of England. The whole stirring history from 1815 to 1871 was a sealed book to him. Intimate friends used to ask him where he picked up so much ignorance; but he was quite content with his kingship in his own domain, and was willing to leave foreign realms to others; indeed, he often seemed to take a pride in the vastness of the nescience which appeared to him to mark the greatness of his field of knowledge. Apparently he used to think, 'See how much I can *afford* not to know.' In this respect he was a great contrast to his father, who was as remarkable for the breadth of his interests as for the depth of his knowledge in particular fields.

If such was the state of his equipment in subjects for which he had a natural bent, the case was of course much worse in branches of science for which he had no congenital turn. Philosophy, for example, inasmuch as it did not give exact results, he utterly despised; and he could not be made to see that such a study, even if no conclusion is reached, may be valuable for the mental processes which it sets in motion. He was, in fact, tarred with the academic brush. In Oxford and Cambridge there is a tendency, fostered by the examination-system, to mark off this man as a 'philosopher,' that man as an 'archaeologist,' a third as an 'historian'; and there is a strong sense that a man who strays from his own subject into that of another is a thief and a robber. You are, in fact, either an expert or an intruder, and an intelligent interest, that does not desire to attain mastery, is frowned upon as trespassing. Moulton, accordingly, was quite content to abandon whole continents of culture to other people, provided only he might be recognized as a master in his own sphere. From one besetting sin of academics, however, he was entirely free. He was not in the least afraid of talking 'shop.' He saw no reason why a man should refuse to converse on the one subject on which his opinion is specially valuable; and to a congenial companion he would pour out the stores of his knowledge with absolute freedom and profusion. A man privileged to know him would acquire, better than from books or lectures, an abundance of philological or biblical knowledge. This ready liberality was even sometimes abused. Boys, for example, who are quite willing to learn anything as long as it is not their appointed lesson, understood fully the art of turning Moulton aside from Sophocles or Virgil to the religion of Persia or the Gospel of Peter, and became quite learned in Zoroastrianism or in the Behistun inscription of Darius. The process, in such cases, was simple, and ran on the recognized lines of the association of ideas. The lesson might be Chaucer, and the phrase 'dear enough a Jane' (dear at a halfpenny) might turn up. From Jane the transition was natural to the French *gêne*; from *gêne* to its original *Gehenna*; and thence the lesson would take a range as wide as that of the *Divine Comedy* itself. But for

those who really wished to learn, Moulton was one of the most inspiring of teachers. It would be hard to find any one in whom the love of learning was more deeply implanted by nature or more fixed by training; and that love inevitably communicated itself to others.

The same causes which affected his mental development also set their mark upon his literary culture. His knowledge and appreciation of poetry stopped with what he had been able to acquire in youth. Fortunately his memory was tenacious, and he had been led early to the best models. *Paradise Lost*, for example, he had read through at the age of eleven, and Milton as a whole he knew well; *Lycidas*, indeed, by a sad coincidence, was the last poem that he quoted, and it was, perhaps, the first that he knew by heart. He who knows and loves *Lycidas* can never admire a bad poem. And Moulton had besides a sound acquaintance with the masterpieces of Greek literature; Aeschylus and Sophocles, in particular, he knew both widely and deeply, and Homer, especially the *Odyssey*, was at his fingers' ends. With such an equipment it was impossible for him to be without the essential poetic gift. His long study of such men 'availed him' as Dante's study of Virgil availed for his life-work.

And yet one could not but regret that this study had stopped where it did. For Moulton, perforce, passed by the whole range of modern Continental poetry. Goethe, Schiller, Heine, Dante, Ariosto, Molière, Racine, were all closed to him; and even in English poetry he may fairly be said to have stopped with Tennyson, for whom he had an almost unlimited admiration. Swinburne he could not be induced to read with care; and he regarded him, in the common but crude fashion, as a master of sound with but little sense. Of the vast number of poets, so unfairly dubbed 'minor,' who followed Swinburne, he had never even heard. It was characteristic of him that he retained to the end of his life a high regard for Calverley—a sure proof that he remained, as far as his critical faculty was concerned, an undergraduate to his latest day. Nor did he know much of English literature within even the narrow limits to which he reduced it. Chaucer—or rather some of the *Canterbury Tales*—he studied; but old Dan was to him but a well of philology unde filed; and he followed 'the footing of his feet' in a very different sense from that in which the phrase was used by Chaucer's great pupil. With Shakespeare his acquaintance was slight; and Spenser, though he provided the measure for his prize-poem, was far from familiar to him.

Every now and then one would have a glimpse of a true poetical feeling in Moulton, and one would wish that the claims of scholarship had allowed its development. I well remember the enthusiasm with which he quoted a passage from *Alastor*, recalled after years of oblivion; and I can still picture his very gestures, and hear his very tones, as he repeated Jebb's fine version of the lines from *In Memoriam*.

'The mystic glory swims away;
Across my bed the moonlight dies,
And, closing eaves of weary eyes,
I sleep till dawn is dipt in gray':

'Vanescentis abit splendor imaginis;
Vanescens alio Cynthia labitur;
Et defessa premens lumina, dormio
Dum Nox caneat in diem.'

And I remember how he agreed with me that Latin, even in the hands of a master like Jebb, is incapable of catching the tone of romance and 'gramarye' which to us is all but of the very essence of poetry. He was, I think, willing to refuse the title of a *Deus Major* to every Latin poet but Lucretius and, in a lesser sphere, Catullus. This is remarkable in a man brought up on Virgilian hexameters and Ovidian elegiacs; and, to my mind, shows that he had the root of the matter in him. But, in criticism generally, like his uncle Richard, of Chicago, he was inclined to distrust subjective impulses either of admiration or of repulsion, and pleaded for an *inductive* system of judgement. That is, he wished the verdict of the world to be accepted, and the merits of men appraised according as they had gained the suffrage of generations. This is a kind of pragmatist view of critical truth, and would lead us to say that so and so is a great poet because he was once thought so. But it is very unfair on the new writer who strikes out a line of his own, and the more unfair the more original he is.

Moulton's sense of humour was crude, if keen. He preferred simple and direct effects, and did not care much for subtlety. This was part of the general texture of his character, which was averse from everything not straightforward. He was, intellectually and morally, as honest as the day, and loathed anything like the 'indirections' or 'assays of bias' in which a Polonius delights. Hence no one could call him, in the strict sense of the word, witty. He was only half a Falstaff—he could be the cause of wit in others, but he had little of the commodity in himself. To all sallies at his expense—and they were many—he had but one reply, 'Is that the rapier or the bludgeon?' But his unvarying good-humour, and the charming way in which he entered into intellectual play, made him as delightful a companion as any Yorick that ever set the table on a roar by a flash of merriment. After a day of the hardest study, he could come down and unbend with more than the ease of Apollo; and, if he was not quick at repartee, he was what is better—the one whose presence secured the cheerfulness of the assembly. He used to say of himself that, like Horace, he was willing to perform the function of a whetstone.

Alas, that all those days are gone for ever! No Boswell thought it worth while to take notes; nor indeed can any notes recall the cheerful gaiety, the unforced mirth, the ease of a mind unbraced

in the presence of those whom one trusts, and with whom one may venture to wear one's heart upon the sleeve. The little jest—and how much it is! But it will scarcely bear transplantation. Moulton had given hostages to fortune. His singing, for example, was correct but cacophonous; it was a tenor with the peculiar property of sounding worse than if it had been out of tune. His prize-poem, *Vasco da Gama*, again, after being kept concealed for long, fell at last into the hands of his friendly foes, and supplied endless quotations which added point to their 'faithful wounds.' One of its phrases was 'Poets sing'—a fatal confession for the poetic songster. All this, united to his well-known views on temperance, lends a meaning to the lines addressed to him by a colleague—

> 'Vasco da Gama underneath the bough,
> A loaf of bread, a cup of milk, and thou
> Beside me singing in the wilderness—
> The wilderness would hear an awful row.'

When the Rev. Mr. Gace, a bigoted High Churchman, produced a catechism in which it was stated that Dissenters were excluded from 'society' in this world and from heaven in the next, Moulton published an answer called 'What is Schism?'—and it was long before he heard the last of Schism and Catechism. When the *Gospel of Peter* appeared, he wrote an article on it, and requested various masters to distribute it to boys in different forms. This, said one of his friends, is a case of 'James to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting.'

The fact that a jest or an epigram was old did not deter him from using it. After he had repeated a particularly hoary 'chestnut' for the tenth time, one of his colleagues told him he was writing a history of that joke, and that the following were to be its chapters: 'Rise of the Joke. Growth of the Joke. Palmy Days of the Joke. Decline and Fall of the Joke. Death and Burial of the Joke. The Joke is Eaten by Worms. Final Chapter: The Joke is Repeated by Dr. James Hope Moulton.' No one enjoyed the sally more than its victim.

But time would fail were I to try to record the half of the memories that throng upon me as I recall those bright and happy days, in which James Moulton was perhaps the brightest and happiest element. To us, his friends, the world can never be the same again, now that he has gone, far away into the Silent Land. It is indeed sad and strange to think of the times that are no more. One had hoped so much from him—the full fruition of all that scholarship, the gradual growth to serene and flawless beauty of that already beautiful character, the perfecting of that Christian life. But *Deo aliter visum*. It must be elsewhere that that strength is to be practised, elsewhere that that loveliness is to flower. For us who are left behind perplexed, there remains an example and a memory.

E. E. KELLETT.

THE RESTORATION OF WESTERN IDEALS

AMIDST all the plans for reconstruction after the war—political, social, national, economic, religious—it is becoming increasingly clear that the most important questions of all are those which lie deepest. As in the Theophanies of the Old Testament 'The foundations of the world were laid bare,' certainly in these days the very depths are being revealed. Such questions as the settlement of Ireland, the future conditions of production and the relations between capital and labour, the regulation of the drink traffic, economic war after military conflict is ended, an international League of Peace, surely go deep enough. But deeper still lie the ideas which regulate our attitude towards each one of them and the temper and purpose of the nation in handling them. If an ideal is an 'emotionally coloured conception of a state of things better than the present,' how is the conception formed, and how is the emotion which colours it generated? The questions may sound remote and abstract, but on the answers to them will depend the success with which we and other nations are able to confront the most serious crisis civilization has ever known.

A study of the past may appear to be a singularly far-fetched method of approach. But as the general of to-day is worthless unless he has mastered the principles underlying the campaigns and strategy of past wars, so present-day national and social problems have been in a sense anticipated; and a study of success and failure in bygone centuries will freshen the mind for an intelligent comprehension of what is going on around us. Our ideals are not new. True, they must be fresh as the morning if they are to be effective, but they must be as old as the light if they are to illumine our darkness and kindle our enthusiasm. 'We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have told us, what things Thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.' When these words are quoted, they do not lull to slumber, but stimulate to action. They are followed in a nation's litany by 'O Lord, arise, help us and deliver us for Thy name's sake.'

It is from such a point of view that readers alive to the times will regard such researches as Dr. F. W. Bussell has just published in a portly volume entitled, *Religious Thought and Heresy in the Middle Ages* (R. Scott, 21/-). At first sight anything less germane to such a period as that through which we are passing could hardly be suggested. But Dr. Bussell is not one of the seven sleepers of Ephesus. When he was Bampton Lecturer in 1905 he showed himself as wide-awake to the imperative demands of 'Social Progress' as to the necessity of a living 'Christian Theology.' The last sentence of the Lectures contains its theme in a single line—'Christian belief and the welfare of Society are one.' Into his latest volume Dr. Bussell has condensed an amount of learning which would have smothered a less skilful writer, and is still only too likely to repel readers in a hurry. He tells us that it is but a part of 'a comprehensive study of *Human Thought and Ideals* from the dawn of history'—an enter-

prise likely to recall Casaubon's *Key to all Mythologies*. Compared with such a history, a narrative of the rise and fall of all human empires and dynasties were light and easy reading. The author himself is uneasily conscious that he may have gathered together 'unwieldy and disparate material,' but he has persevered, believing that by fetching a wide compass he may help to chart a rarely-travelled sea, and guide mariners in these days and in days to come.

Dr. Bussell is very hard on the nineteenth century. He comments on the 'foolish complacence, shallow optimism, narrow prejudice, and culpable blindness' which he considers to be its 'true marks.' Verily, these be hard words, and it might well seem rash to argue with the master of so many legions. But *dolus latet in generalibus*, and the whole of the author's survey of the fascinating period 600—1300 A.D. is a warning against the cheap and hasty depreciation with which he dismisses the century 1800–1900 A.D., when one might almost say a thousand years were condensed into a hundred. The early decades of any century are about the worst time for judging the significance of its predecessor. But the analysis of the religious thought and ideals of the comparatively unknown mediæval period given in Dr. Bussell's encyclopaedic work is very able and likely to be of permanent value. He goes far afield in quest of formative influences at work. The section on Hindustan and the religions of further Asia might almost have furnished a volume by itself. The survey is full of interest, though it is somewhat difficult to bring it into focus with the rest of the book. The influence of Islam upon European thought, especially in philosophy and religion, is more direct, and the chapters upon Muslim sects and Arab philosophy are full of information and suggestion. Under the heading of 'Greek Thought and Chaldeism,' the influence of Aristotle upon scholastic orthodoxy and that of Eastern Dualism upon Christian heresies are described and estimated. The most interesting chapters in the book for many readers will be those which deal with 'Authority and Free Thought in the Middle Ages'—what Dr. Bussell calls the monism of orthodoxy and the dualistic opposition manifested in many sects of pre-Reformation times. As one example only of the wealth of suggestion which lies in Dr. Bussell's comprehensive studies, we may mention the religious and even political bearing of the controversy between Realists and Nominalists. This might appear to be a mere logomachy concerning the nature of 'Universals,' but it really implied a close fight between the 'authoritarian' and the 'free thinker.'

It is not the object of this note even to describe in detail such a volume as this. Adequately to review it would almost require a syndicate of critics. But it may not be amiss to suggest that ministers and students of religious and political thought to-day will find in its thousand pages a mine in which they may profitably dig, whilst those who are concerned with the more practical aspects of current ideals will find much material not suggested by the title of the book.

Few would expect, for example, to come upon a section of fifty pages devoted to the social and economic conditions of Christendom after 600 A.D., the rise of the communes, the evolution of town and borough, and the forces and needs that produced the modern secular State. For Dr. Bussell has much to say of democracy, though little belief in some of the claims put forward on its behalf. He believes that 'the democratic principle lay throughout at the very roots of the mediaeval Church system,' because 'with the Church the value of the individual was a primary axiom.' It may be said, however, in passing, that 'primary axioms' laid down in theory may easily be so overlaid in practice as to lose all their original force and value. If there was one thing the mediaeval Church-system did *not* foster it was the development of healthy individual religious life. But the sections devoted to the new social order established after the Black Death in the fourteenth century, when between one-third and one-half of the entire population of these islands was swept away by pestilence, are very instructive.

The erudition and patient toil of the Oxford scholar, who has here recorded the results of thirty years' labour, have provided a wealth of material for which some readers, the present writer included, ought to be very grateful. Perhaps it is too much to expect from him also the ardour of an eager and hopeful reformer. He hardly deserves to be styled a 'gloomy Dean.' But he does not think that 'the present study warrants any very bright hopes for the immediate future of mankind,' and he does not consider himself 'empowered to deliver any encouraging message.' He is not alone in viewing with grave fears the dangers arising from State autocracy in other than Teutonic countries. But it is hardly worthy of a philosopher to dismiss with an airy wave of the hand what he calls 'vague aspirations after liberty,' especially when he shows so little discrimination in estimating them as to throw into a promiscuous heap 'socialism, anarchy, communism, and millenarian hopes!' It is true that the Middle Ages witnessed not only the dawn, but the extinction of some of the dearest ideals of mankind. But the whole history, while it furnishes warnings against ill-based hopes which the present generation may well lay to heart, provides, as Dr. Bussell's pages show, abundant lessons of stimulus and inspiration. The 'restoration of Western ideals after the present war' will, he thinks, depend mainly upon 'native instincts, feelings, and convictions.' History shows, however, that these furnish rather the material and motive for reconstruction than the guiding principles which are necessary for shaping it.

In our own country we can trust the true and sound instincts and the deeply rooted convictions of the Britain to which we are proud to belong. What is not so certain is whether leaders will be forthcoming possessed of the ripe and mature wisdom, the clear, penetrating insight, and the firm and steady hand necessary to guide the ship of State through conflicting currents and between uncharted rocks. Peace, when it comes, may perhaps succeed

better than the war has done in discovering the heaven-born genius who can lead, as well as the splendid heroes who can follow and fight. But in our island story there has been more than one kind of 'pilot that weathered the storm.' For our own part, while glad to have had Dr. Bussell's guidance through an intricate period of the history of thought, we hail with far greater hope than he offers us the auguries of the future and the prospect of a successful and stable restoration of ancient Western ideals.

W. T. DAVISON.

THE PROSECUTION OF OUR LORD

THE courtesy and careful reasoning of Mr. R. C. Hawkin in his review of my book *The Prosecution of Jesus*, appearing in the October issue of the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, induce me to defend certain of my positions.

A student of the Roman procedure in criminal law cases is naturally concerned with the establishment of a single great principle in connexion with the trial of Jesus. The available evidence justifies the belief that all crimes committed in Roman provinces were investigated, and the cases adjudicated, by the Roman provincial officials, and by them alone. With this principle firmly fixed in my mind, I approached the legal study of this, the culminating episode in the life of Christ. It is upon this single, but all-embracing, point that I part company with practically all who have written upon the legal aspects of this trial.

Hence arises the objection raised to the ordinary explanation of St. John's statement, 'The Jews sought to kill Him.' If the statement is to be regarded as historically accurate, it means either that the Jews were prepared to commit murder, or that they planned to have Jesus tried on some charge that might lead to the death penalty. The one thing which it cannot mean, contrary to the rather general interpretation, is that the Sanhedrin intended to conduct a criminal trial themselves.

Upon the same principle also the episode of the arrest was approached. On the one fundamental point Mr. Hawkin seems to misunderstand my argument. The belief was expressed that a military tribune was not present to superintend the taking into custody. The reason assigned for this positive assertion is that it is quite incredible that if the Roman authorities once took a person into their custody they would even temporarily allow him again to pass beyond their control. We are confronted, then, with the dilemma of believing either that no Roman forces were present at the arrest, or that the whole account of the proceedings before the Sanhedrin, as narrated in the four Gospels, is spurious. The second alternative I cannot agree to. It is true that a military tribune would not need the sanction of Pilate in advance to effect the arrest. It may be stated positively, however, that if a military tribune did cause the arrest, with or without a warrant, he would have lodged

the arrested person somewhere within the Roman citadel or barracks. In that case there could have been no hearing whatever by the Sanhedrin, for the Roman Court would have proceeded with the case simply as a Roman affair.

It is easy to agree with Mr. Hawkin that the Jews desired to have the whip hand over Pilate, and the majority of scholars would be ready to agree to any demonstrable evidence of their duplicity. The Sanhedrin wished to put out of the way one who interfered with their political ascendancy, and whose teaching was so radically different from their own, and so infinitely superior to it, that they realized they could not long retain the following of the multitudes of Jews, whose political backing and financial support they must have. A prosecution might well be considered also a covert attack upon the Roman authority, inasmuch as Christ counselled submission to legally constituted rulers, and this was absolutely in opposition to the nationalistic aims of the controlling element in the Sanhedrin.

An admission that the Sanhedrin was prejudiced against Jesus should not induce us to believe simply for that reason that the course of trial was irregular. The law of treason had become much more stringent between the time of Cicero and the time of Tiberius, and doubtless evidence was accepted in the courts of Tiberius that would not have been accepted in Republican times; and yet we are bound to maintain that criminal procedure has not changed materially in this interval unless we have actual proof from ancient sources that a change had come about. So far as one is able to discover, cases of treason were tried in the courts of Tiberius in precisely the same manner in which they were tried from the time of Sulla onward.

On another point Mr. Hawkin somewhat misunderstands my position. I am as willing as any writer on the subject to admit that the Sanhedrin, and even Pilate, would readily consent to accept false evidence in a criminal case. The thing which is incredible is that the Sanhedrin could act so stupidly as to hire false witnesses, and then reject the evidence given by those same witnesses. They would certainly have drilled their tools in the false evidence they were to offer to such a degree that the statements presented in the court would sound truthful.

A final point is very interesting in several respects. It is necessary to protest once more against a statement which is extremely common, even in our most scientific treatments of the life of Christ and of the trial. It is impossible to find any evidence whatever that Pilate had become Procurator through the influence of Sejanus, or any evidence that Sejanus was even acquainted with Pilate, to say nothing of his being a friend. Nevertheless, writers are continually saying that Sejanus was the patron and friend of Pilate. The deduction drawn by Mr. Hawkin from this assumed friendship, that it would be dangerous in A.D. 33 for Pilate to be regarded as a friend of Sejanus, is extremely interesting in view of the fact that this argument depends absolutely upon an acceptance of the date assigned to the Crucifixion in my book. It is necessary to recall

that Pilate is mentioned only once by a Roman historian. Tacitus speaks of him, but he does not bring him at all into connexion with Sejanus. Not even Philo mentions that Pilate was dependent for his political advancement upon the favour of Sejanus, and we cannot believe that he would have omitted to give such a piece of information, which would have been to the discredit of Pilate, had he known of it.

R. W. HUSBAND.

State House, Concord, New Hampshire.

We have submitted Professor Husband's note to Mr. R. C. Hawkin, who makes the following comment :—

If Professor Husband means that the Sanhedrin had no power to judge criminals I cannot agree: the attempted stoning of our Lord and the stoning of St. Stephen shows that the old Mosaic Law still existed.

Josephus makes it clear that the Procurator was only an Imperial Overseer, and that the aristocratic Sanhedrin was the governing body. Perhaps the present Government of Cuba is not unlike that of Judaea in A.D. 30. The Sanhedrin had very limited powers over Roman citizens, but Rome acknowledged and enforced the authority of the Sanhedrin over Jews.

It seems to me that the Sanhedrin decided to make a charge against Jesus before Pilate, and that the meaning of the reference to 'false' witnesses is that their evidence proved unreliable on cross-examination, so Jesus was convicted on his own admission that He was a king, which also explains Pilate's refusal to alter the superscription over the cross.

As regards the appointment of Pilate by Sejanus, as the latter was the Imperial Minister charged with the duty of making all such appointments at that time, it is difficult to imagine how Pilate could have been an exception. The *Annals* of Tacitus are unfortunately incomplete during this period, but I think the tradition that Sejanus appointed Pilate should be accepted.

WESLEY'S STANDARDS IN THE LIGHT OF TO-DAY

IN his excellent article on the above topic, with which in almost every point I heartily agree, Dr. H. Maldwyn Hughes has not mentioned the Wesleyan ORDINATION SERVICE, in which each candidate is required to answer in the affirmative two questions: (1) 'Are you persuaded that the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? And are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge; and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?'

(2) 'I have further to inquire whether you have read the first four volumes of Mr. Wesley's Sermons, and his Notes on the New Testament; and whether you believe that the system of doctrine therein contained is in accordance with the Holy Scriptures?'

This is the official exposition of the doctrinal 'clause in the Model Deed,' so far as it bears upon individual ministers. It claims their assent only to broad principles, and to details only so far as they bear on these principles. We may well congratulate ourselves that the only doctrinal test required in our candidates for ordination is so rational. Moreover, since the Conference is our ultimate authority, it follows that in all details the decision rests with it. This is well understood.

A valuable and compact embodiment of this 'System of Doctrine' is given in Sermon 43, on 'The Scripture Way of Salvation,' now excluded from 'Wesley's Standards.' We have here, conspicuously asserted and connected, two distinctive doctrines, viz. (1) Justification by Faith, and (2) Sanctification by Faith. It is worthy of note that these are the main doctrines of the Epistle to the Romans, the earliest and greatest work on Christian Theology. See Rom. iii. 24, v. 10, and vi. 11–22, xii. 1, xv. 16.

This sermon was published as a pamphlet in 1765, as a sort of manifesto in a time of theological controversy. In it we have the earnest and mature thought of Wesley.

J. Agar Beet.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ. By R. S. Franks, M.A., B.Litt., Principal of Western College, Bristol. (Hodder & Stoughton. 2 vols. 18*s.* net.)

THIS is the most satisfactory book in English on the important subject with which it deals. It was greatly needed, and will be highly appreciated by students of theology. Principal Franks is not content to treat the doctrine of Atonement in the limited sense of an interpretation of the significance of the death of Christ. Historically as well as theologically it is part of a larger whole. Mr. Franks' great merit is that he carries this principle of theological perspective into its many historical implications, and deals throughout his discussion with 'the saving effects of Christ's Incarnation, Life, Passion, Death, and Resurrection.' Moreover he elects to consider this wider aspect of the 'Work of Christ' in turn not as a doctrine isolated from a system of Christian thought. His method is much too scientific for that; his main interest is in system and method. He thus happily preserves a most scholarly and balanced survey of the ecclesiastical development of the doctrine from becoming a mere catena of theological opinions skilfully arranged in chronological or scholastic order. He provides at every point where it is possible for the articulation of his specific doctrine in an organic system of Christian teaching; it is never left unrelated to the larger whole, a mere fragment or monogram. Mr. Franks' method is to select four principal syntheses, or total views of Christian doctrine in its historical development—Greek theology, mediaeval scholasticism, Protestant orthodoxy, and modern Protestant theology—and to arrange his well-chosen dogmatic material relating to the work of Christ within them. Within these circles he also concentrates chiefly upon writers who have attempted a system of Christian doctrine in which the parts hold together in the unity and coherence of a whole. With great ability he brings out the differing principles which underlie the several systems, and we get the significance of the saving work of Christ admirably presented in living relation with the characteristic view-points of the system. Varying psychological and philosophical influences, differing bases of authority in reason or experience, and other elements peculiar to the stage of general culture of the times in which the several doctrinal systems took form, are worked up to supply an organic setting for the historical treatment of the doctrine of Christ's work. The gain of this is great. The way, for instance, in which Mr. Franks shows how in the mediaeval

synthesis the elements of the preceding Greek synthesis were broken up and recombined into a new synthesis in which merit and sacramental grace became leading ideas in the scholastic doctrine of the Atonement is illuminating. Or to take another illustration: in his treatment of Schleiermacher's method, involving, as it does, an entirely fresh and arresting reconstruction of theology, resulting from 'the abandonment of the attempt to put together the Scripture data in an external way, as is done in the scholastic systems alike of Catholicism and Protestantism' Mr. Franks gives us the ruling principle which has dominated modern theories of atonement, and thus provides his readers with ample illustration of the frequent assertion that Schleiermacher is father and prince of modern theology by his treatment of that part of his system which deals with the saving work of Christ.

But in addition to his lucid statement of guiding principles, Mr. Franks gives us sufficient data for independent judgement by the remarkably well-selected and carefully-translated quotations from the works of master thinkers who have been exponents of his subject. These reveal a mind finely disciplined by long familiarity with the first-hand sources from which he selects with scholarly judgement and restraint. Writers are fairly treated and justice done to their views by a sympathetic and patient student of their all-round teaching. If any of these appear to suffer a relative disadvantage in respect of the fullness with which their individual positions and the particular synthesis to which they contribute are stated, they are the more recent modern writers; but these are comparatively better known and more easily accessible to the modern reader. Mr. Franks' work is limited to the ecclesiastical doctrine, excluding reference to biblical material; he does not attempt any constructive interpretation of the doctrine itself. For both these requirements we have abundant sources elsewhere. What Mr. Franks has given us we had not within easy reach elsewhere, and we are grateful for his fine bit of historical workmanship.

The Challenge of the Universe. By Charles J. Shebbeare, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Rector of Swerford has here given a popular restatement of the argument from design. He starts with the problem of evil, and shows that the conquest of evil by a rational will is the highest function which a rational being can perform. No world therefore 'which was devoid of evil could conceivably attain perfection.' The argument from design may be called the plain man's argument. The chief criticisms against it are due to Kant and to Darwin, and though Mr. Shebbeare does not defend it as it stands, he holds that the fundamental thought which it enshrines can be restated in a less questionable form. Naturalism, in denying that Nature shows any tendency towards beauty and aesthetic harmony as such, hereby treats the beauty of Nature as a mere accident, and this, we rightly

feel, is incredible. If there is a real tendency towards beauty, the world is not cold and purposeless. This is very different from the conscious purpose of a personal God, but the plain man's identification of the two is not without excuse. 'The fact that the world is like a work of art does not prove that there is a conscious Creator, but it does suggest it.' Several of the most important statements of the argument are examined. Then follows the restatement in three propositions. First, we all believe that the world is a rational whole, governed by a rational system of laws. Second, one of the laws of nature is that men's minds tend to a true conception of what the universe ought to be. Third, we ask whether a system of laws could be rational 'if they prescribed that all men should tend to a knowledge of these right ideals, and yet these ideals should not be taken into account in the ordering of the universe.' If the universe had not this regard to good and evil it would be just one great, unconscious, practical jest. Anything might happen, however absurd or irrational. The world is not the product of blind forces and unconscious atoms, but is governed by rational principles. The argument is worked out with great lucidity and skill.

(1) *The Gospel of Buddha, according to Old Records.* Told by PAUL CARUS.

(2) *An Inquiry into the Nature of Man's highest Ideal, and a solution of the Problem from the standpoint of Science.* By PAUL CARUS. (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company).

(1) The only objection we have to this account of Buddha is the title. In no sense is it a 'gospel,' unless the 'gospel' of failure and despair and impotence. What 'good news' did Shakyamuni bring to the world and bequeath to mankind? Gautama never scaled the loftiest heights and never plumbed the lowest deeps of things. His legacy is a confession of shame and weakness. Brought face to face with human nature, and feeling he possessed no remedy for its ills, he found himself only able to deny or ignore it, and to put in its place a makeshift scheme of his own devising, without the shadow of a single hope or joy. All he could say asserted that human nature was bad to the core, and contained no possibility of improvement except by repudiating its greater part. He left no room for self as then understood, and maintained that man's soul was constituted of thoughts alone. He denied the ego entity, the âtman as a soul monad, though he accepted our mentality, our spiritual fabric, and our personality. In short, he gave us distinctions without any but metaphysical differences, the shadow of being, the ghost of a spirit. As Laplace swept the heavens with his telescope and found God nowhere, so Buddha has no room for Deity, he offers us instead an impossible Nirvâna. This apparently operates as a kind of *Deus ex machina*. But it removes some difficulties only by raising more. We may dismiss the false ego to the

clouds of its false sanctuary, but we cannot as easily dismiss our doubts and fears. The problem, for of course everything more or less is a problem, thus seems to be only burked and not solved. But the solution of dissolution satisfies no one. Alexander cut the Gordian knot with his sword, but Buddha by renouncing all ties and declaring them to be no real attachments. So his followers lead a semi-detached existence, neither of this world nor of the next. The morality proposed as a religion is empty and unworkmanlike, because it commits matricide. The doctrines of the accumulation of merit and the extinction of all desire would be sublime if they were not ridiculous. To conquer and regulate appetites is a noble thing, but to abolish them utterly for ever is unpractical and undesirable. By converting them to splendid uses, to good channels, and wise purposes, the whole man is enlarged and glorified. Buddhism takes but a portion of human nature, and redeems that into anaemic categories and a negative state. Christianity, with its positive affirmations, appeals both to our common sense and enthusiasm. We cannot capitulate to a cold-blooded negation or surrender any fragment of our divine inheritance. Even the animal possession can be tamed out of its brute qualities and spiritualized. Buddha was but a deliverer by destruction, when he failed to transform and transvaluate, as only the Cross of Christ can and does every day.

(2) Dr. Carus has written an able book, and from his point of view, which is not ours, nor any Christian, he has settled the case for ever. But the overwhelmingly conclusive arguments are usually the most inconclusive. It is a book that will well repay reading. But if it were ever so true it would remain utterly and entirely inadequate. No doubt, God is all that Dr. Carus tells us, but He is very much more. But who but perhaps a mathematician could worship a 'Formative Omnipresence' of the 'Supreme Norm of Existence,' even with the aid of Clifford's 'cosmic emotion'? 'Pampathy,' but surely 'Pampathy' would be better, does not help us. One might as easily pray to the 'cosmic order,' and throw ourselves on its tender mercies. Tennyson's famous prayer seems to offer us more, 'O Thou Infinite, Amen!' or shall we kneel down to the 'Uniformities of Nature'? May we hypostasize Form and the Formal, to which our author renders the chief authority? There is no place for prayer in Buddhism, which puts vows instead. And there seems no room for it here. The bloodless Deity of Science has no use for adoration, no room for repentance, no time for love. It is but a chilly comfort we extract from 'Super-personality' and the 'Super-real,' and the 'Form' that conditions everything. 'Every man,' says our author, 'has the religion that he deserves.' But who would exchange Christianity for this? Dr. Carus makes many interesting points, and there is a great deal with which we can cordially agree, but his theology gives contentment neither to the heart nor the head. And if any one wants to be confirmed in the Christian faith he should read this book.

Reality and Truth. By J. G. Vance. (Longmans & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Dr. Vance is Professor of Philosophy at Old Hall, and has wished for many years to write 'a critical but definite treatment of knowledge, truth, and certainty.' He compares the theory of knowledge to the piles, driven deep below the surface of the water, to sustain some great structure. He begins with the realism of plain men, and shows how scepticism and dogmatism deal with the question of knowledge. Then follows a luminous critique of Descartes. Dr. Vance thus clears the way for his position that we can know and prove that there exists outside us a real world of persons and things. The Kantian theory of knowledge is discussed, and the differences between it and Dr. Vance's own position are clearly brought out. Kant was convinced that the mental processes which render the sciences and philosophy possible are *a priori* independent of experience. Dr. Vance shows good reason for holding that they are one and all *a posteriori*, dependent both for their actuation and content upon experience. The way in which the questions of immortality and of God's existence are dealt with is really helpful. The book is wonderfully pleasant to read and most easy to follow. Many plain men will feel grateful for such a clear and suggestive discussion of the whole problem of knowledge.

This Life and the Next. By P. T. Forsyth, D.D. (Macmillan & Co. 4*s.* net.)

This is a small book, but it embodies much hard thinking as to the effect on this life of faith in another. The moral rebound of the belief in immortality is brought out in a way that will help many. Dr. Forsyth sees that the abolition of death would do away with that uncertainty which educates faith, with the mystery, the tragedy which makes life so great, the sense of another world which gives such dignity and meaning to this. Love, valour, pity, sacrifice, would all vanish if death were gone. The other life is but the eternal life which is our true life now, only viewed as going on, prolonged rather than intense. 'Eternity is thus beyond time only in the sense of being deep within it. . . . We are living now the life beyond.' We cannot truly or finally realize ourselves except in the service and spread of the Kingdom of God. Life's chief end is to glorify and to enjoy for ever in His realm a God of holy love. The book is full of thought put in the most sparkling and epigrammatic style. It will stir mind and heart with hope and give courage for the burdens and sorrows of the war.

The Oxford University Press has just published *The Psalms Explained* (1*s.* net), and two tracts on *Ideals of Common Prayer* and *The Use of the Psalter*. The first is a companion to the Prayer-Book Psalter with a valuable introduction on the origin and history of the Psalms and brief notes to bring out the meaning of each Psalm.

The Use of the Psalter is concerned chiefly with the imprecatory Psalms and *The Ideals of Common Prayer* with simplicity in religion, treated by Dr. Sanday in two sermons. The question of matins and Holy Communion is discussed by the Rev. C. W. Emmet, who feels that it would be a real loss to banish matins as some propose. The pamphlets are intended for 'the plain man and the plain woman,' and they are admirably clear and helpful.—*The Minor Prophets Unfolded. II.* Joel and Amos. By A. Lukyn Williams, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.) A devotional commentary of the best sort arranged in daily portions.—*The Expository Times.* Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D. (T. & T. Clark. 9*s.* net.) This is the twenty-eighth annual volume, and its riches are inexhaustible. The Notes of Recent Exposition are as fresh and well-informed as ever, and the articles deal with almost every subject that interests a preacher. The attention paid to literature keeps readers in touch with the world of books, and such exegetical notes as those of Prof. Kennedy will enrich the mind of every student. The *Expository Times* was never more indispensable than it is to-day.—*The Woolwich Crusade* (S.P.C.K. 1*s.* 3*d.* net) describes the mission to the munition workers in September, 1917. The women and girls employed in the Government factories welcomed the services, though at first the workers found a rooted suspicion of the Church. The Crusade has led to some useful work for girls which is being carried on by the War Workers' League.—*Death and the After-Life.* By the Right Rev. J. W. Diggle, D.D. (Williams & Norgate. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.) Bishop Diggle's little book is very timely and very comforting. He describes death as natural and inevitable, certain yet uncertain, and shows that the Christian prepares for it by constant and thorough unselfishness. 'All his thoughts are for the glory of God and the good of his fellows.' The chapter on 'The Natural and the Spiritual Body' is very suggestive. The little book has a message that many anxious hearts will welcome.—*Christ and Woman.* By F. W. Orde Ward, B.A. (Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) Every woman will be proud of this book. It selects ten of the great female figures of the New Testament, and brings out Christ's relation to them and to all whom they represent. It is the work of one who feels that 'religion's name is woman,' and that 'as the cross-bearer, she will reign by divine right of consecrated suffering and sanctified sorrow.' Every page has its flash of swift insight, its subtle interpretation of familiar things, its gems of thought and expression, but the predominant feeling with which one turns the pages is that of the chivalry and grace with which woman's place and power are depicted by this master hand.—*Righteousness in the Gospels.* By the Rev. E. A. Abbott, D.D. (Milford. 1*s.* net.) A scholarly survey of the use of the word which leads up to the conclusion that Jesus, in thought at all events, protested against the doing of a spurious 'righteousness' or 'almsgiving,' dictated by love of applause and a belief that it would be 'rewarded in strict accordance with a debtor and creditor account registered by God.'

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

Occasional Addresses, 1893-1916. By the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith. (Macmillan & Co. 6*s*. net.)

Mr. Asquith says in a brief preface that he has been 'constrained by the force of circumstances to divide nearly the whole of his active life between two of the most contentious of professions. A man who spends most of his days and nights in the law courts and the House of Commons has a special need for the soothing and cleansing influences of literature and scholarship.' Eleven of the addresses were delivered on various public occasions; five are tributes to eminent contemporaries. Mr. Asquith's college life is represented by the estimate of Benjamin Jowett, in whom there was 'the union of worldly sagacity with the most transparent simplicity of nature; an intelligence keen and unsleeping, but entirely detached, and absorbed in the fortunes of a great institution and its members.' Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's service to the State is very happily described. Alfred Lyttelton, 'perhaps, of all men of this generation, came nearest to the model and ideal of manhood which every English father would like to see his son aspire to, and if possible to attain.' Earl Kitchener is here, with 'sleepless energy, resourcefulness, and masterful personality.' Nothing could be more fitting than the tribute to Edward VII, with his singular, perhaps unrivalled tact in the management of men, his intuitive shrewdness, and his genius of common sense. The address to the English Bar throws light on Mr. Asquith's professional life and his contemporaries. 'The Spade and the Pen' compares the old classical training with the new, whilst the speech on 'The English Bible' shows how the Authorized Version 'opened to one and to all, small and great, poor and rich, learned and ignorant, the treasure-house of the divine wisdom.' The Rectorial addresses to the Universities of Glasgow and of Aberdeen are rich in sagacious counsel. 'We must take with us,' he says, 'into the dust and tumult, the ambitions and cares, the homely joys and sorrows, which will make up the tenure of our days and years, an inextinguishable sense of the things which are unseen, the things which give dignity to service, inspiration to work, purpose to suffering, a value, immeasurable and eternal, to the humblest of human lives.' The opening address on 'Criticism' is eminently suggestive, that on Biography will be read with delight by every lover of books. The volume will not merely give pleasure and stimulate its readers to love the highest and best things; it opens many a window into the mind of our great statesman and increases one's estimate of his sanity and strength of judgement.

Joseph H. Choate. A Great Ambassador. By Theron G. Strong. (Cassell & Co. 15*s.* net.)

Mr. Strong is himself a member of the New York bar, and has written this book with warm appreciation of the gifts of the distinguished lawyer and ambassador who won so proud a reputation on both sides of the Atlantic. Mr. Choate's ancestors had been settled at Salem, Massachusetts, for generations, and there the future ambassador was born in 1832. His father was a doctor with an extensive practice. Fees were low and he had only a hundred dollars apiece to leave his six children. But all his four sons were sent to Harvard, and well repaid the sacrifices made to give them the best education possible. The rule of the household was duty first and pleasure afterwards. That created an indissoluble bond between parents and children. Mr. Choate never made any important decision without wondering what his father and mother would have said about it. At Harvard he made his mark. He cultivated a conversational style in speaking and was agreeable and popular. After a year with a distinguished Boston lawyer, he entered the office of Butler, Evarts, and Southmayd, in New York. There he remained four years, and after twelve months in partnership with another lawyer, General Barnes, he returned to his old firm as a partner, with about £600 a year. For ten years he worked with Mr. Evarts in the courts, preparing the cases and doing the work of a junior counsel. Genial and buoyant, he was strong and self-reliant, with a vein of New England austerity and a high sense of duty. Mr. Strong describes him under four aspects—the New Englander, the New Yorker, the lawyer, the ambassador. He never ceased to glory in New England, and the memorial window to John Harvard, in Southwark Cathedral, was a mark of his enduring affection for his old college. He became a popular figure in New York, and no great occasion seemed complete without a speech from him. 'His intellectual resources and his manner and style of expression were so perfectly suited to his audience, and his play of humour so captivating, that they appealed with convincing force to the intelligence of his hearers.' His audacity was sometimes startling, and the Irish boiled over with indignation at his speech on St. Patrick's Day, 1893, when he suggested that all the Irishmen in America should return with their wives and children to cure Ireland's woes and feebleness by applying the science of government which they had learned in America. Mr. Choate's course at the bar is described with rare skill. He was never excitable; never ill-tempered; never seemed to be keyed up to make an effort. He began speaking as if engaged in private conversation. By and by the wonderful charm of his voice, the easy familiarity of speech, the wit, and the powerful diction revealed the master mind that was bent on convincing court and jury. His chief legal triumphs are described in a way that lights up the procedure of American courts. As ambassador he exerted his gifts and influence to promote friendly relations between

the United States and our own country. He was in constant request for public functions, and did not spare himself. He never spoke without throwing light on the subjects he discussed, and everything had a Choate touch that was inimitable. Queen Victoria warmly appreciated his witty sayings. The English bar did him rare honour by electing him a Bencher of the Middle Temple, and the farewell banquet at the Mansion House was a fitting tribute to his six years' service. On his return to America he was recognized as the first citizen of New York. From the day that Belgium was invaded he was heart and soul with the Allies, and felt profound satisfaction when America declared war. He was Chairman of the Committee of Citizens to receive Mr. Balfour and the French Commissioners, and the veteran of eighty-five delivered some of his happiest speeches when the guests arrived. He died a few days after bidding Mr. Balfour farewell, having given his last strength to inspire his countrymen with his own lofty enthusiasm for the cause of liberty, humanity, and civilization.

Protestantism in Germany. By Kerr D. Macmillan. (H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This publication of the Princeton University Press appears at the time when 'the spectacle of the Protestant nations of the earth engaged in a fratricidal struggle, the issues of which are essentially moral if not religious, is a direct challenge to the student of Church history.' The President of Wells College seeks to give some account of the progress of German Protestantism, with special reference to Luther's ideas on the one hand and to the State control of the Churches on the other. He throws light on many of the phenomena of present-day German life and thought. The present war cannot be laid at Luther's door, for the Lutheran Church, as it developed after Luther's death, had no more resemblance to his ideals for it than to the Church it superseded. Luther has fascinated his followers as Calvin never did. He was long regarded as prophet, apostle, knight, teacher, and priest. His translation of the Bible was said to be inspired. He found that his early views on Church government could not be carried out, and the Lutheran Church has remained in the unfinished condition outlined in his 'German Mass.' It is a teaching Church, proclaiming the gospel of salvation to all, but without congregational self-government or congregational life. The Churches called by Luther's name allowed four centuries to elapse without answering his challenge to a higher and freer congregational life. The Church was surrendered into the hands of the civil government. The clergy were drawn from the lower classes, and were badly educated, and sometimes dependent on the charity of the patron or the gentry. Frederick William III imposed a liturgy on the Church, and though Schleiermacher and a few brave pastors resisted, the king won the day. From the time of the Reformation there have been many pastors in every generation who have stood fearlessly

for pure doctrine and true morality and have endeared themselves to their parishioners, but the Church, deprived of proper organization and self-government, has never been 'free to control its ministers, to train its people, or to play its proper part in educating, disciplining, and directing the thought of the nation.' The Lutheran system has cultivated the idea that religion and morality were imposed from above and could be cared for like sanitation and education. It was the sole duty of the layman to obey. 'The importance of this in the education and development of the people cannot be exaggerated. It lay, and to some extent still lies, at the basis of German thought and German institutions.' Dr. Macmillan holds that the conditions for the formation of healthy and effective public opinion have been absent from Germany largely because the people were deprived of their privileges as Protestants. The doctrine of the divine right of princes is to this day one of the strongest weapons of the monarchy. The study is illuminating.

Eminent Victorians. By Lytton Strachey. (Chatto & Windus. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Eminent Victorians are Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale, Dr. Arnold, and General Gordon. Mr. Lytton Strachey thinks that the history of the Victorian Age will never be written. We know too much about it. He has here attempted to present some Victorian visions to the modern eye. The lives of an ecclesiastic, an educational authority, a woman of action, and a man of adventure, are used to examine and elucidate certain fragments of the truth about the Victorian age. A dry light is poured over these great figures. They become really human and really alive. Blemishes are dragged into the light. We see Florence Nightingale possessed by a demon—a woman of unconquerable purpose and remorseless in her campaign for the reform of nursing and Army medical work. Manning and Newman stand out in strange contrast. There is a caustic touch in the reference to Newman's visit to Loretto. When he 'was a child he "wished that he could believe the Arabian Nights were true." When he came to be a man, his wish seems to have been granted.' The work of Gordon in China and his last expedition to Khartoum are described with rare insight. The strange vein of mysticism in the hero is brought out, and we get right to the heart of the final tragedy which left the Mahdi supreme ruler of the Sudan. The studies are barbed, and every touch helps to complete and vivify the portrait. No one who likes to study the unfolding of character should overlook this stimulating and powerful book.

Robert Hugh Benson: Captain in God's Army. By Reginald J. J. Watt. (Burns & Oates. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

These reminiscences cover the last two years of Father Benson's life, when Mr. Watt and he lived under one roof, served each other's masses, played games together, and shared their daily confidences.

The book is divided, as befits an author who is now an Army chaplain, into four parts: In Training, the Theory of War (the Writer), In Action (the Preacher), and In Command (the Director). It is an intimate picture of the man in all his moods, his versatility, his highly-strung nature, his industry, and the delight he took in being lionized. His novels, with perhaps one exception, had an underlying and insinuating militarism. 'They sowed their seeds of Catholic aspirations, they tickled the palate, created a want in the mind of the reader, and unsettled faulty religious foundations.' He put every bit of himself into them. As a preacher personal magnetism more than compensated for all his faults in elocution. All his personality and all his talents were used in every sermon. He caught the attention of his congregation from the beginning, and never let it slip. The book is intensely interesting, even for those who have least sympathy with its Roman Catholicism.

William G. C. Gladstone. A Memoir. By Viscount Gladstone. (Nisbet & Co. 5*s.* net.)

There is a quiet dignity in this touching memoir which befits the record of a singularly noble and devoted life. Lieut. Gladstone had made himself a name in Parliament for his courage and fidelity to conviction; he was proving himself a worthy Lord-Lieutenant of his county, and in many ways was upholding the honour of the great name he had inherited. Then came the war, and though he loved peace and wished England to keep aloof from military complications on the Continent of Europe, the invasion of Belgium shattered his hopes and ideals. He joined the Royal Welsh Fusiliers, left for the front on March 15, 1915, and was killed on April 13. When he was nine he asked for a Bible, and it became the foundation of his character. 'Moral truths and a never-wavering belief in God held him from the first, and guided him from day to day.' He was not a keen scholar, but was proud indeed to be President of the Union at Oxford. All his life was shaped by unswerving loyalty to duty. His opinions were based on deep thought and held with tenacity. 'He lived his short life joyously, working honestly, believing faithfully. His memory is treasured for what he was, for what he did, and it lifts the soul.'

The Popes and their Church. By Joseph McCabe. (Watts & Co. 6*s.*)

The publication of this volume will give no pleasure in ultramontane Romanist circles. The first part of the work is a trenchant criticism of papal claims viewed in the light of papal history; while in the second part the author, who possesses an intimate inside knowledge of the Roman Church, which he not unfairly regards as an essentially medieval corporation that has survived into modern times, subjects that Church in respect of its methods, atmosphere, and institutions to searching criticism. Mr. McCabe's treatment of such topics as

Roman Scholarship and Teaching, Sacerdotalism, Confession, and Indulgences is at once arresting and attractive. Regarded as a whole this volume is the most interesting that its author has given us. It is not, however, more particularly in the historical portion, the most satisfactory. Mr. McCabe can do, nay has already done, better historical work than this. Of his learning and industry there can be no question, but at times he appears to us to have suffered partisan prejudice to darken historical judgement. It is not that his deeper shadows are too black, that were impossible; but at times he has forgotten to give us the varying shades of grey. To one or two great pontiffs he has done less than justice, not as a rule by baseless accusation, but by allowing their virtues to pass unhonoured and unsung. If, however, this tendency on the part of the author be duly allowed for, his clear, compact, and well-informed volume will be of great service. It presents a case which Rome can hardly ignore, but to which it will be far from easy to make a convincing reply.

An Abbot of Vézelay. By Rose Graham, F.R.H.S. (S.P.C.K. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Vézelay is less known to Englishmen than it was in the twelfth century when it lay close to the main road between France and Italy. Its great church crowns an isolated hill within a few miles of Avallon. If the traveller alights at Avallon he may drive twelve miles through picturesque scenery to the little town, where a nunnery was founded about the year 860. This was destroyed by the Saracen invaders, but in 872 or 873 a Benedictine monastery was established on the top of the hill, and to it were given the lands and privileges of the nunnery. Abbot Pons, who held sway from 1138 to 1161, had a stormy life, and Miss Graham gives a striking account of his struggle with the burgesses and with the Counts of Nevers. His appeals to the Pope and his final victory over all the enemies of the monastery is a dramatic story and throws light on all the religious life of the times. The description of the great church of Vézelay, with its splendid carving, and the most marvellous Romanesque doorway in France, is of special interest, and full-page illustrations add much to the charm of a book that many will count a real treasure.

The Diocese of Gibraltar. A Sketch of its History, Work, and Tasks. By Henry J. C. Knight, D.D. With Map and Illustrations. (S.P.C.K. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Bishop of Gibraltar has written this history of his Diocese under many disadvantages, but that only makes us more grateful for his most interesting volume. No one can read his Introduction without feeling the claims of the English communities scattered over his vast diocese from Lisbon to the western shores of the Caspian. They used to be attached to the See of London, but in 1842 the bishopric of Gibraltar was founded, and Dr. George Tomlinson, one of the

Secretaries of the S.P.C.K., was put in charge. Thirty clergy were at work within the new diocese, but of these only ten or eleven were known to be under the bishop in 1846. Progress was at first very slow, and though friendly relations were established with the Eastern Church, there seemed to be 'little apparent quickening in the spiritual life of the congregations.' Bishop Sandford, who was consecrated in 1874, saw a marked advance during his thirty years of service. In 1876 he licensed three lay readers, who rendered valuable help in scattered stations. Bishop Collins had a brief but fruitful Episcopate (1904–11), and Dr. Knight shows how great are the burdens and opportunities of the present. Churchmen may be proud of the work represented in this volume, and Nonconformists owe much to the care taken of their members where their own Churches had no places of worship. The illustrations and statistics add much to the value of a good piece of work.

An Old Gate of England. Rye, Romney March, and the Western Cinque Ports. By A. G. Bradley. With Illustrations by Marian E. G. Bradley. (Robert Scott. 6*s.* net.)

There is rich matter for the historian of the Western Cinque Ports, and Mr. Bradley has made good use of it. He begins at Rye, and takes us round to visit the chief places of interest, among which is Lamb House, where Henry James lived. The history of the port is told, and the charm of the unique town is well brought out by the descriptions and the vigorous little pictures. From Rye we pass to Winchelsea. Even apart from the great distinction of the church itself, the whole effect of the place is vastly pleasing. It has a leisurely flavour. Its shops are inconspicuous, and most of the houses suggest a snug and peaceful life. Mr. Bradley gives the palm to Northiam among the neighbouring villages, and all who know Brickwall and the church and village green will agree with him. But the whole district is delightful, and this book ought to be in the hands of every visitor to this historic corner of Sussex. Miss Bradley's illustrations are well chosen and daintily executed.

Contributions toward a History of Arabico-Gothic Culture. Vol. I. By Leo Wilner. (New York: Neale Co. $3.50 net.)

Dr. Wilner is Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Harvard University. He has made important contributions to the History of Yiddish Literature and the Study of Germanic Laws. His present work is intended to 'compel the world of scholars to take into consideration the influence of Arabico-Gothic culture upon the history of Europe.' He discusses various words and documents such as the works of Virgilius Maro the Grammarian, and Vita S. Columbani. He even studies the history of Arras cloth. The Arabic words

which entered the Gothic, and from it got into other Germanic languages, must have thus entered because Gothic had an acknowledged hegemony among those languages. Alcuin in the ninth century spoke of the Goths as a God-favoured nation, and Charlemagne 'considered it his chief duty, not only to favour the Goths by throwing open waste lands for their colonies, but also to combat their heresy, which was supported by the superior Gothic learning, by employing Alcuin, the most learned man of the time, in that struggle.' The philological discussions of the volume are of special interest, and in other volumes the origin of the Codex Bezae and the formation of the Old High German and Anglo-Saxon languages and literatures will be discussed. The work represents years of expert study.

French Catholics in the Nineteenth Century. By W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 5*s.* net.)

These bright studies are the work of a master, who uses them to light up the whole field of Catholic thought in France during the nineteenth century. Dr. Simpson begins with Lamennais, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and then passes to less familiar phases of French thought as represented by Louis Veuillot, Gratry, Émile Olivier and D'Hulst, the Rector of the Catholic Institute of Paris, who burnt his fingers over his two professors Duchesne and Loisy. The studies represent a large amount of research put in a luminous and attractive way.

The Heritage of India. Asoka. By James M. Macphail, M.A., M.D. (Milford. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Asoka began to reign over his vast Indian empire about the year 272 B.C. He is not likely to suffer from comparison with any monarch of the ancient world. He set himself to fulfil the high duties of his office, and for forty years proved himself a philanthropist as well as a noble ruler. After his conversion to Buddhism he became one of the greatest missionaries the world has ever seen. He ranks next to Buddha himself in the history of Buddhism. He found it an individual and made it a world religion. This little book gives a most interesting account of the monarch and his work. It has been skilfully printed at the Wesleyan Missionary Press, Mysore City.

Select Passages from Josephus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, illustrative of Christianity in the first Century. Arranged by H. J. White, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 8*d.* net). It was a happy thought to begin the *Texts for Students* with this collection of passages. They are given in the original Greek and Latin, with footnotes showing the variations that Eusebius introduced in his text. Students will greatly prize the little collection.—The S.P.C.K. has added to its series of Texts for the Study of Christian Origins *The Apocalypse of Abraham* and *The Ascension of Isaiah*, edited, with a translation from the Slavonic text, and Notes, by Canon Box (4*s.* 6*d.* net). The first part of the *Apocalypse* is based on the legend of Abraham's conversion from idolatry, the second part is based on the trance-vision of Genesis xv.

BOOKS ON THE WAR

From Bapaume to Passchendale, 1917. By Philip Gibbs. (Heinemann. 6*s*. net.)

No newspaper correspondent has done so much as Mr. Gibbs to make Englishmen understand the struggles and perils of the war. Now that we have his letters in book form we are able to form a clearer estimate of their vividness and their force. His new volume describes a year crowded with fighting save in its last month. Its colour was 'not black but red, because a river of blood flowed through its changing seasons and there was a great carnage of men.' The year leaves a curious physical sensation of breathlessness and heart-beat. 'The heroism of men, the suffering of individuals, their personal adventures, their deaths or escape from death, are swallowed up in this wild drama of battle, so that at times it seems impersonal and inhumanlike, some cosmic struggle in which man is but an atom of the world's convulsion.' The letters are divided into five groups: The German Retreat from the Somme; On the Trail of the Enemy; The Battles of Arras, Messines, and of Flanders, and the Canadians at Lens. It was a most extraordinary experience to traverse the country east of Bapaume which the Germans had abandoned and to tramp through the district of Peronne and into that deserted and destroyed town. Mr. Gibbs crossed No Man's Land into the German lines and travelled over roads and fields down which their guns and transports went. After passing the area of shell-fire, the field of shell-craters, the smashed barns and houses and churches, the battered tree-trunks, the wide belts of barbed wires, they came to open country, with smooth and rolling fields. We live through all the scenes of the battles of Arras and Messines and the great contest in Flanders down to the capture of Passchendaele. The bravery of our men baffles description, but the story is told with so much spirit and discernment that we dimly understand their heroic deeds and see the tremendous forces with which they have had to grapple. The names of regiments are now given, and that itself adds immensely to the interest of the letters.

With our Heroes in Khaki. By William E. Sellers. (R.T.S. 3*s*. 6*d*. net.)

This book is an inspiration. It tells the story of Christian work among our soldiers and sailors in a way that makes one's heart glow with gratitude to God and to the workers who have carried the gospel to our brave men and have seen the transformation that it has wrought in their lives. The best of true stories are gathered here from all sources and told with unfailing insight and feeling. Every side of Christian work in the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army, the Church

Army, and as done by all the Churches is represented. The book is a set of living pictures which show the reality and depth of the religious life of Christian men in the ranks. Holy Communion is the most precious of all means of grace as death comes near. Before an advance, and indeed in all sorts of circumstances, our men gather at the Lord's Table and find strength for every trial. Mr. Sellers has given us a book that every one will do well to read.—The Religious Tract Society has also produced a coloured view of Jerusalem (*8d.* net), with certain objects that are to be cut out and pasted at various points in the landscape. It will enable boys and girls to build up a realistic model showing the ancient and modern places of interest.

Watchman, What of the Night? By Richard Henry Malden, M.A. (Macmillan & Co. *5s.* net.)

Mr. Malden spent three years in an industrial parish in Lancashire, three years as College lecturer in Cambridge, five as Principal of the Leeds Clergy School and Lecturer of Leeds Parish Church. For two years he has been a naval chaplain. That is a record which entitles a man to a hearing, and these 'Thoughts on the Position and Ideals of the Church of England' have a great deal of gun-cotton in them. Mr. Malden cannot approve of the suggestion that High Mass should be substituted for Morning Prayer. That would degrade the Eucharist, he holds, to the level of a piece of magic. 'Our congregations may be disappointingly small, but we are not likely to effect any real improvement by recklessly thrusting the deepest divine mystery upon those for whom it is alleged that the minor offices of the Church have already proved too hard.' Mr. Malden gives away Apostolic succession. In the pages of the New Testament *episkopos* and *presbuteros* are 'plainly interchangeable terms.' The Episcopalian cannot assert that no room is left in early Christian origins for Presbyterianism. But he holds that the bishop represents the laity, and that in England he is 'nominated by the two representative laymen of the whole nation'—the King and the Prime Minister. The laity exercise 'their royal priesthood through the Bishop whom they have chosen. This is the theory underlying our system of ordination.' This is interesting but not convincing. Mr. Malden pleads for a teaching ministry, and holds that the neglect of the Holy Spirit is 'a serious doctrinal weakness of the Church of England.' His exposition bristles with controversial matter. He thinks that the Church of England is 'not tied to anything as small as' John Wesley's sermons. But is there not more sea-room in those four volumes than in the Thirty-Nine Articles?

Peace of Mind. (Melrose. *3s. 6d.* net.)

These 'Essays and Reflections' cover the leisure time in the first three years of the war, of one whose chief interest in life is in books. The first pages describe the August night of 1914, when the crowds moved

incessantly between Charing Cross and Buckingham Palace, when London saw that our country had a time of sacrifice and very real suffering before her. It is a vivid picture of that momentous night. When the war began many predicted that it would be a 'three weeks' job.' The writer did not cherish such hopes, but he never wavered in his conviction that there could only be 'one end—the utter defeat of Germany, whose civilization is the denial of the moral order of the Universe.' The deciding factor will be the unreckoned moral force. There was no form of German savagery for which what he had known and read of Germany had not prepared him. 'I have always detected a lurking strain of brutality in the German character. Add to that, insolence of power, and anything is possible.' The writer tells us about his favourite books, his Christmas Day reading, his discoveries of young poets like W. H. Davies. He ascribes the Anglo-American Entente in large measure to the influence of English literature during the last twenty-five years. Dickens, Thackeray, and Matthew Arnold by their caustic criticisms opened old wounds which were nearly healed, but a better spirit has helped to bring the two nations together, and the present Entente seems destined to blend into a permanent, indissoluble friendship. One suggestive paper deals with the deterioration in writing that comes through dictating books. As to the war, he feels that the only compensations are to those who take a spiritual view of life. The little volume stirs many thoughts, and is a companion that every book-lover will cherish and brood over again and again.

War and Revolution in Russia: Sketches and Studies. By John Pollock. (Constable & Co. 6*s.* net.)

Most of these papers appeared in various newspapers at earlier stages of the war, so that they reflect the hopes and fears of the time in a somewhat pathetic way. Mr. Pollock knows Russia well, and his pictures of life at Bergen, Karungi, Warsaw, and other cities are vivid bits of description. The chapter on Rasputin gives the best conception of that strange being that we have seen. His hypnotic power, to which the Czarina and her son owed so much, and his horrible licentiousness, are brought out, and the immense sense of relief caused by his assassination. Mr. Pollock draws a terrible picture of the revolution and the demoralization of the Army. General Alexeiev, small, pink-cheeked, and smiling, had an air of charming benevolence when Mr. Pollock dined at headquarters. He looks like a Russian of the Russians, with the wide face and large brow of the good peasant stock from which he has sprung. These are vanished pictures full of painful memories. A letter from Petrograd, which appeared in *The Nineteenth Century* for November, 1917, discusses 'Peace without annexations or indemnities.' Russia has looked civil war in the face. Fraternization with the enemy reached astounding proportions, and drunkenness has assumed such proportions in the Army that it has become nearly as dangerous as

desertion. Mr. Pollock feels nevertheless that Russia will yet rise to the height of its destiny. She is 'a land of wonders, and the wonder of reborn patriotism may be nearer than any can know, ready to spring into life within her and blossom in a day into a rare and deathless flower.'

Nelson's History of the War. Vol. XIX. By John Buchan. (1*s.* 6*d.* net.) This important volume deals with the German retreat in the West, the battle of Arras, the second battle of the Aisne, Mesopotamia, Syria, and the Balkans, Italy's campaign since the fall of Gorizia, and the progress of the Russian Revolution. The dispatches of our generals are given as appendices, and the 'List of Maps' covers two pages. Much light is thrown on important phases of the war. Germany's 'shock-troops' were a confession of failure. The skimming of the cream to form these left the residuum weaker and depressed the moral of the ordinary line. The tragedy of the Russian revolution is powerfully brought out. The heroic army 'sunk into a mob of selfish madmen, forgetful of their old virtues, and babbling of uncomprehended pedantries.'—*Over the Top with the Third Australian Division.* By C. P. Cuttriss. (Kelly. 3*s.* net.) The Australian has proved himself a great soldier, and his contagious cheerfulness has made him a prime favourite in France. This book will make every one more proud of him. He bears no malice against the enemy, and though he detests war he feels that he is serving the cause of Christianity by upholding those 'standards of justice and honour which have made us the greatest nation in the world. It is not a war of retaliation nor aggression, but a war to redress wrong, to succour the weak and down-trodden.' It is refreshing to look at things through the eyes of this brave officer, and the verse and Mr. McBeith's striking illustrations make this a book that every one will be eager to read.—*And behold, We Live. Papers by a wounded Soldier.* Edited by James Adderley. (Constable & Co. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.) Attwood Tomkins was an East End lad brought up in a drunken home. His search for religion in churches and mission-halls, his enlistment as a soldier in the Great War, and his meeting in hospital with a padre who led him into the light make a stirring record. To Canon Adderley it brings home the fact that this lad 'wanted God all his life, and he has not been able to find Him at all easily because of people like myself. We somehow seem to obscure what we are commissioned to make clear.' At certain points the boy's story does not escape the suspicion of caricature, but it is so intense and so heartfelt that one follows it with never-failing sympathy. There is a great deal of shrewdness in it and not a little wisdom.—*From the Ranks to Chief of Staff.* By Edward W. Walters. (Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) This biography of General Sir William Robertson is of great interest. The story is well told, and throws much light on our military history and especially on the present war. Sir William owes his honours to indomitable perseverance and high purpose. He is a deeply religious man and

has won the confidence of the Army and of the country in an unusual measure. Every Englishman will delight in this record.—*Christian Imperialism.* By Arthur C. Hill. (Hodder & Stoughton. 6*s.* net.) Mr. Hill discusses the principles of Imperial rule, showing that the British Empire is coming well out of the crucible of war, and that its political future is full of promise. The spirit of a free people has made the gigantic efforts of the last three years possible. 'Men, money, munitions—they have sprung as it were from the ground.' 'Christian democracy can render this Empire of ours the beacon-light of the world.' Mr. Hill thinks that the best arrangement as to the Dominions and the Mother country is that formulated by Mr. Curtis in *The Problem of the Commonwealth.* 'The Scenes of Imperial Activity'—Canada, Under the Southern Cross, Egypt, Africa, India, are described at length, and the closing section deals with the Builders of Empire—soldiers, sailors, writers, and missionaries. The subject is of supreme importance, and it is very lucidly and helpfully treated.—*Killed in Action and other War Poems.* By Henry Burton, M.A., D.D. (Kelly. 7*d.* net.) Dr. Burton's twelve poems have both beauty and passion. His soldier dies in action, but his course is not over:

> 'Say not his life is quenched; but rather say
> The dawn has broadened into perfect day.'

Such poems as 'For the Absent' and 'Through Death to Life' will bring comfort to many, and the feeling of the time is mirrored in 'Daybreak in Judah' and 'Zion Redempta.' It is a booklet that one takes to one's heart.—*Prisoners of Hope.* By Arthur S. Peake, M.A., D.D. (Allen & Unwin. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.) Prof. Peake has keen sympathy with the 'conscientious objector,' though he does not share his views. He seeks to explain his position, and pleads for liberty of conscience. He specially appeals to those who have fought the battle of freedom and progress in the past. It is a sensible discussion of a difficult and thorny problem.—Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton publish *Syria and the Holy Land,* by Sir G. Adam Smith (1*s.* net), and *Palestine and Jerusalem* by Rev. H. Sykes (10*d.* net). The latter is a handbook for soldiers, giving the salient points of geography, history, and present-day life. It has maps as end papers, and is just the pocket companion a soldier will prize. Sir George Adam Smith's booklet deals with the recovery of the land, its peasantry, the claims of the Jew, and the physical character of the country in an illuminating way. It is a very valuable survey.—*Dawn in Palestine,* by William Canton (S.P.C.K. 1*s.* 3*d.* net), is one of the best booklets on the country, its history, inhabitants, and prospects that we have seen. It has some excellent illustrations.

GENERAL

Platonism. By Paul Elmer More. (Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

THESE lectures were delivered at Princeton University in October and November, 1917. They do not deal with education, art, and government as represented in Plato's Dialogues, but concentrate attention on the ethical theme which is the mainspring of his philosophy. The volume is an invitation to the practice of philosophy. The lecturer hopes that he may lead some seeking minds to the inexhaustible source of strength and comfort in the Platonic Dialogues. No person in antiquity stands out more vividly than Socrates, whom Plato made the responsible mouthpiece of his speculations. The impulses which carried him towards philosophy were an intellectual scepticism, a spiritual affirmation, and a tenacious belief in the identity of virtue and knowledge. After expounding these theses Prof. More describes the Socratic quest, where Plato shows that the popular view of morality has the sanction of religion. The ethical system of Plato as revealed in the *Republic* rests on the criterion of happiness, which is essentially different in kind from pleasure. There is a dualism in Plato's philosophy which sets pleasure, virtue, and opinion in one group, and over against them happiness, morality, and knowledge. The chapter on Psychology has much to say about Socrates and the daemonic guidance for which he cherished such reverential regard. That in fact was the religion of Socrates. The Doctrine of Ideas, Science and Cosmogony, and Metaphysics are discussed in three luminous chapters. Prof. More asks what the influence of Plato's teaching has been on the world. 'Half the enthusiasts and inspired maniacs of society have shielded themselves under the aegis of the great Athenian.' Yet no one can read the Dialogues without being impressed by 'the broad sanity of the life they inculcate and display.' Philosophy, as Plato expounded it, was 'the fullness of life, moving ever to higher and richer phases of knowledge and feeling. Yet it was a life, also, conditioned by the moral law, consciously present as an inner check setting limits to the grasp of reason, staying the flow of desires, governing the imagination,' offering true liberty and opposing that licence whose end is the faction and disease of the soul. Better still, Plato has given us an immortal portrait of philosophy, incarnate in a living, historic man. We are grateful for this fine study of Platonism.

Per Amica Silentia Lunae. By William Butler Yeats. (Macmillan & Co. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Yeats divides his meditation into two parts—Anima Hominis and Anima Mundi. In the first he exercises the art of introspection.

When he gets home after meeting strangers he goes over all he had said in gloom and disappointment. But when he shuts the door and lights his candle 'all my thoughts have ease and joy. I am all virtue and confidence.' Among artists and emotional writers Mr. Yeats has discovered a similar contrast. One severe critic has 'written comedies where the wickedest people seem but bold children.' That seems to be 'the compensating dream of a nature wearied out by over-much judgement.' A great poet's work is 'the man's flight from his entire horoscope, his blind struggle in the network of the stars.' Mr. Yeats suggests that 'we must not make a false faith by hiding from our thoughts the causes of doubt, for faith is the highest achievement of the human intellect, the only gift man can make to God, and therefore it must be offered in sincerity.' It is deep thinking on life's problems which will set others brooding over them. The second part, with its search for the soul of the world, is even more mystical and thought-provoking. The mediums in Connaught and Soho have nothing for Mr. Yeats on which some light is not thrown by Henry More, who was called during his life the holiest man now living upon the earth. The Cambridge Platonist 'thought that those who, after centuries of life, failed to find the rhythmic body and to pass into the Condition of Fire, were born again.' We feel lost in these speculations, but Mr. Yeats throws a glamour about them as we turn his pages. The little Epilogue refers to the French poets of the day, strangely unlike their predecessors save for the preoccupation with religion. 'It was no longer the soul, self-moving and self-teaching—the magical soul—but Mother France and Mother Church.' Mr. Yeats says his thoughts have run through a like round, though he has not found his tradition in the Catholic Church, which was not the Church of his childhood.

Waltham Thickets and other Poems. By E. J. Thompson. (Kelly. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Thompson's latest volume of verse maintains the promise of his earlier work, if it does not show a marked advance upon it. His muse is always melodious, tender, and graceful. The note of spiritual, mystic emotion is rarely absent. Perhaps there is no poem to equal the well-wrought Miltonic dignity and pathos of 'Ennerdale Bridge' in his previous book: but there is much beauty in his Mesopotamia lyrics, swift and memorable visions as they are of the Tigris landscape and well-known points in the 1916 campaign, such as 'The Pastures of Sannaiyat' and 'The Wadi.' We are not altogether convinced that his experiment of transporting the Eastern poetic device adopted in the first part of his book into Western verse is quite a success. The exotic is rather bewildering to the English mind, and tends to distract rather than to elucidate; and we prefer Mr. Thompson undivided, and not himself and 'Conrad of Elsass' in poetic partnership. But while there may be difference of opinion as to this particular form of his verse, Mr. Thompson preserves his

distinctive and arresting charm of expression and thought, and many a reader will be grateful for the serene beauty of his poetic vision. We have refrained for reasons of space from quotation; but what has been said will suffice to show that this little volume of verse is not to be missed by those who are interested in the poetic harvest of a memorable period.

The Eclogues of Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus. Edited, with Introduction and Notes by Wilfred P. Mustard, M.A., Ph.D. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press.)

Andrelinus was born at Forli about 1462 and was admitted to lecture publicly at the University of Paris in 1489, where he remained, with the exception of some months at Toulouse and Poitiers, till his death in 1518. He helped to spread the New Learning in France, and won the friendship of Erasmus, who says he deserved to live for ever. This did not prevent him from writing in the year after his death a very unfavourable report of his character and attainments. Prof. Mustard gives a list of his principal published works. The *Eclogues* were printed in Paris about 1496. They owe a great deal to Virgil and Ovid, and the 'moral' passages draw upon Horace, Persius, and Juvenal. He also freely uses Calpurnius and Nemesianus at a time when they were not very widely read. The Eclogues of Arnolletus are also given in this little volume. The Latin text is provided with notes that show how largely Andrelinus drew from earlier poets. The liberal policy of the Johns Hopkins press has enabled Prof. Mustard to make this third contribution to the history of the humanistic pastoral. It will be greatly appreciated by all students of the revival of learning.

The Poetical Works of Gray and Collins. Edited by Austin Lane Poole and Christopher Stone. (H. Milford. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This reprint of early editions of Gray and Collins, with notes on the chief editions and manuscripts, chronological tables, and notes on MSS. variations, will be of great interest to students and lovers of poetry. Facsimiles of the original title-pages are given, and of part of the manuscript of the 'Elegy' at Pembroke College. The Editors are much to be congratulated on a piece of careful and valuable work.

Impossible People. By Mrs. George Wemyss. (Constable & Co. 5*s.* net.) This story is rightly named, but Joanna is charming, and her John comes near perfection. Their adopted daughter Hope is a disappointment, but Milly is a gem. The whole thing is a tissue of impossibilities, but it is alive and full of quiet charm. We wish Hope had not been spoiled, but she had no poetry in her nature and no self-sacrifice.—*Anne's House of Dreams.* By L. M. Montgomery.

(Constable & Co. 5*s.* net.) The house was on Prince Edward Island, looking over the beautiful St. Lawrence Gulf. Anne and the doctor begin their married life in it, and have some neighbours, whom it is a pleasure to know. Captain Jim is a world in himself, and tragedy seems bound up in Leslie Moore, though it turns into unmixed happiness by and by. The story is full of quiet humour, and love stories of every sort are woven into it in the most amusing way.—***The Revival at Broad Lane.*** By Kate Drew. (Marshall Bros. 6*s.* net.) The visit of a lady evangelist proves a wonderful blessing to the languishing church at Broad Lane. The minister is a brave and true man, and his love affair adds a happy note to a stimulating and most interesting story.—***Jacqueline.*** By John Ayscough. (Chatto & Windus. 6*s.* net.) Lady Adelgitha loses her reason after the birth of her only child. She never loves her, and Jacqueline has to endure something like martyrdom, but the girl has the making of a saint in her, and her patience under this harsh discipline is a marvel. She is a Catholic, and prayer is her constant source of strength. She makes a tragic marriage, but is left a widow, and real happiness is in store for her when the war ends. It is a story of real power and beauty.

Messrs. Routledge have just published four books which have an urgent claim on the attention of the troubled housewife. In ***20th Century Cookery Practice*** (3*s.* 6*d.* net) Mrs. Aronson has compiled and edited over 1,200 recipes, many of which are new. They are drawn from British, French, and Colonial sources, and are compact but clear. French cooking terms are explained, useful household hints are given. Nothing seems to have been overlooked in this most practical and sensible volume. ***Meatless and Less-Meat Cookery,*** by Matilda Lees-Dods (1*s.* 6*d.* net), has a special value at the moment, and shows how many appetizing and sustaining meals can be prepared with little meat. It is full of good recipes.—In ***Food Values,*** by Margaret McKillop (1*s.* 6*d.* net), teachers and caterers will find a scientific study of the nutritive values of food, with directions as to the calculation of calories and estimates of the way in which different kinds of food build up strength.—***The Wild Foods of Great Britain,*** by L. C. R. Cameron (1*s.* 6*d.* net), has 46 figures, of which 21 are in colours, and shows where to find and how to cook these foods. Over thirty years' experience has gone to the making of this little book. Peasant folk in Scotland, France, Italy, and Spain have supplied material, and very few of the dishes have not been cooked and eaten by the author. When we say that they include hedgehog, gulls, and all kinds of wild fruits, the author's courage shines out.—***The Oracle of Colour.*** By William Kiddier. (Fifield. 2*s.* net.) 'When light first dawned, colour was the added charm, the garland thrown in upon the things men need, God's gratuity to a grey world, the miracle of His afterthought; His finishing touch with which He smiled.' That is a painter's thought, and the little book is itself a colour study which will help plain folk to see with a painter's eyes.

To the mother it was a drab world, to her little child all nature was a lyric. The lyrics brought new colour into the scene, and Mr. Kiddier paints it for us, and sings to the rain in some graceful verse. It is delicate word-painting, over which one likes to linger in these days of storm and stress.—*Our Case against Rome.* By N. P. Williams. (Longmans. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.) These five Sunday morning lectures are very clear and cogent. The claim of the Papacy to a title coming straight from Christ is not allowed. The great passage in St. Matthew confers on Peter no power of binding and loosing which our Lord did not also confer on the other disciples. Nor did Christ say that He would build the Church exclusively on Peter. He was a foundation, but not the only one. Mr. Williams shows how the Roman Church inherited the prestige of the Caesars. The question of infallibility is very well handled. The last lecture is on 'Gallicanism and Reunion.' Mr. Williams does not desire reunion with Rome as she is, but hopes that she may sooner or later modify her claims so as to allow reunion without sacrifice of principle on the part of the Church of England. The subject is well handled, and is intensely interesting, though we see small hope of any change in Rome.—*Marriage.* By the Bishop of Norwich. (Murray. 1*s.* and 2*s.* 6*d.* net.) Nothing could be wiser or more persuasive than this unfolding of the marriage service. It is specially intended for young people who may be thinking of marriage, and for brides and bridegrooms, but it is hoped that those who are already married will find help and inspiration from its pages. It gives a beautiful picture of what Christian marriage may be, and every one who reads it will feel grateful to the Bishop of Norwich for so gracious and so timely an exposition. Simple family prayers for morning and evening by Dr. Bindley are added.—*Towards Freedom.* Poems. By W. Robert Hall. (8*d.*) There is much in this little set of poems to arrest attention. The Foreword sadly misinterprets our Lord's claim to be Master. The Divine Christ-self, Mr. Hall holds, is there declared to be our only Lord. That is to shut one's eyes to the plain meaning of the words. At many points there is a narrow socialistic conception of things, but there is ability and force in some of the verses, and we hope Mr. Hall will yet think more deeply and see things more clearly.—*Nigeria the Unknown.* (C.M.S. 1*s.* net.) A textbook for missionary study which describes the country and the present opportunity. It is well illustrated, and packed with facts.—*The Problem of Man's Antiquity.* By F. Wood-Jones. (S.P.C.K. 7*d.* net.) Every one interested in the descent of man will do well to study this booklet. Prof. Jones shows that Huxley's teaching on the subject is altogether unreliable. 'Man is no new begot child of the ape, born of a chance variation, bred of a bloody struggle for existence upon pure brutish lines. . . . Were man to regard himself as being an extremely ancient type, distinguished now, and differentiated in the past purely by the qualities of his mind, and were he to regard existing primates as misguided and degenerated failures of his ancient stock, it would be a belief consistent with present knowledge.'

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Edinburgh Review (April) 'The Riddle of After-Life,' by A. Wyatt Tilby, speaks of the recent revival of interest in psychic questions, and more particularly in the possibility of communion with the dead, which is a direct outcome of the war. The article itself is a sign of the times, but it does not shed much light on the problem. Mr. Gosse thinks 'Mr. Hardy's Lyrical Poems' have a sense of unity of direction throughout. He has chosen to interpret one rich and neglected province of the British realm. 'No poet of modern times has been more careful to avoid the abstract and touch upon the real.' A French soldier's article on 'Alsace-Lorraine and Democracy' is of special value. The editor's 'Power of the Press' and Mr. Bodley's 'Romance of the Battle-Line in France' are peculiarly timely and full of interest.

The Round Table (June).—The first article—'The Ordeal'—shows how the German onset which began in March has reproduced the critical situation of 1914, and has also revived the spirit in which our peoples faced it. Our object is the re-establishment of liberty and public right in Europe and the foundation of a new order of international relations instead of hatred and war. The peace made with Russia has led to 'a new birth of Prussianism.' At all points reaction has triumphed in Germany. 'The Irish Crisis,' the growth of American war power, and other important subjects are discussed in this fine number.

Journal of Theological Studies (January and April).—The leading article, by Dr. T. R. Georgevich, contains an account of the relations in past centuries between Serbia and the Holy Land. Amongst 'Notes and Discussions' the longest paper is on 'The Latin Sources of the Commentary of Pelagius on Romans,' by A. J. Smith, whose scholarly inquiry has been inspired and guided by Prof. Souter of Aberdeen. Other articles are 'An Ancient Prayer in the Mediaeval Euchologia,' by Dom Conolly, the Structure of Jeremiah, Chapters 50 and 51, by Rev. T. H. Robinson, 'Myths and Genealogies,' by F. H. Colson, and A Commentary on the Syriac Hymn of the Soul, by V. Burch.

Church Quarterly (April).—Dr. Headlam, over whose appointment as Regius Professor of Theology at Oxford we sincerely rejoice, has a powerful article on 'The Bishopric of Hereford.' He shows how Dr. Henson's views have been misrepresented, and draws out three propositions which he maintains, expressing the opinion that

there is not 'an honest court in the country which would condemn Dr. Henson's opinions on any of these points as heretical.' The article on 'The War' is an outspoken criticism of our military policy in regard to Serbia, Roumania, Russia, and the Western Front.

Hibbert Journal (April).—An essay by the late Stopford A. Brooke on Shelley's interpretation of Christ and His teaching furnishes suggestive reading. 'There is no more magnificent embodiment of the noblest doctrine of Jesus on these matters'—the redemption of the world by faithful suffering in love—'than the "Prometheus Unbound,"' and Shelley's enthusiastic hopes for the future are 'the very faith of Jesus translated into another form,' says Mr. Brooke, whose own hopes were near akin to Shelley's, whilst he was loyal to the Jesus in whom he believed. An illuminating essay on Stopford Brooke by G. K. Chesterton appropriately follows this posthumously published paper. Prince Troubetzkoy's article 'The Meaning of life, and of the world, revealed by the Cross' completes and explains a previous article, the two forming one whole. The doctrine of a 'finite' God has been largely debated of late; the article on the subject here contributed by Dr. R. H. Dolterer, of Philadelphia, contains a discriminating criticism of Mr. H. G. Wells. Sir Philip Magnus' article on the Book of Jonah seeks to dissociate the 'fable of the fish' from the moral and religious teaching of the story of Jonah. Prof. Foster Watson's article on 'Erasmus at Louvain' points to the historical irony of the fact that it was from a city which has been a martyr to the outrages of modern *Kultur* that Erasmus 'advocated his noble humanism.' Rev. R. H. Coates, under the title 'Birmingham Mystics,' brings together such diverse names as those of R. A. Vaughan, J. H. Shorthouse, and Cardinal Newman.

Holborn Review (April).—Articles of very various interest compose the current number. These include an appreciative paper on 'The Loyalty of Lord Morley' by W. Barker; 'Fénélon as a Philosopher' by Dr. James Lindsay; 'The Evolution of Maeterlinck,' by J. W. Richardson, and a Symposium on the Holy Communion by D. S. Guy and the Editor (Rev. J. Day Thompson). A fitting eulogium of Thomas Burt, 'father' of the House of Commons, is contributed by H. J. Cowell, who closes his notice with the striking testimony to Mr. Burt's character by Viscount Grey, 'There is no one that I have known in public life for whom I desire so much to express my respect and admiration without qualification or reserve.'

Expository Times (April and May).—Some of the more notable articles in these numbers are 'Christianity and International Politics,' by Prof. J. Dick Fleming, of Winnipeg; 'The Family and Religion of Sergius Paulus,' by Sir W. M. Ramsay; 'The Mystical Interpretation of the Psalms,' by Rev. G. C. Binyon; and an instalment of 'The Bookshelf by the Fire,' by Rev. G. Jackson, dealing with Sir T. Browne's *Religio Medici*. Dr. H. A. Kennedy continues his study of Irenaeus and the Fourth Gospel. Rev. J.

Courtenay James contributes a scholarly note on 'One-Tense Semitic.' The Editor's notes are as varied and interesting as ever, touching as they do on the late Dr. J. H. Moulton's 'Treasure of the Magi,' Bartlet and Carlyle's 'Christianity in History,' his own question, 'What is the Cause of the Failure of Christianity?' and Bishop Brent's 'Mount of Vision.' The notices of books form a valuable feature of this periodical.

Calcutta Review (January).—A specially interesting article on Meadows and his books. His *Confessions of a Thug* proved a new sensation for the reading world. The main events were all actual facts, and the writer's imagination had to do little save supply connecting links. 'The War Work of Women since August, 1914,' 'The Post Office in India,' and other important articles appear in this number.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review (April).—'The Monologue of Browning,' by G. H. Palmer; 'New Realism and Religion,' by R. F. A. Hoernlé, and 'Angelus Silesius,' by F. Palmer, are the main articles of this number. In *The Ring and the Book* a story is told ten times without ever failing in interest because 'the event is transfused through personalities which it illuminates in every part.' Where else outside Shakespeare has individual experience been painted on such a scale?' The hymns of Angelus Silesius have kept his name alive in Germany. He 'sought God; and, as always, more abundantly than he had dreamed God met him.'

American Journal of Theology (April).—The first article, by C. H. Cunningham, on 'Ecclesiastical Influence in the Philippines,' possesses but limited interest for this country. Dr. A. E. Garvie, of New College, writes on 'Recent Progress of the Free Churches in England,' in which he recognizes the approach towards Christian unity and the important impulse in this direction received from America. Under the heading 'Some Theistic Implications of Bergson's Philosophy' Prof. F. H. Foster, of Oberlin, argues against what he calls 'the static view of God' with its 'evident insufficiency and untenableness,' and expatiates on 'the relief the dynamic view gives to the apologist.' The writer is reckoning without his host in counting Bergson among Theists—at all events as yet. Other articles are 'The Problem for an Empirical Theology,' by A. C. Watson, and 'J. A. Froude and Anglo-Catholicism,' by Prof. H. L. Stewart, of Halifax, N.S.

Bibliotheca Sacra (January; April).—Dr. Preserved Smith writes a suggestive paper on 'The Reformation.' Some investigations of the Pentateuch, and an article on 'The Religious Philosophy of Pascal' are features of this number.—(April). Dr. Wishart discusses 'The Christian Attitude towards War' and concludes that as long as nations attempt to destroy freedom and the rights of men 'it will be necessary that governments which acknowledge that they are

ordained of God should fight His battles, and it is the duty of the Christian to bear his part in such struggles.' The number includes articles on the composition of the Pentateuch and on the Unity of Isaiah by Chancellor Lias.

Princeton Theological Review (April).—Dr. B. B. Warfield continues his interesting study of 'The Terminology of Love in the New Testament,' 'The Sanctuary of Israel at Shiloh,' by John D. Davies, and a timely article by F. P. Ramsay on 'Christianity and Humanitarian Patriotism.' Two Old Testament articles deal respectively with 'Ecclesiastes,' and 'The Authenticity of Jonah.' Neither of the writers is in sympathy with the prevalent school of biblical criticism. 'Life Worthy of the Gospel of Christ' is the title of a republished lecture on the Stone Foundation by Eugene C. Caldwell.

Methodist Review (New York), April.—Prof. C. G. Shaw, of New York University, discusses 'Religion, Science, and War.' In 'World Democracy and the Christian Sabbath' Dr. J. H. Willey points out the need of a Rest-Day for the world and the present great danger lest it should be lost. Dr. J. Mudge, under the title 'A Philosophical Humorist,' discourses of H. W. Shaw, better known as 'Josh. Billings.' Other articles are on 'The Vatican and Italy in the War' and 'The Christianization of Patriotism.' A thoughtful article in smaller type on 'The Divine Triunity,' by Rev. E. Lewis, of Drew Seminary, is the most valuable feature in this number.

Methodist Review (Nashville), April.—Mr. H. M. Wiener in the first article celebrates what he calls 'the downfall of the documentary theory' in Old Testament criticism, but is good enough to say that this 'does not involve the bankruptcy of critical scholarship.' Dr. H. W. Magoun follows suit by contending that no one who does not include Mr. Wiener's articles in his reading 'can claim that he is up to date.' Rev. H. E. Wheeler, dealing with 'The Inspiration of the Bible,' contends that the objections to verbal inspiration are neither real nor valid. The subject of the war is handled in no fewer than five articles—'Real Causes of the World War,' by A. C. Millar; 'The Church in a World at War,' by J. L. Holt; 'The Pope and the War,' by E. T. Clark; 'Martin Luther and our World War,' by J. A. Rice; and 'The Philosophy of the World War,' by J. J. Tigert.

The Review and Expositor (Louisville).—Prof. E. B. Pollard, in 'The Baptists and World Democracy,' anticipates that 'American Christianity, with the Baptists holding a high place of sacrificial leadership,' will after the war point the path to a new and better world in a new and better day. Prof. J. A. Faulkner, of Drew Seminary, writes on Celsus as making 'The First Intellectual Attack on Christianity.' Two articles on 'The Churches and the Present War' are contributed by Dr. W. P. Wilks and Dr. S. Q. Batten. Other articles are on Finney, the Lawyer-Evangelist, and 'Shall we read Jonathan Edwards?'