

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:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<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

CONTENTS

	PAGE
AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST AND DIPLOMATIST . . .	1
<i>By REV. JOHN TELFORD, B.A.</i>	
WERE THE PHILISTINES 'PHILISTINES' ? . . .	16
<i>By REV. GEORGE JACKSON, B.A., D.D.</i>	
ON SOME DISPUTED GIORGIONES	31
<i>By ARTHUR SYMONS.</i>	
THE SWEET UNREASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY .	44
<i>By REV. F. W. ORDE WARD, B.A.</i>	
THE MENACE OF EDDYISM	58
<i>By REV. F. BALLARD, D.D., M.A., B.Sc.</i>	
PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE . . .	72
<i>By REV. WILFRED J. MOULTON, M.A., B.D.</i>	
THE RT. HON. GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL	82
<i>By T. H. S. ESCOTT.</i>	
THE ALLEGED EARLY MARTYRDOM OF THE APOSTLE JOHN	96
<i>By REV. J. ALFRED FAULKNER, M.A., D.D.</i>	
METHODIST MISSIONS IN THE NEW WORLD . .	145
<i>By REV. JOHN TELFORD, B.A.</i>	
SACRIFICE AND RECONCILIATION : A STUDY IN RELIGION	160
<i>By REV. W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D.</i>	
SOUTH AFRICA IN THOMAS PRINGLE'S POEMS . .	175
<i>By REV. W. W. SKILLING, B.Sc.</i>	
THE REVISED BIBLE	186
<i>By REV. J. AGAR BRET, D.D.</i>	
RELIGION IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS	200
<i>By HERBERT W. HORWILL, M.A.</i>	
THE ARISTOCRACY OF INTELLECT	211
<i>By REV. JAMES LEITCHAY, M.A., D.D.</i>	

THE SYSTEM OF ANIMATE NATURE	220
<i>By</i> REV. T. STEPHENSON, B.A., D.D.	
INDIA AND THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE	231
<i>By</i> STANLEY RICE.	
NATIONAL STATES AND WORLD AFFAIRS	241
<i>By</i> ST. Nihal SINGH.	
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS—	
Bernard Lucas; The Solution of the Synoptic Problem; The Occasional Papers of an Historian	106-115
Christian Theism Justified; The Relation of Theology to Philosophy; The Spiritual Splendour of Christ's Sonship; The Direction of Human Evolution	201-200
RECENT LITERATURE—	
THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS	116, 261
HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TRAVEL	126, 268
GENERAL	133, 272
PERIODICAL LITERATURE—	
BRITISH	138, 279
AMERICAN	141, 283
FOREIGN	144, 283

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY 1921

AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST AND DIPLOMATIST

The Life of Whitelaw Reid. By ROYAL CORTISSOZ. 2 volumes. (Thornton Butterworth. 1921.)

WHITELAW REID, the American Ambassador, died at his post in London on December 15, 1912, and his body was borne to the United States on his Majesty's armoured cruiser *Natal*. Mr. Asquith paid him high tribute in the House of Commons: 'We regard him as a kinsman.' In the same spirit, President Taft acknowledged King George's message of condolence: 'Mr. Reid's death is a loss to both countries, for his service as Ambassador was exceptional in the closer friendship that he secured between them through his own personality. His intimate knowledge of both countries, his profound respect and love for England, entirely consistent with the highest loyalty on his part to this country, gave him peculiar influence for good in his great station.'

He was often asked to write his memoirs, and admitted that there occasionally came over him the desire to make memoranda for such a work, but he added, 'It is always so much easier, in such things, to put it off to a more convenient season.' After all it served to remind him that when his duties as ambassador were over he could still find something to occupy himself with, if he had sufficient energy. His death found the work unattempted, but Mr. Cortissoz,

the literary and art editor of Reid's paper, the *Tribune*, has proved an ideal biographer. He has endeavoured to exhibit the relations between Reid and his contemporaries, so far as possible, in their own words.

Whitelaw Reid was born on October 27, 1837, at Xenia, Ohio. His grandfather, James Reid, was of Scottish Covenanter origin. He came from Cookestown, County Tyrone, Ireland, and after drifting through Pennsylvania, settled for a few years in Kentucky. Early last century he acquired a farm of several hundred acres where Cincinnati now stands. A ferry ran from it across the Ohio, and a clause in the deed—which he had overlooked—required him to see that it was in operation every day of the week. To avoid such a violation of the Sabbath he sold the land. If he had any prescience of the wealth of which he was thus depriving his descendants, we may be sure that his decision would have been the same. Regardless of profit or loss he moved on, a Stoic in homespun. 'Now he turned north, and in Greene County helped to found the town of Xenia.' The people lived in scattered log cabins, and would walk or ride miles to hear their minister. His home was on the other side of the creek, and when the water rose he crossed over to his church on stilts. In 1826 James Reid's second son married Marion Whitelaw Ronalds, whose father had emigrated from Scotland under the care of General James Whitelaw, one of two commissioners sent out by the Scotch-American Company of Farmers to select a town site for a body of colonists. Whitelaw became Surveyor-General of Vermont, and Mr. Ronalds named his daughter, who was born at Ryegate, in that State, after his friend. The girl was, for a time, brought up in Whitelaw's house, and named her second boy—the future ambassador—after the family patron. The Reid farm comprised about two hundred acres, and is still rich in timber. Whitelaw Reid enlarged the house but preserved its simplicities. 'The principal bed-room was barely large enough to hold the four-poster

which one of his mother's kinsmen had himself made for her as a wedding gift.' Her husband was for forty years an active ruling elder of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, especially useful as a peacemaker in the community. He loved his flute and took pride in his bookcases, which he made and kept well filled.

Whitelaw was sent to the district school, whose master lived at their farm. When scholars became too lively the eccentric teacher would push a peacock feather down the back of the chief offender so that its crest reached above his head. Each boy then had to lift his foot, which the boy behind caught in his hand. The queue thus hopped round the stove while the school laughed to its heart's content. One day Whitelaw was locked in the big deak which the master called his jail. The teacher's dinner was there, and before the culprit emerged he had eaten it. In due course he went to Miami University, from which he graduated at the age of nineteen, well equipped and uncommonly well poised. His political views were formed, and he delivered a speech in Xenia on behalf of the new Republican party, to which he was devoted. His first post was as Superintendent of the Graded Schools at South Charlestown at a salary of 50 dollars a month. He taught the classes in Latin, French, and higher mathematics, whilst his lady assistants attended to the general curriculum. He had done a good deal of writing at college and was a voracious reader. At the age of twenty he became editor and proprietor of the *News*, published in Xenia. The *News* had been started four years earlier, and its young proprietor was able to boast that in a year after he took charge it had the largest circulation of any paper of the kind published in Ohio. The Civil War was drawing near. The ninety-three weekly numbers which he edited form 'a moving, sometimes positively thrilling, record of the state of mind in which the North faced the lowering crisis.' These files are a window into the editor's life. 'There is excitement in looking

through it, in observing the conduct of a young man "on the ground," breathlessly watching for what each day may bring forth and striking out, in the growing dark, at what he knew for the oncoming evil.'

His newspaper proved a fine training ground. He wrote editorials and local paragraphs, set type, and sometimes worked off the paper on the clumsy machine. Errors, of course, crept in. Once he described a college as a 'well-deserving institution,' and was horror-stricken to find it branded as 'hell-deserving.' He had an instinct for the world in which he lived. Years afterwards he said it was the business of a newspaper to embrace in its outlook 'every new and significant fact affecting the social, political, intellectual, or moral movements of the world.' He acted on that principle at Xenia. He eagerly followed the famous struggle between Douglas and Lincoln. To him, the Democrat Douglas seemed 'shuffling and evasive.' 'He is an adroit special pleader, skilful in the "fence of words," ready on the stump, but to any higher character than this he has no claim.' John Brown's trial caused him an agony of apprehension: 'Let this man be executed as he has been tried, with a shameful partiality and injustice, and with an indecent haste only equalled by the cowardice which prompted it; and his blood will serve as the anointing oil for thousands who will step forward to take up his mantle and do his work!' On the day of the execution, Reid broke down under the strain and had to rest for a month. He was always proud that he had broken a modest lance in Lincoln's cause in 1860. When he was nominated for the Presidency by the Chicago Convention, the young editor wrote: 'Recognizing in Abraham Lincoln one of the most logical and clear-headed of our statesmen, dowered with a magnificent intellect, all the more completely developed that its self-culture has progressed amidst the most unfavourable circumstances; regarding him as commended alike by the sound fidelity of his principles and by the

brevity and clearness of his political record, and believing that his nomination assures at least one of the four doubtful States, while it renders success highly probable in the other three, we cannot but pronounce the choice of the Chicago Convention the very best and the very wisest.'

That editorial marked the close of his two years' work at Xenia. In March, 1861, he was engaged by the *Cincinnati Times* to supply a daily letter as its legislative correspondent at Columbus. For this he received five dollars a week. The *Cleveland Herald* made a similar arrangement with him, paying fifteen dollars a week; before the month was out he had engaged also to write for the *Cincinnati Gazette* at twenty dollars a week. He was able to live in affluence on five dollars a week, and was undismayed at having to turn out three letters a day on the same subjects.

W. D. Howells remembered him at this time as 'a tall, graceful youth with an enviable black moustache and imperial, wearing his hair long in the Southern fashion, and carrying himself with the native grace which availed him in a worldly progress scarcely interrupted to the end.' When he proposed to leave his country paper, he told one of the most trenchant writers in the journalism of the West that he didn't want to do reporting. 'Youngster,' was the reply, 'if anybody wants to succeed he must do whatever work he can get to do, and do it better than it has been done. Report the law courts, fires, prize-fights, anything they set you at, and do your best every time. That's what I did, and you have no right to expect anything else.'

Life at Columbus was full of excitements. The Civil War broke out. Reid reported the debates over the war bill, described 'the turmoil in the streets and sprinkled through his letters the little human incidents showing more tangibly than anything else how the "fighting fever" had taken possession of the town.' He tells of the soldier who wrote to his sweetheart that he didn't intend to come home till he had Jeff Davis's heart in his breeches pocket; of the

woman of Clyde who sent a huge bass drum to the governor and a long rope for the hanging of a rebel leader. He paints the soldiers kneeling in prayer, and discusses critically the food problems which had to be dealt with by the quartermaster. The Cincinnati *Gazette* quickly measured his powers, and called him to be its city editor in May. Next month he was sent to the front in West Virginia as war correspondent. The work was arduous, dramatic, and full of perils. To Reid, as a Northerner, the war was a process by which the country was to be freed from the infamous evil of slavery. He describes how the national colours floated from poor log cabins, and women in the mountains used the Stars and Stripes as aprons and handkerchiefs. 'The fullness as well as the graphic richness of his work' enabled the readers of the *Gazette* almost to see the work of the army, whilst his criticisms went to the heart of subjects such as the health and medical care of the troops in whom all were interested. The brilliance of his dispatch dealing with the battle of Shiloh brought him into wide repute, and his outspoken criticisms of its strategy made him popular in Cincinnati, where the cost of the fight had been severely felt. General Halleck resented the censures of the press, and the correspondents withdrew from the lines. Reid was now sent to Washington, where his letters on military affairs and on the political life of the capital showed the same grasp and insight as his work at the front. There he met Horace Greeley, who quickly took note of Reid's mastery of the subjects discussed in the House of Representatives and his sound judgement as to great issues. 'Personal liking, reinforced by sympathy and appreciation in professional matters, quickly paved the way for the understanding which was in due course to take Reid to the *Tribune*.'

When peace was declared, Reid became a cotton planter in Louisiana and Alabama. His *After the War* was published in 1866, and in 1868 two stout volumes on *Ohio in the War*. He had turned again to journalism as chief editorial

writer for the Cincinnati *Gazette*, and was a stockholder in that highly prosperous paper. The editorship of the new journal, the *Nation*, was offered to him, but he declined to leave his plantation, and Mr. Godkin accepted the position. In the early fall of 1868, Greeley managed to enlist him as 'first writing editor' for *The Tribune*, which had been 'successful through the sheer force of his personality and his victorious habit in the general journalistic mêlée. Yet the stinging, quotable things he was always saying in print were not by any means the source of *The Tribune's* influence. The strength of the paper, founded in the first place on its anti-slavery leadership, resided in the merit it possessed in all its departments.' Godkin said, 'The paper was an institution more like the Comédie Française than anything I have ever known in the journalistic world.' When Reid came to New York, the presidential campaign was reaching its height, and he wrote a large part of the articles which promoted the election of Grant. In the summer of 1869 he became Greeley's second in command. He had to do the work of two men, if not of three, but he enjoyed doing it. His biographer says, 'It is never really a hardship to have too much to do, when a man is placed in a position of importance, and left, on the whole, to use his own judgment in the administration of it.' Greeley was always going off on lecturing tours, and the management of the paper came more and more into Reid's hands. Breezy little missives from the chief fluttered in almost daily. 'Do your best,' ran one of them, 'and lose no sleep because of grumblers.' In 1870 John Hay returned from Madrid, where he had been first secretary of legation, and accepted a post on the editorial staff of *The Tribune*. Greeley predicted that Reid's appointment of his friend was a mistake, but when he found that two editorials which he particularly admired had been written by Hay, he changed his verdict. Hay was 'a hard hitter with an inestimably deft touch.' Reid wrote to John Bigelow, 'I have never seen a more

brilliant beginning, and it is an immense comfort to have him with me.'

Reid's first great *coup*—in concert with Mr. Smalley, his London correspondent—was to publish reports of the Franco-Prussian war, and especially of Sedan, in advance of all contemporaries. He used the cable as it had never been used before for the transmission of news, and wrought a revolution in journalism. Greeley's position as a possible candidate for the Presidency in 1872 brought Reid into close relation with political leaders in the Cincinnati Convention, where he acted as his chief's personal representative. He showed admirable discretion and was able to say, 'I think I came away from Cincinnati without having made a single enemy for Greeley, but I am sure I helped make him some friends.' Grant won re-election, and Greeley died before the year was out.

After an interval of suspense, when it was debated whether *The Tribune* should maintain its independent attitude or fall into the ordinary rank of Republican organs behind the *New York Times*, Reid was appointed editor. Mark Twain wrote: 'The Lord knows I grieved to see the old *Tribune* wavering and ready to tumble into the common slough of journalism, and God knows I am truly glad you saved it. I hope you will stand at its helm a hundred years.' The paper now became the instrument of his thought and influence. Mr. Cortissoz says, 'His closest prototype is Delane, in the most powerful days of the *London Times*, when everybody was aware of his power behind the editorial columns, but no one could identify in detail his relation to the writing of a given editorial.' He was content to be merged in his journal. The circulation 'passed handsomely' above the highest points reached during the Franco-German war. In April, 1875, when it moved into its new building at the end of thirty-four years' service, it had an average daily circulation of 50,280 copies. Henry James wrote letters from Paris, but he could not run

in journalistic harness and soon withdrew. Charles Reade sent some brilliant papers. Walt Whitman and Mark Twain were also contributors.

When Garfield became the Republican candidate for the Presidency, Reid supported him with 'literally unbounded enthusiasm' and acted as his old friend's close counsellor. When he was elected, the *Tribune* dwelt on the fact that the more people had 'learned of his career, his studies, his ideas, and his daily life, the stronger he became.' No President was 'ever made more sharply aware of the fact that in getting elected and forming an administration it is necessary to deal not only with the people but with the politicians.' Reid and Hay both wished that Garfield might have a clear vision amid the plots and counterplots thickening around him. It was an anxious time for the President and all his friends. He leaned much on Reid for criticism and suggestion, and their friendship was never more disinterested 'than when the herculean task of forming an administration was faced.' 'The clamour for jobs was beyond all precedent. Hay heard it rumbling all day long in the marble corridors of the State Department, like the sounds of beasts at feeding-time. He described the President and the Secretary of State as living in a whirlwind, fighting like baited bulls against the mob, hounded down by politicians from morning till midnight.' 'Heaven preserve you from being President,' he said. 'I could be Secretary of State easily enough, because I am not genial and magnetic, and have no friends, God be thanked.'

In April, 1881, Reid married the only daughter of Darius Ogden Mills, of California and the East, and made a wedding trip to Europe. Garfield wished his friend to be minister in Berlin, but Mrs. Reid's mother was delicate and her daughter did not wish to be so far from her. Reid also preferred his work on *The Tribune*. Whilst they were abroad news reached them of Garfield's assassination. Reid had first known him as a country teacher, and as he

moved on to the White House saw in him but one motive force, a great-hearted ideal.

In London Reid met Kinglake, Lecky, Huxley, Lord Houghton, and other celebrities. He talked with Gladstone at Lord Rosebery's house in Epsom and at dinner in London, and heard one of the Prime Minister's great speeches in Leeds. Gladstone told Mr. Smalley: 'Your countryman seemed to me a man so exceptional that I wished to know more about him. When you have men like that why do you not put them in positions of high public trust, where their abilities can be of most use to you?' Smalley replied that Reid used his influence in *The Tribune*. 'Yes,' Gladstone said, 'but here we should not leave a man like that in private life. Mr. Reid talks to me like one who understands affairs of State and has to deal with them. He is of a type on which the State has a claim as the State.'

In November he was back in New York. The conduct of the men who had managed the Republican party since Garfield died had disgusted Republican voters, and deprived the party of public confidence. Reid told his party some unpleasant truths, and preached the imperative need of reorganization in all the States. He watched Roosevelt's opening career at Albany with the interest of an old friend of his father's, and helped him in his bold endeavours to expose frauds in New York administration. His days were crowded, but his home life and his holidays in California gave him welcome relief from the strain of business in New York. In 1887 he found a country house with an estate of a thousand acres in Westchester County, and Ophir Hall became a precious resting-place.

In 1889 he was selected by President Harrison as Ambassador to France, and held office for three years. Of his work as minister, M. Blowitz said, 'He has added to the cleverness of the Americans the urbanity of the French.' He carried through some difficult business negotiations with rare tact and skill, and was everywhere surrounded by an

atmosphere of friendliness. In 1892 he was nominated Vice-President by the Republican Convention, which re-nominated Harrison as President. The Democrats, however, secured for Grover Cleveland a second term at the White House. Reid went abroad in 1894, and gained much relief from his bronchitis and asthma in Northern Africa. The next two winters he spent at Phoenix in Arizona, and this with visits to other places conquered his asthma. He worked strenuously for his paper whilst away from New York. When caught in the whirlpool on his return he found it 'amazing how much work a man who is well again can stand under the stimulus of success.' The success was the nomination of McKinley at St. Louis in 1896, to secure which Reid had worked hard. McKinley's nomination by a single ballot he regarded as 'the greatest personal tribute our party has extended for a quarter of a century.' When his friend was elected President he wrote, 'I think you have the greatest opportunity since Lincoln—as you have made the greatest campaign since his, and have had the greatest popular triumph.' He was in constant consultation with McKinley as to his Cabinet. 'It is the formation of your official family; its members are to bear to you a family relation. They should be peculiarly your personal selection.'

Reid represented the United States at Queen Victoria's Jubilee, and was heartily welcomed by John Hay, then ambassador in London. The Queen expressed the liveliest gratification over the American Mission. Reid was greatly impressed by 'the tremendous depth of the devotion shown to her Majesty.' In private conversation he assured the Queen of the friendly interest of America and its great pride in the achievements of her reign. 'Her face lit up constantly with smiles, and once or twice she laughed with great heartiness over something which I mentioned. At the end of the talk she said quite earnestly that she hoped I would express to the President and to the people of my country her high appreciation of the good-will they had always shown

her, and had especially been showing now, and her desire for perpetual peace and friendship. Altogether it was a conversation that showed thorough intellectual familiarity with what was going on, and exquisite courtesy, coupled with the greatest possible dignity. In the mingled dignity and simplicity of her bearing, she reminded me greatly of her daughter, the Empress Frederick.'

Next year Reid was member of a Commission which met in Paris to arrange the peace treaty with Spain. His firm but conciliatory action added much to his growing prestige, and when he returned to New York, in his speeches on public occasions he was able to justify the retention of responsibility for Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines. Despite the cry of 'Imperialism' made by the 'little Americans' he maintained that having put its hand to the plough the country could not possibly look back.

When Roosevelt became President in 1901 through the assassination of McKinley, he also turned to Reid for counsel. He told a friend that of all the men he had ever met Reid had the most gracious manners and winning ways, that he was an accomplished diplomat, and that his advice as to certain passages of the President's message to Congress had been of the utmost value. Roosevelt appointed him to represent the United States at the Coronation of King Edward. The King's illness upset all arrangements, but the Reids were received by the Prince and Princess of Wales, and in a farewell audience Queen Alexandra spoke of the King's returning strength and his pleasure at Mr. Roosevelt's sympathetic words at Harvard. Reid took an active part in the election of Roosevelt as President in 1904. That marked the close of 'a lifetime of editorial service to the Republican party, of long participation in the great game of President-making, of unremitting activity in national, state, and local politics.' The *Tribune* had always stood for the highest interests of the republic.

In 1905 Reid succeeded Choate as ambassador in

London. He was greatly impressed by 'the absolute determination of the Government and of the Royal Family to embrace every opportunity to show their marked friendship for the United States.' John Hay's death in July, 1905, was a heavy blow to his old friend. They first met at Washington when Hay was Lincoln's private secretary; for years they worked together on *The Tribune*, and subsequently shared manifold political activities. 'Their minds ran in perfect unison, moving as though by a common understanding through the same fields.' Hay was Roosevelt's Secretary of State, and the friends had what proved a last meeting in London after Reid's arrival as ambassador. Their intimacy had 'lasted unclouded by a single shadow for over forty-three years.'

Reid's letters to Mrs. Roosevelt, and afterwards to Mrs. Taft, give many interesting glimpses of the English scene as it appeared to his clear-sighted eyes. He told her that when Mr. Carnegie was installed as Lord Rector at St. Andrew's he finished a violent outburst against war by an appeal to the boys—if called up to go to war—to answer, 'Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?' 'The whole crowd instantly began barking in every tone of canine expression from the bull-dog and the mastiff to the toy-terrier, and you may imagine the ludicrous nature of the scene for the next few moments.'

When the Algeciras Conference met, Roosevelt wrote: 'The trouble is that with Russia out of the way as she now is, Germany firmly believes that she can whip both France and England. I have excellent reasons for believing that the German naval authorities are as confident as the German military authorities, and believe that England is relying still upon the memory of the Nelsonic triumphs, and that they would have a first-class chance of temporarily crippling or driving off her fleet; while the military men firmly believe that an army of fifty thousand Germans landed in England would with but little difficulty take

possession of the entire island.' Roosevelt's moderating influence in the Algeciras crisis was of great service. He told Reid: 'You will notice that while I was most suave and pleasant with the Emperor, yet when it became necessary at the end I stood him on his head with great decision. . . . I am very polite to him, but I am ready at an instant's notice to hold my own.' As to the famous interview in the *Daily Telegraph* in 1908, Reid told the President that if Wilhelm had sat up nights for a month to devise the best way of discrediting himself at home and abroad, he could not have hit upon a more successful method. 'Doubtless it will blow over, like the Kruger telegram, the Tweedmouth letter, and all the rest. In the language of the Southern negro, commenting on his son's experience with the hind legs of a mule: "Bill'll never be so handsome again, but he'll know a heap sight more."' Sir Edward Grey said to the Ambassador, 'If your President would come, London would grow wild. There is no man anywhere in the world who has such a hold on the imagination and admiration of our people.'

The Ambassador enjoyed the warm friendship of Edward VII. He told Roosevelt in 1906: 'The more you know of him the better I am sure you will like him, and the more you will come to the prevalent English and in fact European belief that he is the greatest mainstay of peace in Europe.' Reid's work was arduous, but he found his country house at Wrest a great source of refreshment. His only daughter married John Ward, son of the late Earl of Dudley, in 1908, and her boy was born in London next year. Mr. Ward had served under Lord Roberts in South Africa, and was in the War Department until King Edward made him his equerry. The same year, Reid's only son Ogden began his service in *The Tribune*, of which he became editor in 1918. Reid was asked to retain his post as ambassador by President Taft, and steadily increased his reputation on both sides of the Atlantic. He was called on to deliver addresses at many

important English functions, where he spoke of poets, novelists, and statesmen, or dwelt on topics likely to promote Anglo-American friendship. In one of his last speeches, at the Dickens centenary, he quoted the words he had heard Dickens speak at Delmonico's forty years before: 'It would be better for this globe to be riven by an earthquake, fired by a comet, overrun by an iceberg, and abandoned to the Arctic fox and bear, than that it should present the spectacle of those two great nations, each of whom has in its own way and hour striven so hard and successfully for freedom, ever again being arrayed one against the other.' He wrote on September 1, 1911: 'The English public is more apprehensive than I have seen them at any time since scares about Germany became the fashion. Serious business people and serious politicians are equally frank in speaking of war with Germany as a thing that may come at any time, and in fact is almost within measurable distance. They don't want it, but I doubt if they are as much disturbed by the prospect as they might be. Apparently they believe that if war comes, it will be England and France together against Germany, and that the German action has been so wanton and provocative that they will have the moral support not only of their own people, but to some extent of other nations.' He did not live to see the terrible conflict. He overtaxed his strength, and fell a victim to his old enemy asthma on December 15, 1912, honoured and regretted both in Great Britain and in America as one of the most brilliant and influential ambassadors ever sent from Washington to the Court of St. James. His mantle has fallen on his successors, who have felt, as the present Ambassador said at the welcome given him by the Pilgrims, that he would fail miserably in his mission, to the grievous disappointment of his chief, if he did not greatly strengthen those bonds of friendship and mutual helpfulness which existed between the two great English-speaking nations.

JOHN TELFORD.

WERE THE PHILISTINES 'PHILISTINES'?

AMONG all the nations by whom the Hebrews were surrounded and with whom from time to time they were at strife, there was none whom they held in such steadfast scorn and hate as the Philistines. Their youthful champion's cry: 'This uncircumcised Philistine,' was caught up by most of their great prophets, and rings through all their literature. When Ezekiel brings against Israel her 'abominations' and her 'whoredoms,' the sharpest sting with which he can barb his fierce taunts is this—that even the daughters of the Philistines are ashamed of her lewd way (xvi. 27). And the rest of the world, as is so often the thoughtless world's way, has made its own a judgement which it has inherited but has never taken the trouble to examine, and to this day still flings its offal in the Philistine's face. Thus Milton, for example, in his *Samson Agonistes*, writes of

' the Philistines,
Idolatrous, uncircumcis'd, unclean ' ;

and in a book by one of the most deservedly popular and honoured preachers of our day, I find this: 'The Philistines were the aboriginal inhabitants of Palestine. Philistia was the original name of Palestine, and the original inhabitants of Philistia were known by the name of Philistines. . . . Their chief gods were Ashtoreth and Baal and Beelzebub—three of the most cruel and most obscene of all the cruel and obscene gods of the Gentiles. The Philistines were of a gigantic size and of herculean strength, while in their moral character they were exactly like the gods they made and worshipped. Brutish size and brutish strength of body; brutish grossness and brutish stupidity of mind and heart, with great cruelty and great obscenity, these were the outstanding characteristics of the Philistines among

all the heathen peoples of those days.' The statement is incorrect in almost every particular. The Philistines were not the aboriginal inhabitants of Palestine; Philistia was not its original name; Ashtoreth, Baal, and Beelzebub were not its chief gods.¹ There is not sufficient evidence of the Philistines' 'gigantic size' and 'herculean strength,' and none whatever of their 'brutish grossness and brutish stupidity of mind and heart.' Yet in using language of this kind, the preacher was probably only putting into words the general impressions of his hearers themselves.

Nor is this all. As every one knows, 'Philistine' has come to be in our common speech the accepted symbol of impenetrableness and obscurantism. 'Philister' on the lips of a German student means a man who has never been to a university. And there is the same note of intellectual scorn in our own use of the word. 'A professor at Oxford,' writes Froude, 'spoke of Luther as a Philistine, meaning an enemy of men of culture or intelligence, such as the professor himself.' Similarly, Leslie Stephen says of Macaulay: 'In common phraseology, he is a Philistine—a word which I understand properly to denote indifference to the higher intellectual interests.' (Stephen, however, is careful to add that the word may also be defined as 'the name applied by prigs to those of their species.') But, of course, the writer who has done most to fix in English minds this connotation of the word is Matthew Arnold. England, and especially middle-class England, with its inaccessibility to ideas, its resolute following of a dismal and illiberal life under a sky of iron and of brass, seemed to him the very headquarters of Goliath. 'Philistinism!' he cries; 'we have not the expression in English. Perhaps we have not the word because we have so much of the thing.' It may not be amiss, however, to point out that this modern use of the word goes back far behind Arnold's time. We find

¹ The chief Philistine deities named in the Old Testament are Dagon and Ashtoreth. Baal-zobub is only named once (2 Kings i. 2).

it, for example, in Bunyan's *Grace Abounding*. 'Temptations,' he writes, 'when we meet them at first, are as the lion that roared upon Samson; but if we overcome them, the next time we see them we shall find a nest of honey within them.' And then he adds: 'The Philistines understand me not.'¹

But now—and this is the question which, in this paper, I wish to raise—is the scornful judgement implied in our modern use of the name of this ancient people a just judgement? Is it warranted by the facts? Were the Philistines simply the unenlightened opponents of the chosen people, thwarting and oppressing the children of light only because they were too slow of heart and too dull of brain to see that they were the children of light? Goliath, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver's beam, very strong but very stupid and very oppressive—is that the typical Philistine? Some one has said that one of the great tasks of the nineteenth century was the whitewashing of scoundrels. De Quincey took Judas in hand; Carlyle, Frederick the Great; and Froude, Henry VIII. Of the success or failure of these attempts I say nothing; but in view of the facts, which recent research has brought to light, justice demands an immediate reopening of the Philistines' case, and a revision, if not a complete reversal, of the harsh verdict of the past. To whitewash the Philistines is idle, to wash them white is impossible, but to remove some of the mud with which for so long ignorance and prejudice have bespattered their name is but bare historical justice.

The Hebrew attitude to the Philistines is easily understood. The Philistines, though they were, when we first meet them in Old Testament story, already largely influenced by their Semitic neighbours, and were ultimately absorbed by them, appear to have been of western and non-Semitic origin. If this is so, their struggle with the Hebrews

¹ For two of the literary references in this paragraph I am indebted to the great Oxford Dictionary.

will be our earliest illustration of that age-long clash of East and West with which the world has since grown so familiar. Being non-Semitic, they were uncircumcised; they set at naught Hebrew scruples about forbidden meats and the eating of flesh with the blood;¹ in one word, they were in Hebrew eyes alien and unclean. Nor must it be forgotten that the Philistines were in possession of one of the most fertile tracts in western Palestine. It is significant that when the Shunammite woman of Elisha's story wished to escape the famine in her own land 'she went and sojourned in the land of the Philistines'²; there at least she would be able to eat and live. 'Whoever held that part of the country,' says Professor Macalister, 'was at an enormous advantage. Though there are few perennial streams, water can be found wherever one chooses to dig for it. Through it runs the great trade-route from Egypt by Damascus to Babylon. The mart of Gaza is the natural rendezvous of all who have commerce with Arabia. The seaports of southern Palestine are all commanded, as are the valleys, which are the doorways to the hinterland; so that the coast-dwellers can engage in commerce on their own account, while at the same time they can control the progress and civilization among the aliens in the interior. When we stand on some eminence that commands this strip of territory we find it easy to understand the bitterness with which through the centuries the Hebrews regarded the Philistines.'³

Hebrew hatred of their powerful rivals is, I say, easy to understand; but do the facts justify their scorn? In particular, do they justify us to-day in making the Philistine name a synonym for a dull and boorish mind? Were the Philistines 'Philistines'? In seeking an answer to the question let me say at once, lest at some points I should seem to speak with a confidence that meanwhile our know-

¹ Zech. ix. 7. ² 2 Kings viii. 2. ³ *The Philistines* (Schweich Lectures), p. 78.

20 WERE THE PHILISTINES 'PHILISTINES' ?

ledge does not warrant, that while I believe that the general conclusion to which the facts point is beyond dispute, nevertheless it behoves us to tread warily, since any day the excavator's spade in Palestine or Crete may turn up some new facts which all our theories will need at once to take into their reckoning. Further let me say that throughout what I have written I am little more than the disciple and interpreter of Professor Macalister. It was he who first called my attention to the subject, and most that I know about it I have learned from him. I have done what I could to confirm or to correct his conclusions by other authorities, but if his main positions should turn out to be indefensible this paper had better never have been written.¹

Who, then, were the Philistines? In a well-known passage in the book of Amos (ix. 7) we read: 'Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?' And elsewhere in the Old Testament Caphtor is named or suggested as the original home of the Philistines.² But where is Caphtor? By fairly general consent it is now identified with Crete; the Cherethites, too, who are sometimes mentioned along with the Philistines, are also believed to belong to the same Cretan stock. Indeed, the evidence of archæology, combined with that of tradition, is now so strong that, in the opinion of Mr. H. R. Hall, of the British Museum,³ the suggested identification is no longer a matter of debate; and since it is accepted by practically all modern Biblical scholars, we may adopt it here without further

¹ For Macalister's findings, see in addition to the Schweich lectures mentioned above, his *History of Civilization in Palestine* and *Bible Sidelights from the Mound of Gazer*. Of other works dealing with the same subject, I may mention G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, ch. ix.; Maspero's *Struggle of the Nations*; H. R. Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East*; McCurdy's *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, vol. 1; and the articles on the Philistines in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*, and the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. (The last-named, by G. F. Moore, is particularly valuable.) See also subsequent footnotes.

² See, e.g., Gen. x. 14; Deut. ii. 23; Jer. xlvii. 4; Ezek. xxv. 16.

³ *The Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 72 (footnote).

preamble. Its significance for our general argument will become clear in a moment.

Of the coming of the Philistines into Palestine the Old Testament has nothing to tell us. Indeed, the whole period within which their settlement falls is one of great uncertainty. 'A cloud,' says Macalister, 'seems to settle down on the world through which we can dimly perceive scenes of turmoil and the shifting of nations.'¹ From Egyptian sources, however, we learn that about the beginning of the twelfth century B.C. a fierce attack was made upon Egypt by a number of tribes from the west and the north. Foremost among these 'Peoples of the Sea' were the 'Purasati' or 'Pulasati,' in whom again our scholars recognize the Philistines of Old Testament story. Failing in their attempt on Egypt they established themselves on the fertile coastlands of Palestine somewhere about the same time as the Hebrew exodus.

If this is an accurate summary of the circumstances of the Philistines' settlement in Palestine, it is obvious that the stories in the Book of Genesis, which represent them as already dwelling there in the patriarchal age,² must be regarded as anachronisms. As Macalister says, 'The tales of Abraham and Isaac were written when the land where their scenes were laid was in truth the land of the Philistines; and the story-teller was not troubled with the question as to how far back that occupation lasted.'³ On the other hand, as the same authority suggests, the presence of the Philistines may be the explanation of the northward migration of the Danites recorded in the Book of Judges (xviii.). Why should the Danites have left their healthy and rich land by the sea-coast for 'the fertile, well-watered, but hot and fever-haunted Laish'? The answer may well be found in the presence of those other newcomers who were

¹ Schweich Lectures, p. 114. ² Gen. xxi., xxvi. Cp. also Ex. xiii. 17; xv. 14.

³ Schweich Lectures, p. 39.

destined for so long to be Israel's fierce and formidable rivals.¹

From this time forward, until the days of David's victorious reign, it is this rivalry that fills the picture, and at one time it must have seemed as if the struggle could end only one way. Perhaps few Bible readers realize how near to complete and final mastery in Palestine the Philistines came. Indeed the real situation is partly concealed by occasional confusion in the Old Testament record itself. For example, in Judges i. 18 we read: 'Judah took Gaza with the border thereof, and Ashkelon with the border thereof, and Ekron with the border thereof.' This is quite plainly unhistorical, for it is contradicted alike by the next verse, which tells us that Judah 'could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley,' i.e. the lowland, in which these cities stood, and by the whole course of the subsequent narrative. Still more confusing, because more frequently read, is the narrative in 1 Sam. vii., which tells us that 'the Philistines were subdued, and they came no more within the border of Israel,' which again is in obvious contradiction to the whole story of the reign of Saul.

How long the dominion of the Philistines lasted our uncertain chronology forbids us to say, but of its completeness there is evidence in abundance. Egyptian records show them in possession of the coastlands as far north as Mount Carmel. At Aphek, where the hostile armies were drawn up in array, the Philistines heartened themselves for the conflict with the words, 'Be strong, and quit yourselves like men, O ye Philistines, that ye be not slaves unto the Hebrews, as they have been to you.'² And what they claimed the men of Judah had already admitted: 'Knowest thou not,' they said to Samson, 'that the Philistines are rulers over us?'³ In the days of Saul we find a Philistine

¹ *Ib.*, p. 38. 'It is suggestive,' Macalister adds, 'that the first great champion to stand for Israel against the intruders, Samson, belonged to Zorah, whence went forth the Danite spies (Judg. xviii. 2).'

² 1 Sam. iv. 9. ³ Judg. xv. 11.

'governor'¹ within a dozen miles of Jerusalem. Still more significant, perhaps, of the apparent hopelessness of their cause was the presence of Hebrews in the ranks of their enemies.² When Saul and Jonathan fell in Mt. Gilboa; the whole of the great plain of Esdraelon, as far eastward as the Jordan, seems to have been in Philistine hands. It is little wonder, therefore, that even in the Old Testament the Mediterranean should be spoken of as 'the sea of the Philistines,'³ and Canaan as 'the land of the Philistines,'⁴ or that to this day the country over which once they ruled should still be known by the name which they gave to it.⁵ It has been suggested that as first the Greeks and then the Romans would enter the country by way of the coast and would first become acquainted with the race that inhabited the maritime plain, it was natural they should extend the name 'Philistia' or 'Palestine' to the whole region of southern Syria.⁶ That may be so, but, as Macalister points out, 'Palestine' is much less of an *extension* of 'Philistia' than is commonly supposed. There was a time when 'Philistia' was 'Palestine' in fact as well as in name.⁷ And even yet, the same scholar tells us, peasant parents in Palestine continue to tell their children tales of the great days of old when the land was inhabited by the mighty race of the 'Fenish.'⁸

Of the strange and sudden collapse which followed close upon the heels of the Philistine triumph it does not fall within the compass of this paper to speak. It was as sudden and as final as any that history relates. Macalister points out that while in the first book of Samuel, the name 'Philistine' occurs 125 times, in the second book it occurs only 24 times, and in the two books of Kings only six times.⁹ Indeed, so completely was the situation reversed that even

¹ The probable meaning of the word in 1 Sam. x. 5; xiii. 3.

² 1 Sam. xiv. 21. ³ Ex. xxiii. 31. ⁴ Zeph. ii. 6.

⁵ 'Palestina,' of course, is but another form of 'Philistia.'

⁶ Ottley's *History of the Hebrews*, p. 92. ⁷ Schweich Lectures, pp. 36, 69.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67, and *Civilization in Palestine*, p. 58. ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

when David's kingdom was rent by the revolt of Absalom, no attempt was made to establish the Philistine ascendancy. Hundreds of Philistine warriors took service as the king's bodyguard in Jerusalem, and one of them, Ittai of Gath, was one of his most loyal and trusted servants. However we account for it, the contrast between the pre-Davidic and the post-Davidic Philistines is, as Macalister says, one of the most extraordinary in human history. Within three centuries of their coming to Palestine they ceased to be a nation and were lost in the ocean of Semitic humanity.

From this brief historical sketch we turn to learn what may be known of the civilization and culture of the Philistines. And it is here that we shall see most clearly how strangely out of place is the scorn, ancient and modern, Hebrew and English, with which this people has been visited. The case for the Philistines has undoubtedly been prejudiced in the popular mind by the fact that the best known of the two personal names associated with their history are Delilah and Goliath. But the Old Testament story nowhere speaks of Delilah as a Philistine, and it is equally, if not more, intelligible when it is read on the supposition that she was a Hebrew. Goliath, too, though put forward as the Philistine champion, would seem from the curious fragment in 2 Sam. xxi. to have belonged rather to the Rephaim, a prehistoric race of abnormal stature, a remnant of which (according to Josh. xi. 22) still lingered on in some of the Philistine cities. 'By Delilah and Goliath,' says Macalister, 'the Philistine nation is judged; but there is no proof that there was a drop of Philistine blood in either the one or the other.'¹ The truth is that so far from being the warlike barbarians of popular imagination, the Philistines represented a degree of artistic culture such as Palestine never knew again until after the time of the Greeks. In this respect at least the Hebrews were as

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

children beside them. 'They were skilled in the arts of life and advanced in civil government. Their armies were well disciplined and well armed. Their soldiers were patient and hardy. Their people, as a whole, were rich yet seemingly not enervated by riches. . . . In all points bearing on civilization generally, and particularly on the arts of civilization as applied to war, the Israelites were as much inferior as the Scots to the English when the great quarrel between the two countries was fought out.'¹ Let me illustrate the general statement with a few details.

First of all we must keep in mind the Cretan origin of the Philistines, to which reference has already been made. Now the Cretan civilization is one of the most amazing things which the patient skill of the excavator has ever unearthed and interpreted. Its script has not yet been deciphered, and therefore a great part of the wonderful story has still to be told; but already enough is known to make it clear that two thousand years before Christ Crete had developed a civilization which rivals in interest the more famous civilizations of Egypt and Babylon—a civilization 'perhaps the highest and, in many respects, the most modern that the ancient world ever saw.'² At Cnossos are the remains of a royal palace beside which 'the palaces of Egyptian Pharaohs were but elaborate hovels of painted mud.'³ Its scientific drainage and lavatory system is described as 'staggeringly modern,' unparalleled till Roman days and since then till our own day. Not less so was the dress of the court ladies, as shown on some of the Cretan frescoes. 'It is *décolleté*, with bare necks and arms, the breasts covered apparently with gold or silver guards reproducing their outline, their waists pinched in and, below, ample skirts with parallel rows of flounces, resembling

¹ Miller's *Least of all Lands*, p. 80. See also Peake's *Commentary*, p. 56.

² See J. B. Bury's *History of Greece*, p. 7, and Macalister's *Civilization in Palestine*, p. 49.

³ Hall's *Ancient History of the Near East*, p. 47. On the whole subject see R. M. Burrows' *Discoveries in Crete*.

nothing so much as the crinolines of the mid-nineteenth century.' Further, Mr. Wells says in the two or three pages which he gives to Crete in his *Outline of History*, 'the pottery, the textile manufactures, the sculpture and painting of these people, their gem and ivory work, their metal and inlaid work, is as admirable as any that mankind has produced.' Altogether, Crete may justly be regarded as 'one of the great homes of art of the ancient world,' and this was the home from which the Philistines sprang. They were the inheritors of its great traditions. They were the link between the great civilization which, somewhere about the fourteenth century B.C., perished with the sack of Cnossos, and the unborn civilizations of the future.

'Yes,' it may be said, 'this is all interesting conjecture, but it is only conjecture. Where is the evidence that the Philistines did, in point of fact, carry with them into Palestine, even in a decayed and weakened form, the artistic instincts of their race?' Let us see. From the soil of Palestine itself little evidence is as yet available. At Gaza, however—and here I may quote the words of my late colleague, Professor C. L. Bedale—'five graves were found, differing from any previously discovered there. The *mode* of burial was not that of the Semites, and the deposits displayed a level of artistic skill higher than that of any other objects discovered on the site. In these respects the graves recall the "Aegean" civilization. Professor J. L. Myres is of opinion that there is justification for connecting them with "the little that we know of the Philistine occupation of Philistia."'¹ Obviously this does not take us very far; but, it must be remembered, the exploration of Palestine is as yet but in its infancy, and further excavation, such as is now in progress at Ashkelon under Dr. Garstang, may some day yield fresh material of great value.

We turn from the Land to the Book, and in two directions we may find suggestions of the superior culture of the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

² *The Old Testament and Archaeology*, p. 28.

Philistines. In the matter of architecture, for example, Macalister points out that the only Palestine temples we read about in the Old Testament, until the building of Solomon's temple, are the houses of the Philistine deities.¹ This, it is true, overlooks the story of Eli and Samuel in the sanctuary at Shiloh, the language of which seems to imply some kind of solid structure.² But this is quite insufficient evidence for setting aside the definite and fixed Hebrew tradition that until the days of Solomon, the ark of God 'dwelt within curtains': 'I have not dwelt in a house since the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle.'³ Moreover, it is significant that when Solomon set about the task of building the temple, immediately he turned for help from without. Hebrew resources were quite inadequate. 'Thou knowest,' he said to Hiram, king of Tyre, 'that there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like unto the Zidonians.' And a treaty was entered into by which Hiram undertook to supply both material and labour, including a kind of 'foreman builder,' also named Hiram, to superintend the work.⁴ Now, contrast this with what we find among the Philistines. Doubtless, as has been said, their civilization had been impaired by long migrations and wars, and any buildings they would erect in Palestine would probably not show much trace of the old architectural genius of their race; yet consider what is involved in a picture like this from the old story of Samson: 'Now the house was full of men and women, and all the lords of the Philistines were there, and there were upon the roof about three thousand men and women, that beheld while Samson made sport.'⁵ 'We are at once reminded,' says Mr. Hall, 'of the "Theatral Areas" of the Cretan palaces of Cnossos and Phaistos, and of the gladiatorial games that, we know, went on in them.'⁶

¹ Schweich Lectures, p. 123. ² See especially 1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 15.

³ 2 Sam. vii. 2, 6. Cp. 1 Kings viii. 16. ⁴ See 1 Kings v.; vii. 13 sq.

⁵ Judg. xvi. 27. ⁶ *Ancient History*, p. 418.

Let us take next the use of iron; and here again the opinion steadily gains ground that when the two races are first seen in contact, the advantage is wholly with the Philistines. While the Hebrews are still in the Bronze Age, their hated rivals are already in the Iron, and it was through them they acquired the knowledge of which later history shows them in possession. Our most important Old Testament reference is a passage which Macalister renders thus: 'Now there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel, for the Philistines said "lest the Hebrews make them sword or spear"; but all the Israelites went down to the Philistines to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his ox-goad (?).' The next verse is too corrupt to translate; then the passage continues: 'In the day of battle there was neither sword nor spear in the hand of any of the people except with Saul and Jonathan themselves.'¹ By some writers this is interpreted as implying a general disarmament of the Hebrews. Macalister, however, thinks that it simply means that the Philistines kept the monopoly of the iron trade in their own hands, and naturally restricted the sale of weapons of offence to the Hebrews, just as modern civilized nations have regulations against importing firearms among subject or backward communities.² And this interpretation fits in with what we find elsewhere. Thus of Judah we read: 'He could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron';³ and in the Song of Deborah:

Shield was not seen nor spear,
Among forty thousand in Israel.⁴

The general impression, I think, left on the mind by a careful reading of the books of Judges and First Samuel is that while the Philistines were able to put into the field large bodies of troops, well-armed and well-equipped, with cavalry and with chariots, the Hebrews, at least in their early encounters, were but 'a motley concourse, armed

¹ 1 Sam. xiii. 19-22. ² Schweich Lectures, p. 126. ³ Judg. i. 19. ⁴ Ibid., v. 8.

with such rude weapons as each man could lay his hands on, or hurriedly fashioned from the implements of his peaceful calling'¹—Shamgar doing battle with his ox-goad, David with his sling and stones.

One other fact may be mentioned as showing the comparatively late date of the use of iron among the Hebrews. In the account of the building of Solomon's temple it is said: 'There was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house while it was in building.'² Every one knows with what fantastic comment this simple saying has been embroidered. It does not mean that the temple rose in silence; rather it is an example of what has been called 'the conservatism of the religious instinct.' 'Religion,' says Professor Peake, 'remains in the Bronze Age after ordinary life has passed into the Iron Age.' Long after iron had come into use in ordinary life, there was a dread of using it in religious rites; the stones of the temple must not be profaned by the touch of this new metal.³

One question remains, and here the Old Testament will no longer aid us. Somewhere about the year 1000 B.C. the alphabet begins to emerge in recognizable form. To whom do we owe it? The generally accepted answer hitherto has been—the Phœnicians. But now their claim is being loudly challenged. It may well have been, it is said, that it was through them, the great merchants and middlemen of their time, that the Greeks received the knowledge of alphabetical writing, but that the Phœnicians of all people, who never invented anything, should have been the originators of the alphabet becomes, says Macalister, more and more impossible to believe with every advance of knowledge.⁴ To whom, then, do we owe this great gift to our race? It is of course as yet impossible to speak with certainty, but Macalister is not alone in his belief that its source is to be sought

¹ Moore's *Judges* p. 145.

² 1 Kings vi. 7.

³ See Peake's *Commentary*, p. 252, and Macalister's *Civilization in Palestine*, p. 61.

⁴ Schweich Lectures, p. 127.

30 WERE THE PHILISTINES 'PHILISTINES'?

for in the civilization of Crete, where already a linear script had taken the place of the clumsy hieroglyphics of the past, and that it reached Syria with some of the migrating tribes to which the Philistines belonged.¹ If a fuller knowledge should confirm this conjecture, the wheel will indeed have come full circle, and the Philistines be avenged for the age-long scorn which civilization has heaped upon their ancient name.

And, perhaps, only as we do the Philistines justice, are we able to realize the astonishing greatness of the Hebrews themselves. The more we know of the history of the nations around, the greater grows the miracle of Israel's own history. We are often told what an uninventive, unoriginal people the Hebrews were—a people with a natural unfitness for new ideas, as unprogressive as a community of white ants, unable either to compile a grammar or invent a metre, 'incapable of so much as making a clay waterpot without having a foreign model to copy—and even then making it clumsily.' And yet this 'incapable' people lives on in our modern world, while the big and bustling nations around have long been but dust and silence. Look at them: Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Hittites, Cretans—they and their traditions were the great world-forces which hedged in the little nation of Israel on every side. To-day their ruins are the haunt of the antiquary, and they themselves by most men only remembered at all in so far as they had to do with a people to whom, in their insolence and pride, they gave hardly more than a passing thought. But the Hebrew lives on in the might of the religion which he bequeathed to mankind. And it is this miracle of moral and spiritual separateness and supremacy—this and not the 'miracles'—which is the real miracle of Old Testament history.

GEORGE JACKSON.

¹ See D. C. Hogarth's *Ancient East*, p. 54.

ON SOME DISPUTED GIORGIONES

MY first impression of 'Un Concerto di Musica' (The Concert), in the Pitti Gallery, Florence, was one of disappointment. I did not find all the subtlety that I had expected. It stood out in an extraordinary way and in a singular glow; yet there was something a little obvious in the effect. Next, the painting seemed to me wholly unlike that of any Titian. The only one it actually reminded me of was the 'Baptism of Christ' in the capital. This is certainly Giorgionesque, the same landscape with towers and little figures (storks and a woman) in the middle distance, done ably but with none of Giorgione's magic: it does not live for its own sake, it exists to fill a space in the picture. And the fine Christ is self-conscious and half smiles, and John is a ruddy Bacchus who chuckles with pleasant humour as he pours water out of a hollow shell. But what beauty, what richness and harmony of colour! In the Christ there is the same outline of face and head as in the Loschi Christ, but all the sincerity has gone out of it. It is cheapened. Both are ruined by restoration, but there is in both the same glow, and I can find that in no other Titian, while I find something by no means unlike it in 'The Knight of Malta,' which is as surely Giorgione's as the 'Borghese Lady.' But in that there is a smoothness of paint, no paint showing, no suggestion of technique, which is wholly unlike Titian and wholly like Giorgione. The 'Flora' and 'Daughter of Herodias' and the 'Bella,' all, though showing comparatively little brushwork, have a similar way of laying it on, of painting flesh and folds of drapery. The 'Knight' is painted in an earlier style, in which the art of painting was more carefully concealed. Compare the painting of the white drapery in the 'Knight' (with its fine detailed brushwork) and the much broader

quality of the 'Concert,' where it is done (in the folds to the right) with clear wide cross strokes of the brush (as in the 'Flora'); the folds, which look so definite, are painted without detail and with a brush at once smooth and broad, the paint sticking up in places. This is a much later and freer touch than the latest and freest I can identify with Giorgione. It resembles, though it does not yet reach, the immense breadth of the red robe of Aretino; it is still more akin to the white folds in the recumbent Venus in the Uffizi.

On very carefully examining the Doria 'Herodias,' I cannot help seeing the very closest resemblance with the Pitti 'Concert.' The curious and individual ear of Salome is almost identical with the ear of the right-hand figure (long, with a very scooped-out hollow, drawn in sharply and tightly till it almost meets the outer fold of the ear), and the ear of the central figure resembles strongly the ear of the servant (rounder, not so much scooped out, and not tightening in so that the folds meet). The right curve of Salome's cheek is as nearly as possible identical with the left curve of the youth in the 'Concert'; so in the curve of the eyebrows and the setting of the eye, nose, and mouth. I could quite imagine the same painter drawing the figure to the right in the 'Concert' and the servant here. In all Giorgione's figures the hair is absolutely smooth (except when he represents definitely curled hair), but here the monk's smooth hair curls loosely about his forehead, as Salome's does, and even the line of the servant-maid's hair is not drawn in a quite smooth curve. Note that here the ears are painted very carefully and clearly shown (which is very unusual in Giorgione). Even the ear of St. John is seen distinctly through his matted hair, the turn of the eyes in both figures—with the suggestion of a kind of coquetry—is not unsimilar to that, more expressive and more mysterious, in the 'Concert.' Indeed, the whole face of the youth in the 'Concert' is curiously like Salome's.

And there is an extraordinary freshness in the lovely colours; the red robe of Salome, with the violet drapery thrown across the left shoulder, against the pale blue and white sky; the fine, sober, dark green of the servant's dress; the dull, corpse-like, not yet ghastly brown of face and hair and beard of the head of John, which comes with fine but not too violent contrast against the white inner drapery of Salome; faint, hardly-seen touches of blood on the dish. The face of Salome is the loveliest type of Titian, very like, though not the same as, the 'Sacred and Profane Love': an adorable picture, the most Giorgionesque of Titian's (at least the most like the Louvre 'Concert'). Yet, to me, there is less subtlety of delight, less intensity. The beauty, here suggested, is concentrated in the figures, which are full of genius, and some of the most adorable flesh in the world. What love of the flesh, what pagan delight in its very substance! What delight also in the sumptuousness of dress, of ornament, of what is ornamental in landscape, and the patterns of water, sky, buildings, and the little human figures and animals who stand or run with quaint, spirited motion over the ground! Compare with the broad sweeps of the Venus, giving an effect of minuteness, the broad sweeps which indicate not even folds in 'The Three Ages' (an early Lotto) in the Pitti, where the drapery is generalized exactly in the same way as the 'Lotto Holy Family,' with S. Jerome in the Uffizi, which is dated 1584.

The hair of the middle figure (totally unlike that in any known Giorgione) resembles that of the 'Young Englishman,' and that of Aretino—whose face, with its superb roughness and splendour of colour (infinite colours set together to make a harmony) might be like that of the 'Concert' if the repaint were gone. At present one can only guess what that was like: a whole glaze seems to cover the original surface, obliterating much of the brushwork. The nearest Titian to it in smoothness is the 'Bella.'

It is in the hands that one is least reminded of Giorgione and most of Titian. Note Giorgione's delicate, passive, sensitive hands, with these nervous and energetic hands, whose various colour is so wholly unlike the smooth and uniform paint of 'The Knight of Malta,' and so like the many-coloured hands of Titian. Compare the 'Young Englishman' and the shadow of his white linen on the wrists and see the very summarized right hand of the old man on the young monk's shoulder; wholly unlike Giorgione. And compare with the hand holding the 'cello, both hands of 'St. Antony Abbot,' of 1507, in the Uffizi. The hand of the 'Knight of Malta' is uniform in painting, passive and elegant.

The white plumes of the Giorgionesque youth to the left have all the freedom and splendour of Titian, and remind me of nothing in Giorgione. The designs on the 'cello and on the border of this youth's brown robe are painted adequately enough, yet in a somewhat summary way, which I cannot look upon as Giorgione's, though very like Titian's manner of doing secondary things. I cannot quite find the blacks and browns of this splendid and simple colour-scheme; but Titian was capable of anything. The general resemblance (in the ruddy brown of the faces for instance) with the 'Knight' is more superficial than real. The 'Knight' is far subtler, and also far more uniform, with less obvious modelling. And in the realistic details (the scar on the jaw, the shaved cheek and head of the monk to the right) I find a realism which I can parallel by nothing in Giorgione.

The difficulty of tracing Giorgione is that he has no 'manner.' He does the right thing and with supreme distinction, not showing you how he does it. In Titian you see from the first a technique which he does not conceal, and which becomes more and more all-sufficient, till it reaches 'The Scourging of Christ,' in Munich, in the old Pinakothek, which modern painting has not gone beyond.

We see Titian breaking the achieved rules (compare his calm portraits here ; one stands by the side of it), inventing an art absolutely new, a new way, a more immediate way of rendering what he sees, with all that moving beauty of life in action : lights, colours, and not forms merely, all in movement. The depth and splendour of a moment are caught, with all the beauty of every accident in which colour comes or changes, and in the space of a moment. Colour is no longer set against colour, each for itself, with its own calm beauty ; but each tone rushes with exquisite violence into the embrace of another tone ; there are fierce adulteries of colour, unheard of till now. And a new, adorable, complete thing is born, which is to give life to all the painting that is to come after it. It seems as if paint at last had thoroughly mastered its own language.

If, as it seems, the ' Concert ' is Titian's, it is, in conception at least, the greatest picture which Titian ever painted ; and yet, is it not great enough for Giorgione ? Intellectual as it is, it lacks a certain profound inner quality (not compensated for by a vast external energy), and may it not be a sort of reflex from Giorgione, a work suggested or inspired by him, and executed, with his own individual difference, by Titian ? The St. Rocco ' Christ ' follows and completes it, and the painting of that is much further from Giorgione than this. They are the two greatest *genre* pictures (sacred and profane) in the world ; and can they come directly or indirectly from any one but the painter who simplified and unified *genre* (as we see it in Carpaccio, for instance) to the wonderful creation of the Louvre ' Concert ' ? For indeed we may compare the hands of the monk with the great grip and nervous energy of both hands of St. Jerome in the Brera (182)—the hand which grasps the stone and the hand which clutches the rock—especially the latter, with the fingers wide apart, and the eager movement of the wrist.

The hair in the central figure is very like, in its thin

ruggedness, the hair of Titian's 'Aretino.' One often finds this arrangement of hair in Titian, while never, I think, in Giorgione. One sees it again in the 'Young Englishman,' and, not unlike, in 'Ippolito d' Medici,' where the painting of the dark and ruddy hands holding the sword suggests what the hand holding the 'cello might have been before it was repainted and spoilt. It is now like a piece of the same wood. The painting of the face, too, has a certain resemblance—sallowiness flushed.

The 'Tommaso Mosti' of Titian is really astonishingly like a Giorgione, though the whole conception is unlike. This must be very early work: I do not know any other where the painting of individual hair and moustache and beard is done so minutely, or the modelling with such minute precision. It is a beautiful portrait—this dark, sleepy Southern face, with its fine quietude. I imagine that the 'Concert' may have been painted in very much this style (though somewhat later, more approximating to the 'Ippolito d' Medici' here) and that one sees what the repaint has obliterated, together with the extremely Giorgionesque manner of painting and of posing. The extraordinary lighting, with its ruddy glow, the shadows of the chins on the necks, and of the one fold of the white drapery on a lower fold, seems to radiate lamplight coming from a point outside the picture at the right corner. The face and hands of the monk catch it, and the face of the youth, while the monk to the right is partly in shadow. Here one sees Titian's endeavour to give a realistic form to this glow, which pleases him in Giorgione; just his natural way. Perhaps most like of all is the painting of white with the white in the 'Bella': hard downstrokes of the brush, leaving the paint visible. Nothing like this can be found in any Giorgione. The smooth folds, drooping on the arm, are indicated exactly in the same way. Only the richness is gone. In the 'Knight' the white is painted with a close brush, with little show of paint, with no broad strokes, but thin parallel

strokes—developed, but not essentially changed from the ‘Moscs.’

A Conversation piece in the Casa Buonarotti, Florence, ascribed to Giorgione (16), similar to one in Buckingham Palace, ascribed to Titian, shows a woman fainting into the arms of a man, to the left; another man behind her to the right. The woman reminds one of ‘The Daughter of Herodias’; the two men have an almost too serious and unmeaning a look. It seems to me an imitation or copy rather of Titian than of Giorgione, of Titian in the Giorgionesque mood of the ‘Concert.’ There is a voluptuousness about it which is wholly Titian’s or Palma’s, whose smooth painting and open-breasted women it rather reminds me of. The painting is very smooth, not fine in quality, but capable; a little of the Sebastiano del Piombi kind. It is very difficult to see it in the dark room of the Casa, where it hangs opposite the two small windows. It has a charm, a little sentimental; and has its place among the imitation of the typical ‘conversations’ of that time.

As for the ‘Apollo and Daphne,’ in the Seminario Patriarchal, it is as certainly Giorgionesque as not Giorgione. There is in it no essence. It is painted on wood, cracked, smeared almost all over by repainting, so as to make precise judgement difficult. An undulating landscape with walls and a cascade under a bridge, curious architecture, though solid, against a sunset; with classical figures in draperies blown into many folds by the wind; the thin trees, each leaf clear against the sky, which he loved; many suggestions of richness and Venetian ease; but altogether too summary and exclamatory in the figures, which have no real distinction, only like a faint reflection of beautiful forms and figures. And there seems to remain something dry, deliberate, which I cannot accept as Giorgione. The drawing of the figures and the suggestion of their colours are somewhat Giorgionesque; yet, no nearer this supreme beauty than a very clever imitator could come. There is no magic, no strange-

ness : that quality which he brings into all his work, and which is his genius. In Schiavona's 'Tobit and Angel,' in Hampton Court, the ungainly attitude of the angel is very like the Seminario, with not unsimilar flying robes ; but the picture is painted in a dull and common way

'The Storm Calmed by St. Mark' (Venice, Accademia) came from 'La Scuola de St. Marco,' where it was hung beside Paris Bordone's 'Fisherman and Doge.' It was ascribed by Vasari to Palma Vecchio, by Zanettito Giorgione. This huge composition, a kind of Limbo in Chaos, is certainly not a Giorgione. Never in any of his paintings is that energy in confusion which one finds here ; equally unlike the nervous energy of Titian in the 'San Rocco,' it seems to me also to show much more energy than one finds in any of Palma Vecchio's works ; nor does it seem to me to hint at any idea of his having finished, even slightly retouched, an original so wholly the work of an unknown painter.

On first sight the little picture in the chapel to the right of the choir, 'Christ dragged to Golgotha' (Venice, 'Chiesa di Saint Rocco'), seemed to me, in its severity, tempered by suavity, one of the finest things in Venice. The Christ is very like Titian's 'Ecce Homo,' in the Scuola, though it struck me as finer ; the two other figures have a quality of strangeness in their beauty, of real nature made beautiful by close yet wholly imaginative rendering of its proper quality—life caught and arrested at an exquisite moment. On seeing it a second time I see that there is no essential resemblance with the Titian head in the Scuola : the painting is wholly different—the face, expression, hair, mouth, the skin, all done in another manner. Nor could anything be more different from the head of the praying man in the Accademia, though the old man and the other are not so much unlike. The curious voluptuous painting of Christ, livid in colour, is a little effeminate, without the sorrow of the Titian. The Judas is the finest piece of painting, and the young man who turns away his head has a touch of

grimace coming into the outlines. There is in it something languid, morbid, mysterious. Here is the hand of a master, but whose? After seeing the Castelfranco, the picture in the Chiesa di San Rocco seems very doubtful; the whole way of painting seems so different, a sort of obvious brush-work, which you see: in Giorgione you do not see what has gone to the making of it.

Note that Palma Vecchio's 'Christ and the Woman taken in Adultery,' in the Conservatori Gallery, reflects the San Rocco picture in several faces—the Judas and the figures at the side, and, even alightly, the Christ. This is, in design, an imitation of what may have been Giorgione's composition with reminiscences of St. Rocco. The woman's arm has the same awkwardness as the man's in the Querini-Stampaglia, and the face of Christ reminds me not a little of the portrait of the man and still more of the portrait in the National Gallery. There is the same vague sweetness, large languid eyes, regular face, and faint suggestion of surrounding hair. The paint has faded and gone spotty, but the picture remains one of his most beautiful ones. There is the same inexpressiveness in the hands, one of which is also left unfinished.

Dr. Richter pointed out to me the similarity between the 'Concert' (the energy of the man's hands: how different to any of Giorgione's hands) and the energy in the back of the Judas in the St. Rocco picture. Certainly, this was true. Yet he accepted the Vicenza 'Christ' as a Giorgione (an early attempt almost Flemish in its detail, influenced by Bellini), with the shadow of the head projected on the smooth cross, with rounded contours, with lips of vivid red, too mannered to be a Giorgione. Surely, noticing the similarity of the St. Rocco and the 'Concert,' one can but say: if one gives up the one, is it not necessary to give up the other?

There are only two known portraits of men by Palma Vecchio in the Querini Stampaglia. One is described by

Morelli: 'Among the unfinished pictures found in his workshop after his death we find mentioned a *Ritrato de Messer Francesco Querini*.' This is probably the much-repainted male portrait in the Querini Stampaglia collection at Venice. The other is 688 in the National Gallery, formerly called portrait of Arisoto by Titian. The first is a lovely and pensive portrait (the right hand only sketched, the left one out of drawing, the left repainted) with ruddy auburn hair, parted in the middle, and strange, widely-opened blue eyes; the mouth with its auburn moustache and close beard is something like that of the Christ in the Chiesa di San Rocco. The black, brown, and white of the rich dress are painted with a fine effect of colour, the ruddy brown continuing the hair and beard. The painting is a little like Pordenone's (the woman in the Accademia) but with something richer than he usually gets; a graver and stranger beauty. The painting of the face and hair is very different from that of the Praying Man, with none of that minuteness of modelling; it is scarcely more like Pordenone's. It is certainly a lovely thing (is it not rather like a certain Lotto?). The feminine quality of the face reminds me of the Christ in S. Rocco, with a certain mysterious placidity, the melancholy voluptuousness of the dreamer: a crude temperament.

'*La Schiavona*,' that I saw in the Crespi Gallery in Milan, is most striking, far more than one would imagine. It is immensely living: eyes and mouth speak, with an almost boisterous, an almost animal, frankness. But there is neither poetry nor distinction, no profound inner quality. Life caught in all its exterior vivacity: that is what one sees; a body and a temperament vividly before one, not an essence, a soul, none of the reticent quality of Giorgione; none of the princely quality of Titian.

The painting at first sight is more like Giorgione than Titian; but it has not the whole rarity of Giorgione. The folds of the red dress are done with broad plain strokes

of black, very like the folds of the Licinio at Bergamo; the gold chain is painted quite in the same way (that is very like the 'Knight of Malta,' but not like Titian); the touches of gold in the headdress are like the pearls in the woman's hair at Bergamo, and still more like the bands of colour in the Castello picture. The folds are very simple, very smooth, done with great economy of colour—plain colour against plain colour, exactly as in the very inferior Licinio's Madonna and Saint in the same gallery, and as in the portrait at Bergamo; scarcely the least shading. The white veil of the Virgin is painted very like the greyish white on the shoulder of 'La Schiavona.' Nowhere do I recognize the paint of Titian, the vital paint. The one thing more certain than all others is that it is an original and not a copy. The same brain and hand conceived and executed it. Nothing suggests a conception finer than this quite admirable execution. The vivid, speaking quality of the 'Schiavona' is by no means the quality which Giorgione seems to care for. His people live with a life too intense for much outward gesture: they have a certain indifference to speech. And just this quality is one that a secondary artist often seeks and attains. It is not even the quality which strikes one in Titian.

The Licinio portrait of a woman (in black, with a pearl necklace, and a large head-dress of white with brown stripes around her hair) in the Castello (28) has the strongest possible resemblance with the Licinio in Bergamo (the painting of the white with a gold pattern edging the bodice is identical), and I think considerable with the 'Schiavona.' The painting has the same smoothness, the face without modelling, the smooth hair touched with light, the beautifully and carefully painted head-dress with two colours. Here, as in the 'Schiavona,' the head-dress attracts as much attention as anything in the portrait, and is perhaps best painted. But here the woman is somewhat expressionless. She holds a frame containing the portrait bust of a

man, comparable with the Schiavona profile. The idea of composition is very similar though less happy. The grey coat slashed with white is not unlike the Schiavona's grey sash with white waterings: and, though the folds are much more slightly indicated, one can distinguish the same way of rendering them by straight smooth lines of darker colour.

That the 'Schiavona' is not a Titian becomes to me more and more certain. It has not his quality of paint, but a quality singularly like that of an imitator of Giorgione such as Licinio. It has not his quality of expression, of character-reading. Titian paints all things with the same eager and magnificent indifference. What he cares for in the picture is not the person; and he will paint the whole picture with great skill—the lapdog as skilfully as the Venus. Giorgione subordinates everything to the expression of an inner beauty, a life of the soul, which glows outward, and fills the whole canvas as with a spiritual sunlight. But Titian is content with being splendidly adequate, with giving us a glorious normality. His power and energy are those of a great natural force, indifferent to its direction. Only it is a power rejoicing in itself, prolific, overflowing, inexhaustible; not staying by the way.

In the painting of the 'Schiavona' everything is subordinated to the portrait; and the face is even repeated in profile on the parapet. The portrait is to be above all things living, and nothing is to distract the eyes from this face which laughs and almost speaks, from this woman who stands before one as if she were alive and in the room. It is a portrait painted that may please by its truth, by its genial, literal truth; and the painter has subordinated himself as neither Titian nor Giorgione could ever have done, to this one aim of the likeness. Titian would have shown the brilliance of his talent, Giorgione would have filled the canvas with an idea of intellectual beauty, would have transfigured the woman, not reflected her. The

painter, with admirable skill, but not with any touch of genius, has caught a likeness, set there a reflection from what is passing in life as it moves visibly between earth and the sun.

On a third visit to the picture, I note how faded to a uniformity of colour it is, the red has dried up, so to speak; and become monotonous. In comparison with the two Licinios I note the same unmodelled face, the nose indicated without hard lines: no drawing, only faint touches of light and shade. In all, the hair has a gloss and extreme smoothness of painting. The modelling of the chin is singularly like the Bergamo picture, and by no means suggests either Titian or Giorgione.

In Bergamo (197) there is a woman's portrait in a red bodice, fingering a chain, a piece of work done in the favourite Venetian style, after Lotto's Brera woman perhaps—certainly a Licinio, and a fine one, and by the painter of 'La Schiavona.' It reminds me strongly of it; the face and neck, the gold chain, the pearls in the hair and round the neck, the elaborate head-dress with cross rows of pearls, the white with gold pattern of the chemisette, and the severely-folded red bodice and sleeves, painted smoothly and with no suggestion of paint. The face is full of significance, here gentle and dreamy. The painting is absolutely smooth, in the Giorgione way, though without his subtlety; the folds in the red are done with smooth, separate broad strokes of separate shades of red. No paint stands up, save a touch here and there. Externally she may be like the 'Borghese Lady'; yet, in the immense contrast, both in subtlety of interpretation and of painting, lies all the difference. Nothing could be closer in technique and in type; but the difference is fundamental; there is no inner life.

ARTHUR SYMONS.

THE SWEET UNREASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY

CRITICS of life, profound scholars, and professors of theology apparently too often forget the latent humour of things, the irony of events, and what must be called the general contrariety of creation. The unexpected, the illogical issue, suddenly arrives in an awful moment and upsets all their calculations. It stultifies the elaborate studies of years, in some act of empty or sublime foolishness. Causes or antecedents forswear themselves and deny their nature, the thistles produce figs and the grapes thorns, and the stream brings forth sweet and bitter waters from one and the same fountain. The teachers naturally feel annoyed, angry, or ashamed. Things ought to behave themselves, to evolve decently and in order, not to be so jumpy and irregular, conforming to the accepted and established type, respecting their own characters, careful of the tradition and their ancestry, remembering who are watching them, and that they lie under the microscope of skilled observation and the honour of scientific societies is at stake—to say nothing of the great and glorious British Association. Unfortunately they continue to go about their business, with little or no reference to us or the logic of the schools. Venerable conclusions, guaranteed by the collective wisdom and cultivated ignorance of generations, are abruptly shattered by a new discovery. We find every day and almost every hour—

A little learning is a dangerous thing.

The man of science lays down a solemn law, 'It is their nature to,' and then the cosmos abruptly intervenes and outrages his feelings by some rude fact that says 'It is not.' Things persist in being irrelevant, impertinent, and offer us,

like St. Paul, an *anacoloution* or *non-sequitur*, when we want and wait for the old appropriate result or a decent interval of transition. They content themselves with inconsequences, they positively delight in these. They dance to other tunes than ours. Some mischievous unknown piper sets their movements to an incomprehensible and most unorthodox music. They are only too frequently as incoherent as the grand Apostle to the Gentiles, and just as deeply instructive. Metaphysicians, men of science, resent this conduct, this outburst of violent mutations. They can find, they can allow no room in reason for such awkward side slips or freakish developments and such absolutely impossible fresh departures. The ether has already gone, and gravitation may soon follow. Who will dare to prophesy the next evolution or revolution? The philosophers have their scissors-made schematologies, cut according to the very best and latest pattern, in which the round pegs fit exactly into round holes, and the square pegs into square holes. And therefore, when they find that Things make fools of them, by sometimes planting the round in the square hole and the square in the round, they appeal passionately to logic or the Pragmatists to help them out of their difficulties and protest against the contrariety of Nature. And when the Phrontisterion or Thinking-shop grows too small and too hot for them, they retire into Mark Twain's *imprecatatorium* for a few moments and relieve their wounded and over-wrought feelings there. Their ancient shelter has played them false and betrayed their precious dignity and covered them with solemn ridicule. And yet Things, regardless of their interpreted or misinterpreted Thinghood, to use John Grote's convenient term, careless of the construction we impose on them, proceed along their own light-hearted way, exhibiting more and more of the indifference or neutrality of an unconcerned, uncurious Nature. The sequences refuse to be consequences, the cause and effect seem brutally tangled up together, when they do not

change places altogether, the simultaneities decline to synchronize and co-operate, and the world goes on as before, deaf and blind to the patient and pitiful observers with their cast-iron rules. Platitudinarians platitudinize, teachers teach, professors profess, but Things will not behave as they ought, or rather as we think they ought. We have instead a wrong result, or a reply that confuses the issues and confounds the speculations. We proceed in the interrogation of Nature, but the answers we receive are not what we desire or imagine we deserve. They bear no relation, no proportion to the inquiries and the expenditure of organized research, according to the orthodox rules and regulations. Things are not what they appear, or should be. It is Paradox and not Reason or Logic that rules. The ancient working hypotheses refuse to work any more.

Sir T. Browne, in his stately style, 'the larger utterance of the early gods,' expresses admirably what we have been trying to say. 'Those which others term crosses, afflictions, judgements, misfortunes, to me, who inquire farther into them than their visible effects, they will appear, and events have even proved, the secret and dissembled favours of His affection.'

That cant word, the *deus ex machina* called Providence, presupposes a general belief in the Divine Incongruity of Things—not the Darwinian fitness, but the irrational unfitness. The heart, and *Pectus est quod facit theologium*, instinctively rebels against the cut-and-dried formula of the philosopher or the man of science. If anything goes amiss or, so to speak, runs off the lines in some unanticipated accident, the average religious person exclaims, it was a Providence! Though why we should saddle the Deity with the cause of misfortunes that arise from imperfect machinery or defective coadjustments, is not very evident. And why we should worship a Catastrophic Deity and not the Deity of Order is not clear. And then the question arises, 'Which God?' The one of the New Testament or the *Urgott* who

created the *Urstoff* of speculative romance? Or is there a Deity at all? Can our very refined modernism leave a transcendental corner anywhere for such a superfluous Being as God, unless it be a strictly constitutional God, like our present most gracious sovereign? It was Feuillet who wrote, 'J'avais vu disparaître parmi les nuages la tête de ce bon Vieillard, qu'on appelle Dieu.' And yet, sooner or later, in spite of philosophy and science, we all, and among us the Agnostics, return to the Divine Hypothesis, because we find the cosmos is a thinking cosmos, an intelligible and therefore an intelligent cosmos, a suffering and for that very cause a saving and heavenly cosmos. Yes, it is the very unreasonableness of life, its sweet unreasonableness to which our Lord appeals, and after Him the apostles and the greatest of the fathers. Tertullian knew this when he wrote 'Certum est quod impossibile.' And again, as the Mystics hold, 'Mori est vivere.' Antecedents and necessary consequences, causes, and inevitable effects, have no place or portion or meaning here. It is all, in the Gospel's message of mercy, *charis*, and inferentially, as St. Paul knew, *dynamis*. The idea of logic or laws of thought, or desert even, does not enter in. And as Lord Melbourne put it, there is no — merit about it. The little here (as it seems) is yet so wonderfully vast, the insignificant so significant, and the infinitesimal (by our measures) the true infinite. Acts and facts, coarsely obvious in bulk and spaciousness, do not count, like the invisible motives and feelings and affections.

A world in a grain of sand,
And heaven in a wild flower.

We must read between the lines and under the leaves, and learn from the silences and the inactivities and the unapparent. But this can only be discerned by the second sight of elemental intuition or the mystic's looking-glass. And to such an end we must be twice-born, and pass through the double death, of which even wild West Africans have a gleam or glimpse. For there an image is buried with the

corpse. Mr. Alexander, *quem honoris causa nominatum volo*, has defined knowledge as the 'compresence of object and mind.' But the true 'compresence' must eternally be life and death, or life through death, its opposite and its other. Kant's 'synthetic activity' will never help us like the Christ consciousness, the Christ conception, the principle or key of the Cross. We must use the world in which we outwardly and visibly dwell as not abusing it, or as St. Paul used the language of the Mysteries (e.g. *εὐαγγελίῳ*) without being in any way influenced by them, or rather as part of the time process to be transvalued and spiritualized and thus carried up into a higher synthesis.

Even the Old Testament foreshadows the paradoxes of the New. As when, for instance, in Deut. xxxiii. 9 and Josh. vii. 11, the Covenant and the Command seem coincident, at a time in which the individual was a corporate individual, the family, or the tribe. To say that different passages contradict each other is only to say that the Spirit of God from the first was teaching man to think after God and to worship the God who reconciles all contradictions in Himself, and to assert the divine origin of things. But, of course, the Old Testament, legislating for and addressing a mixed multitude of emancipated slaves or captives, contains in it nothing like the violent disagreements of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, though these may have suffered from interpolations. And in *Asher* we can read the proposition which also professes to be an explanation of hard fact: 'All things are by twos, one over against the other.' But it is in mystics like Julian of Norwich that we find most clearly manifested the temper of the New Testament or Christianity. 'I am sure that if there should be none but I that should be safe, God would have done all that He has done for me.' Here we find a new standard of values. But this does not suit the modern thinker, who, with the idea of a large tolerance, like Montaigne's votary, lights one candle for St. George and one for the Dragon—though not absolutely

certain which is which, and equally prepared to burn incense at the shrine of the Absolute or bow the knee to 'the supreme evil God.' Virile religion like that of the New Testament, the religion of serfs who have become sovereigns in Christ, does not stick at the false *impasse* of a contradiction or two. These are in the order, for the simple reason that apparently they fight against it.

On the earth the broken arcs,
In the Heaven the perfect round.

But then the true *Christodidact* anticipated the end and sees it at the beginning and in the beginning and the completed circle in the fraction of a sequent. 'What time man's soul,' as Lady Julian wrote, 'is homely with God.' 'For in us is His homeliest home.' *Ex pede Herculem*—the mystic recognizes the eternal even in an invisible point, as it was declared of Owen, that if you only gave him a fragment of some extinct monster he would reconstruct the whole. Truth is self-supporting, self-determining, it shines from itself and not like the moon from an alien source. But we must not expect clear-cut definition in theology or religion. Not even in mathematics shall we discover this. 'We prove a proposition by some other proposition, so that at least one proposition remains unproved.' 'The few things are left undefined, that the many may be defined.' Yet even in the most indefinite proposition or term or formula, the vaguest generality or category, the light that each does possess is the light that Christ the Truth alone gives. He is at the back of the indefinite, as well as at the heart of the definite, at once the Creative Factor, the Universal Principle, the Incalculable Force. Whenever we approach some violent antinomy, some irreconcilable contradiction, some passionate paradox, we may feel sure that the Christ element offers the sole solution. He is the Supreme Synthesis in which thesis and antithesis merge harmonized. As when, in the depths of despair of St. Paul's shipwreck, the shipmen sounded and sounded till at last they deemed they drew

nigh to some land. And in the shoreless abysses of ignorance or the unknown, lower than any plummet ever plunged, we shall most assuredly at length discover Christ at the bottom. Where the two seas meet, at the crossing of the roads, at the sudden turn, at the unexpected budding-point where all seems barren and hopeless, at a disjunction in which the humdrum orthodox way divides into two, at the *cul-de-sac* with its blank, blind walls that seem impervious to reason and the right, there He stands, the signpost, the beacon light, the ground-rock, the open door into the infinite and the everlasting—Christ the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

And what are His promises and His precepts? They logically appear mutually exclusive and appear to contradict and cancel each other. But faith and obedience bring the power to translate the command into fruitful act and fact. *Solvitur ambulando*. 'Stretch forth thy (palsied) arm.' 'Speak to the children of Israel that they go forward,' through the Red Sea, through Jordan in flood, through wildernesses and over mountains and oceans of difficulty or danger, through raging fires and insuperable obstacles. Walking round the walls of Jericho, in their sevenfold mystical circumambulations, the chosen people battered down the impregnable ramparts not with artillery of any kind but 'with storms of prayer,' like Simeon Stylites. And the precepts perpetually clash and conflict with one another. 'The meek shall inherit the earth.' 'The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.' 'For judgement am I come into this world.' 'I judge no man.' 'Resist not the evil one.' 'He that hath no sword, let him sell his garments and buy one.' 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' 'Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you.' 'Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth, I am come not to send peace but a sword.' 'A new commandment I give unto you that ye love one another.' 'If any man come to Me and

hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters—yea, and his own life also—he cannot be My disciple.’ ‘Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you.’ ‘I am come to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.’ ‘He that findeth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it.’ The riches of poverty, the joy of sorrow, the pleasure of suffering, these are the prospects and rewards of Christ to His followers. Their bed is to be the grave, their rest and refreshment, persecution or martyrdom, and their crown the Cross. Surely no leader, no conqueror, ever held forth such absolutely repulsive attractions as these to his disciples or soldiers. The demand seems all striving or struggling, all giving and sacrifice, all bearing and forbearing, all clouds and thick darkness, which only fools or fanatics could possibly embrace. No repose, no prizes in the ordinary sense, no privileges except of pain. Stress and strife from the beginning to the end. And yet it was just this sweet unreasonableness that prevailed and conquered, and is conquering still and will always conquer, till it has conquered the whole world. ‘But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised hath God chosen—yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are.’

Christ was the one supreme example, ‘who for the joy that was set before Him endured the Cross, despising the shame.’ He kindled that great and still growing enthusiasm for humanity, or rather for the Divine in humanity, which burns yet in the breasts of saints and confessors and martyrs and missionaries. Calvary has established itself now among the most remote savages and in the slums of our great cities. Christ showed in His own person the

kingliness of service, the life in and for others, the royal prerogative of vicarious suffering. He abolished for ever the calculated systems of rewards and punishments, the rule of three religions, the idea of meritoriousness or works of supererogation, the mercenary utilitarian schemes of so much happiness for so much work done, as if God were the grand chartered accountant who examined our ledgers at some preposterous judgement day, and proved from the books by arithmetical evidence the balance to our credit or the deficit of our indebtedness to Him. The people who look forward to this sort of commercial salvation, forget that Love never could do the simplest sum correctly or add even two and two together. It always shows a plus. The more it gives away the more it has to keep, by new investments of sacrifice for others to God and man. With the New Realism the object remains as it was; whatever happens, its existence and nature are independent of being known. And so it is with the Master. Whether we know Him or not, whether we believe in Him or not, whether we love Him or not, whether we serve Him or not, He is 'the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.' His eternal love He bequeaths to us. Without thought of ulterior gain, without regardfulness of cost or consequence, the loyal servant goes on his way rejoicing, whatever the results. 'And then said I,' wrote Lady Julian, 'that each kind compassion that man has for his even-Christians—it is Christ in him.' And 'prayer ones the soul to God.' 'He who rises from his prayer a better man, his prayer is answered.' But the best petition is for others and the spread of the Kingdom, in good words and good works. *Laborare est orare.* 'We should strive to be towards the Eternal Goodness, what his hand is to a man.'

Our Lord sometimes continued all night in prayer. And the beauty of prayer consists in its preposterous nature, in tilting against law and evolution and the orthodox order and majesty of events—the ethical process versus the cosmic

process. It is all so delightfully illogical, like the Gospel, like Christianity, like Christ Himself. Did not Jesus die and then rise again and then ascend into heaven, defying the chain of cause and effect and gravitation and the chatter of learned ignorance! Everything, more or less, that He said and did broke some iron rule or gave the lie to some old adamantine authority. He burst the chains of the Schools, and gave us instead the gossamer threads of love and light and rebellious thought, creative ideas and motives and feelings, which held faster than any fetters because they were spiritual. A profound Professor, David S. Cairns, has been giving a course of lectures on 'The Reasonableness of the Faith,' very wise, very wonderful, very scholarly, very cogent, and completely unconvincing. There is no common measure between the preaching and teaching of Christ and the methods of trained theologians. If we could demonstrate the existence of a God, or the rationality of the Gospel, we should destroy both. Neither one nor the other can be fixed to a formula or confined in a syllogism. The sheer absurdity of the Truth renders it so utterly irresistible: We all know, or think we know, that two and two make four and two parallel straight lines cannot enclose a space, and the part cannot be greater than the whole. By no means, replies the Gospel. In the mathematics of heaven two and two make five, two parallel straight lines always enclose a space, and the part was ever greater than the whole. Even the Greeks were well aware of this—*πλεον ἡμῶν πεντάς*. The lavish waste of noble effort and fine materials, the frequent entire uselessness of expenditure, the magnificent lunacy in the actors of the Divine Comedy or Tragedy, places Christianity and its progress on a plane quite by itself. We possess no standards to judge by, no rules to which it should conform, no precedents to apply, no criterion by which to test it—excepting Christ Himself—'the measure of the stature of the Fullness of Christ.' We cannot ask *Cui bono?* To surrender all in order to acquire all, seems the prescription

of madness, the counsel not of perfection but of diseased despair. And yet we find at once a simple solution in living the life. 'If any man willeth to do His Will, he shall know.' *Solvitur vivendo* enigma. Things may seem topsy-turvy at first, and matters positively upside down—the earth, for instance, resting on an elephant, and the elephant on a tortoise, and the tortoise on what? Not on the elephant again, but on nothing. We put forth a foot into the awful void, and we see only a terrifying emptiness. But when we take the step of stark insanity with faith and love, we find nothing is everything, because underneath lies the invisible true foundation, the Cross of Christ, the Will of God. And in one eternal transcendental moment, the death minus becomes the life plus. 'They only shall rule who know.' What could be more unreasonable and ridiculous than Conversion—the Ethiopian changing his skin, and the leopard his spots? We may try to explain it by a psychopathic diagnosis, mere idle words that explain nothing. But the fact is as old as Plato's *Republic*, book 7, 518, &c., and indeed it must be as old as the mind of man. For what is life, on the last analysis, but metabolism or perpetual change?

If we protest against the uselessness, so-called, of much Christian outlay and suffering, this merely means that there appears no obvious purpose. But surely even this age, with its halfpenny Press and cheap politics, should have learned that to be obvious is to be vulgar and therefore to be false. The patent, the open secret has no secret, which costs nothing to ascertain, which exercises neither the head nor the heart—it appeals to nobody, to nothing. Publicity degrades. God provides no short cuts and no cheap remedies. It is the Unfit as well as the Fit that He chooses, or that which does not respond to its environment but resists and negates it, and forms a fresh environment of its own, a spiritual environment. It is in the beautiful or unbeautiful incongruities, the dysgenics rather than the eugenics, the slum cellars more than the seat of Government, we often find the starting-

point, the jumping-off place, of the new creation, the new world and the new religions and the new Divinities. Let us be thankful for the survival of the Unfittest, as well as of the Fittest. They co-operate just as much as, and in as much as, and because they compete. If we have been planted in a maze of mysteries, God has not left us without a saving and guiding clue—namely the Eternal Cross. Set in the midst of Nature that wears the appearance of blank unconcern, a kind of neutral zone, a dispassionate borderland that belongs equally to two universes or can be annexed to either, the ethical ingredient and intruder can make this Nature good or bad as we choose. Like money it seems to bear no moral value, and is receptive of the stamp or coinage we impose upon it. But it lies in the lap of an infinite Spiritual Environment, always able, always willing, always present, to discipline and direct and help us to the uttermost. Not that we are saddled with the yoke of any detestable purpose or anything that points a lesson at our expense and for our stultification, to gratify a cynical and sanguinary Deity—not that we approach a pre-ordained, scientific, cold-blooded plan like the ‘pre-established Harmony’ of Leibniz; but that our efforts in sacrifice and for the welfare of others and our own self-improvement meet with a response, like that of some favoured nation’s clause in the Scheme of Things. For, in a certain and very true sense, Heaven has its favourites, and God (so to speak) Calvinizes. But we shall discern alike continuity and discontinuity, the struggle for existence and the ‘thanatic instinct,’ evolution and revolution, the endurance of the best and the endurance of the worst, the victory of the lowliest organisms and the vanquishing of the highest, the triumph of mind and the triumph of matter, natural selection and unnatural, intervention and non-intervention, parasitism and its noble prey, God may be a philosopher, but He never was or will be a man of science obsessed by one idea or a single method. He is both a Darwinian and a Mutationist, to say it with all reverence,

He Mendelizes and then He de-Mendelizes, employing impartially eugenics and dysgenics, but remains for ever sublimely consistent in His inconsistency. Without prejudice He creates and destroys and creates by destroying. He breaks in order to make whole and then breaks again for the same reason and a fairer whole. Heraklitus, Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel are but the dust (though the living, thinking dust) of His eternal progress. He brings with Him the two greatest blessings of humanity, the Veil and the Vision—and the Veil no less fruitful than the Vision—the glorious gift of Blindness and the grace of the Secret Light. But the meaning and goal of the everlasting process, who shall conjecture? Its movement looks like a storm of stars at night, and clouds of magnificence. We must in Christ become our own God, through the transvaluation of all values at the Cross.

I am the master of my fate,
I am the captain of my soul.

We are only certain of two things, and one is Polarity, or the union of opposites. And the other we find in the Useless, as we fondly think it and call it, which proves to be as necessary as the Useful. We forget that God draws His brightest and most precious jewels from the rubbish heaps of the world. The waste, the refuse, the superfluous, the aberrations—*splendidus error*, the evil and the false—*splendide mendax*, the diseased and insane, *splendida bilis*, the grotesque, the humorous, the demonic and diabolical, the irrelevant, the impossible, the impertinent and inconsequent, the trifles and infinitesimals, the micro-organisms and macrocosms, the accidents and inessentials, the foolishnesses and frivolities, the idlenesses and emptinesses—all these somehow and somewhere go into the picture—and by their incompleteness and negative qualities help to make it complete. The bud in its way and in its hour has as much perfection as the blossom, and the autumn leaf has no less beauty than the spring shoot that laughs in a fresh

paradise of greenery—and God's throne is in each and all. *De minimis curat Deus.* 'Your Father which is in heaven maketh His sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.' He is always on our side, and yet always against us, and when He has become our Adversary and fights against us He is not least our Friend and Helper. Let us hope that some day men will awake from their dreams, and erect an altar to the Unknown God of Divine Uselessness. And then perhaps, but not till then, shall we appreciate better the sweet unreasonableness of Christianity. It takes all kinds of men and things to make a world, and it takes all kinds of God, as Donne said, to govern it.

F. W. ORDE WARD.

THE MENACE OF EDDYISM¹

THE following pages are not—what every avowed 'Christian Scientist' will at once declare—an attack upon any one or any thing, but a definite though brief defence; a reply, indeed, to the challenge lately reiterated in a well-known Christian journal, which ought not, for the truth's sake, to pass unnoticed.² And the very first item of this reply, is to refuse definitely to allow the assumption which is embodied in the name 'Christian Science.' The modern trick of begging the whole question in a name is clever enough, and common enough, but has become intolerable. The Romanist calls himself a 'Catholic,' and on all hands people who ought to know better concede it. The Agnostic covers his failures under the name 'Rationalist'; the Atheist styles himself a 'Freethinker'; the man in the street who wishes to 'get rid of the god idea,' claims to be the only true 'Socialist.' So now, for some years, a cult which is demonstrably neither Christianity nor science arrogates to itself the title of 'Christian Science.' In point

¹ *Science and Health: with Key to the Scriptures.* By MARY BAKER EDDY. (Boston. U.S.A.) *Plea for the Investigation of Christian Science.* By Mr. C. H. Lea. (Dent & Sons.) *The Faith and Works of Christian Science.* By Dr. STEPHEN PAGE. (Macmillan.) *Christian Science.* By L. P. POWELL. (Putnam's Sons.) *Why not Eddyism?* By Dr. FRANK BALLARD. (Epworth Press.) *Christian Murderers.* By WINIFRED GRAHAM. (Everett & Co.)

² In the *Christian World*, for many issues, appeared an offer to send, free to all Christian ministers, a book by Mr. C. H. Lea on behalf of 'Christian Science.' The advertisement included the statement that 'Christian Science directly challenges the accuracy of all other religious teaching, and differs from the teaching of other Christian Churches. A careful study of Christian Science brings a knowledge of God upon which men can bank with absolute certainty. The day of mere belief in God must pass from every Christian Church; then will all be filled to overflowing.' The book referred to is a curious production, seeing that the author insists upon the superiority of Christian Science with all possible emphasis, and yet asserts that he himself is not one of that cult. All in it that calls for notice is definitely dealt with in the booklet *Why not Eddyism?* published by the Epworth Press at threepence.

of fact, from beginning to end, it is nothing more than Eddyism;—its whole structure rests, to this very moment, solely upon the utterances of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, and if she had been but half as wonderful and good as her devotees declare, they ought to be proud to own no other name than hers. In order to appreciate truly the whole situation, nine definite items call for careful consideration. Of these six are plainly stated below, and three may be briefly specified here.

(1) Any one who desires to know the whole truth must certainly study the life history of Mrs. Eddy, as given by Georgina Milmine—which guarantees itself as reliable in comparison with that faked by Eddyists for their own purpose, by Sibyl Wilbur. For most minds, the true history of the evolution of such an unparalleled religious autocracy will in itself suffice.

(2) The financial development also deserves a close scrutiny which cannot be given to it here. But the fact that Mrs. Eddy's 'estate' was 'filed in the Probate Court' at more than £500,000, and that the Temple at Boston cost some £400,000, whilst other manifestations of wealth abound in all its operations, cannot but be significant.

(3) A thorough study of the volume which, in spite of any protest to the contrary, really constitutes the Eddyist Bible,—*Science and Health: with Key to the Scriptures*,—is absolutely necessary.¹ No one knows exactly how many editions have been issued—the pages given below are taken from the 450th edition. For this edition they are exactly accurate; but the alterations have been so many that it

¹ Concerning this, Mr. Leo Prince, who inclines to favour Eddyism in many respects, writes: 'From a literary standpoint the book is vague, stilted, artificial, and repetitious, frequently obscure in meaning and unintelligible in expression. It has "damnable iteration." No chapter unfolds any special line of thought, or is otherwise distinctive. The book in its entirety exhibits neither unity, outline, nor coherence. Like the Koran, one may begin at the front and read to the end, or at the end and read backwards, or in the middle and read either way, the effect is all the same. This remarkable characteristic of Mrs. Eddy's writings is regarded by Christian Scientists as strong evidence of their inspiration.'

is almost impossible to guarantee any references. It is enough to say, quite carefully, that this weird volume is more to the Eddyist than the Koran to the Mussulman, or the Bible to the Bibliolater.

Bearing, then, the above in mind, we have to face the fact that this Eddyism is still growing, and is indeed in this country, at the present time, carrying on a quiet and insidious but persistent propaganda. Its principal methods are (i) the deliverance of special lectures in prominent public halls—always without charge or collection—by well-paid American lecturers, who permit neither questions nor discussion of any kind. (ii) The establishment of 'reading-rooms' in all city centres, where Eddyist literature of all kinds, including the *Monitor* and *Sentinel*—may be purchased, or may, sometimes, be borrowed for home perusal. There is also an immense pamphlet production which is widely distributed. (iii) By public services, and especially 'testimony' meetings, where accounts are constantly given of alleged marvellous cures of disease through the study of Mrs. Eddy's wonderful book. The new converts are made of course from the Christian Churches, not from the streets, nor from the ranks of unbelief; and it is mainly for this reason that some estimate of its words and works appears to be really necessary, from the standpoint of the Christian Churches which it so openly challenges.

Whenever any such attempt is made, a whole host of replies as a rule appears; hence it is also necessary to point out that they all avail nothing, so long as we are clear and sure of the words of Mrs. Eddy, in the book which is ceaselessly declared to be 'the original standard and only text-book on Christian Science mind-healing.' In support, therefore, of the following six allegations, all the statements in inverted commas are Mrs. Eddy's own words—taken from the above book when only the numbers of the pages are attached—or if otherwise, specially noted. The definite assertions here made, resting on such unquestionable

authority, are, that this Eddyism is (1) not Christian at all; (2) not scientific; (3) false philosophy; (4) contrary to valid common sense; (5) a private delusion; and (6) a public menace.

Before, however, demonstrating each of these, some notice must be taken of the two main allegations which tend most to win popular favour, and so contribute to the making of definite converts. They are, first, that Eddyists are, as a rule, such nice, kind, good people; and secondly, that there are so many wonderful cures. But in sober truth neither of these need detain us for more than a moment.

As to the former, it is simply false to say that Eddyism produces more winsome or noble characters than the ordinary Christian Churches. It does not appertain to the nature of a true saint to make himself or herself conspicuous, but what Prof. Seeley wrote at the close of his remarkable chapter in *Ecce Homo*, on 'the enthusiasm of humanity' finds still a most real application in almost every Christian Church in the land. Undoubtedly, there would be more such characters if ordinary worshippers at 'orthodox' services could but be led to realize what they profess. But in order to grow real saints, it is no more necessary to have recourse to the follies of Eddyism, than it is to set fire to one's house in order to warm one's hands.

Then as to the alleged wonderful cures of disease. At the very outset, and in every case, Eddyism contradicts itself helplessly. The dilemma is simple and final. The cures are either real or unreal. If they are unreal, they are of no value as 'testimony.' If they are real, then the disease which is cured must have been real—and in that case, the Eddyism which declares that all disease is unreal, is itself false. But apart from that, four things have to be noted in regard to all these vaunted healings.

¹ 'There has scarcely been a town in any Christian country since the time of Christ, where a century has passed without exhibiting a character of such elevation that his mere presence has shamed the bad, and made the good better, and has been felt at times like the presence of God Himself.'

(i) There are many, yes, many, ghastly failures, of which nothing is ever heard.¹ In his most valuable work on *The Faith and Works of Christian Science*, Dr. S. Paget has given a tragic number of such cases, and only the limitations of space prevent the giving here of many more.

Again (ii) many alleged cures are by no means shown to be such, for want of competent investigation and accurate diagnosis.

(iii) In very many cases the alleged cures are not permanent, and the last state of the sufferer is worse than the first.

(iv) But some, it is said, are both real and wonderful. Be it so. But do they prove the principles of Eddyism? Certainly they do not. In technical but useful language, a *post quod* is by no means always a *propter quod*. Mrs. Eddy herself supplies a case in point—for she tells of a patient of Sir Humphry Davy, who was cured by simply having the clinical thermometer put into his mouth. Certainly in that case it was not Eddyism that worked the cure—but what is now more and more acknowledged as ‘psycho-therapy.’ That it is no less so in most of the alleged healings of Eddyism, scarcely admits of a doubt for impartial minds. And yet more. Suppose that there are some cases which seem to be inexplicable, what then? Well, at least, two things, definitely. First, in all their wonderful reality they can be completely matched by other methods which assuredly have nothing Eddyistic about

¹ Except in cases where publicity is unavoidable, as just recently in Sheffield, where, an inquest was held over the death of a comparatively young woman who had had ‘Christian Science treatment’ for a tumour for three years, but had at last to submit to an operation for its removal. It was, however, then too late; but competent medical authority testified that had it been attended to at the proper time, complete recovery would have been the result. The stupid and dangerous fanaticism which characterises this cult was only too typically exhibited at this inquest. The Coroner asked the mother: ‘After your daughter’s death, do you still approve of her having had no medical treatment?’ and she answered ‘Certainly.’ That is one illustration, out of many, of the menace of Eddyism.

them. For some time now I have been collecting cases of healing, guaranteed in every way, by other means than ordinary therapeutics or surgery, and they are in every respect as wonderful as anything Eddyism has ever alleged. Indeed, every single case of alleged cure of any deadly ailment, on the part of Eddyist patients, can be matched by testimonies of cases of complete recovery from equally severe illness by the use of patent medicines. Instances may be seen in almost every daily paper. Any one who knows anything at all about drugs, knows perfectly well that it was not the drug which wrought the cure, any more than the thermometer in the mouth of Sir Humphry Davy's patient.

But whilst the above considerations rule out of thought the usual triumphant references to the miracles of healing which are ascribed to Eddyism, there is yet another consideration. Whether such ascription is warranted or not—even if every alleged cure were accepted as conclusive Eddyistic evidence,—we have still to reckon with the assertions and dogmas of the 'standard' in which Mrs. Eddy's definite doctrines are unalterably enshrined for evermore. This is what remains therefore to be done in these few pages, in regard to the sixfold indictment specified above. It is unfortunately impossible to quote here always the very words of this bizarre volume—though that would be overwhelmingly more conclusive—but let it be most definitely and emphatically understood, that *every statement here made* can be definitely proved, *ipsissimis verbis*, from the pages of *Science and Health*.

(i) This alleged 'Christian Science' is miscalled, because it is not Christian. In so affirming, we may give greatest breadth to all that the term 'Christian' includes. Excepting only distinctly avowed Unitarianism, and not even that, in some respects—all that the Christian Churches stand for is unmistakably flouted and denied in the Eddyistic standards.

(i) God is not personal; is not omnipotent; is not triune.¹

(ii) As to Christ—'Jesus is the divine man, and Christ is the divine idea; hence the duality of Jesus the Christ.' (478.) Then also, Jesus did not die; there is no atonement; no resurrection; and all His works amounted to this—'Jesus demonstrated the power of Christian Science to heal mortal minds and bodies.'²

(iii) There is no Holy Spirit—'He shall give you another Comforter—this Comforter I understand to be Divine Science,' i.e. Eddyism.

(iv) As to man, besides teaching definitely contrary to the whole Biblical representation, *Science and Health* asserts that the human body is not material at all, but is a 'myth.'³ No man has a mind of his own; man is incapable of sin, sickness, and death. There is no individuality; 'God is the mind of man; man is co-existent with God'; 'man is the full and perfect representation of God.'⁴

(v) As to sin. There is no sin; there can be no sin; sin is nothingness; evil is an illusion.

(vi) Prayer is useless, because 'God is not influenced by man'; and is wrong, because it represents 'God as humanly circumscribed.'

(vii) There are no sacraments; the 'Lord's supper' is transformed into a breakfast, and baptism is only figurative.

(viii) As to the Bible—its avowed study is a travesty; for it is only to be understood in the light of *Science and Health*. The statement—'we take the inspired Word of the Bible as our sufficient guide to eternal life'—is falsified

¹ See Mrs. Eddy's 'No and Yes,' pp. 19, 20, &c. *S.H.* (*Science and Health*, pp. 475, 331).

² Pp. 44, 45, 324, 110, &c.

³ P. 150.

⁴ For every one of these statements exact pages can be specified, as well as for all the rest to follow. It seems mere waste of space, therefore, to keep on specifying them. *Every one* is expressed in Mrs. Eddy's own words.

in many ways. The principle of interpretation is false; the texts quoted are falsely applied, and even altered, to suit Mrs. Eddy's notions; sometimes there is direct misrepresentation.¹

Sometimes there is direct contradiction, as when it is declared that Lazarus did not die at all, but was only in a dream. The whole use of the Bible in the public services, when picked passages from it and from *Science and Health* are read alternately, is forced, artificial, and contradictory. . . . This will be sufficiently illustrated by examining the *Christian Science Quarterly Bible Lessons*.

In face of all the above, and very much more which might easily be specified, it is plain that Eddyism has no more right to call itself Christian, than has Comtism or Islam.

(2) That it is not science is equally manifest. The audacity as well as absurdity of its claims will be best expressed in its own speech. 'Christian Science differs from material science, but not on that account is it less scientific.' That is to say, it may under the name of 'science' make any outrageous statement whatever, but all is to be accounted 'scientific,' because the term 'Christian' is prefixed. Thus, in the exact words of S.H.,

To material sense the severance of the jugular vein takes away life; but to spiritual sense, and in science, life goes on unchanged, and being is eternal. Temporal life is a false sense of existence. Thus matter will finally be proved nothing more than a mortal belief, wholly inadequate to affect a man through its supposed organic action or supposed existence. Christian Science eschews what is called natural science, in so far as this is built on the false hypotheses that matter is its own lawgiver. Science relates to mind, not matter. Adhesion, cohesion, and attraction are properties of mind.

¹ Perhaps proof of this ought even here to be shown—though instances abound. See pp. 196, 324, &c. Again and again Mrs. Eddy declares that Jesus said: 'Take no thought for your body,' and ~~means~~ that neither food nor cleanliness were necessary. See pp. 170, 382, 530, 365, &c.

After such stuff as this, one is prepared somewhat for much; but hardly for what is actually printed. For instance, genuine students of science all desire to know what electricity really is. They need doubt no more. Mrs. Eddy has settled it.

Electricity is not a vital fluid, but the least material form of illusive consciousness—the material mindlessness, which forms no link between matter and mind, and which destroys itself—electricity is the sharp surplus of materiality which counterfeits the true essence of spirituality or truth.¹

Physiology is generally regarded as a branch of modern science, but Eddyism's final authority declares that the study of physiology, anatomy, and health, promotes disease; that there is no bodily structure to consider; that indeed there is no body at all to study; that Eddyist 'practitioners' have nothing to do with physiology or pathology; that embryology is a delusion; that there are no bones or nerves; that physical exercise is useless²; that there is no such thing as weariness; that sleep is unnecessary. Doctors 'are flooding the world with diseases because they are ignorant that the human mind and body are myths.' With barefaced falsity, in face of facts, we are told that 'Obedience to the so-called physical laws of health has not checked sickness.' And yet, all the time, there is no such thing as sickness or disease.³ There is also, we learn, no such thing as growing old; nor does heredity deserve thinking about.

But under this head one special question must be plainly

¹ P. 293.

² 'Because the muscles of the blacksmith's arm are strongly developed, it does not follow that exercise has produced this result or that a less used arm must be weak. You do not say a wheel is fatigued; yet the body is as material as the wheel. The consciousness of truth rests us more than hours of repose in unconscionness.'

³ You say a boil is painful, but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful. The boil simply manifests through inflammation and swelling a belief in pain, and this belief is called a boil. Now administer to your patient a high attenuation of truth and it will soon cure the boil (153).

asked. Is Mrs. Eddy dead—or not? If she is not, then there must be a very clever gang of liars at Boston. But if she is, then this her vaunted book is false—for it openly declares that—‘Any material evidence of death is false, for it contradicts the spiritual facts of being’—‘If you or I should appear to die, we should not be dead—the seeming decease is caused by a majority of human beliefs.’ And yet this all-conglomeration of absurdity is called ‘Science’—can audacity farther go?’

(3) Yes—it can also boast that this unscientific hash is a philosophy. Under five heads this claim might be fairly examined. As to what should be understood by ‘reality’; as to the ‘divine perfection,’ of which Mr. Lea has so much (unwarrantably) to say; as to what ‘matter’ really stands for; as to Mrs. Eddy’s special obsession regarding ‘mortal mind’; and as to the existence and nature of ‘evil.’ Nothing but space is required to show the utter inanity of the whole Eddyistic attitude in regard to each of these. Think of a ‘philosophy’ which commits itself to these avowals. ‘If truth is real, error must be unreal.’ ‘Matter’ is another name for ‘mortal mind—the opposite of God;’ mortal mind does not exist, and yet is the producer of heat and cold, and of the organism and action of the mortal body; since God is ‘perfection,’ everything He makes must be perfect; because God is all, and is good, therefore everything, and everyone, must be good. Also, ‘evil is a negation because it is the absence of truth; it is nothing, because it is the absence of something.’ And yet—on the very same page—‘Evil is self-assertive. The only power of evil is to destroy itself.’ Surely it were waste space to add more. Such ‘philosophy’ is only fit for an asylum.

(4) Then what about common sense? The cynic says

¹ P. 584, 164. As a typical instance of such audacity, Mrs. Eddy quotes 1 Cor. xv. 54, but puts ‘divine Science,’ i.e. Eddyism, in place of ‘immortality,’ and ascribes it to St. Paul.

that its special feature is that it is so uncommon. If he had in view this American craze, verily he would be justified. For if common sense really represents the lessons learned through many generations of human experience, then it is flouted, scorned, trampled on, by Eddyism, as by no other of the many religious crazes from which humanity has suffered. Proofs hereof, from the one standard authority of this cult, are overwhelming. At a recent lecture, at which I was meticulously careful to give the audience *only* Mrs. Eddy's own words, a lady who strongly avowed herself to be a 'Christian Scientist' arose and declared that all the lecturer had said was 'mere twaddle'—overlooking the fact that it had *all* been the very words of the authority upon Eddyism from which there is no appeal. That such was a true estimate, is manifest enough. The system which shamelessly asserts that the laws of health are useless; that all medicine is worse than useless; that all surgery is to be abandoned; that all hospitals should be closed; all thought of hygiene dismissed; that the only thing needed is the volume issued by Mrs. Eddy; that washing and bathing are delusions; that babies need no washing; that no wounds need any attention; that there is no need or room for sympathy; that all people are to be 'healed of disease and sin' simply by reading *Science and Health* (especially bearing in mind the definite Eddyistic dictum that there is no such thing as sin or disease)—all this is truly what that lady said—'twaddle' in very deed.

(5) But it does not end there; and that is the main reason for this definite protest. There is measureless harm in the private delusion, and untold danger in the public menace, which are involved. The former is pitifully double physical and spiritual. To teach that deadly poisons cannot be poisonous, because God pronounced them good; that fire does not burn, but only 'mortal mind' can; is folly enough in the realm of practical daily life. But in order to know the higher life, which Christ calls 'eternal

life,' is it really necessary to commit oneself to the falsities, the inanities, the self-contradictions of the Eddyistic pantheism which flouts the New Testament at every point? Most assuredly it is not. It is, as stated above, entirely untrue to aver that the type of character produced by Eddyism is superior to all other.¹ There are myriads of instances to the contrary, in all the Churches. If we take the name Christian in the broadest sense compatible with truth, all that is needed is that in each fold of Christ's one flock,² every member of it should be true to what he believes. The New Testament, fairly interpreted by itself, is a far higher ideal than the incoherent meanderings of the Eddyist Koran.

(6) But Christ's second great command, as we find it there, compels us also to beware of the public menace, no less than the private delusion, of this new-fangled importation from America. It is false enough, and bad enough, to be told that Eddyism 'does honour God as no other theory honours Him'—for the whole Bible flatly contradicts it. But if we think also of our fellow men, if we care at all for what in these days is generally known as 'the health and well-being of the community', then we pass beyond the realm of religious liberty into the zone of unmistakable public danger. Whilst we are year by year increasing the number of cases in which certain diseases must be 'notified,' because of the possibilities of infection, ought any cult to be permitted to teach that there is no such thing as infection, because all disease is but a delusion of 'mortal mind'? Should any body of fanatics in a community be permitted to insist that 'less thought should be given to sanitary subjects'? Or that all thought of hygiene should be dismissed? Also that all our modern wonderful merciful

¹ To say nothing of the law-suit now pending (December, 1920) in the supreme Court of Massachusetts between rival sections of 'Christian Scientists.'

² cf. John x. 16, where the Revised Version corrects the blunder of the wrongly named 'Authorized' Version.

arrangements for immediate ambulance help in cases of accident, should be given up, and an unlimited number of this weird and misleading book substituted? If that is not a public menace, what is? That this procedure would also involve the cessation of all Christian foreign medical Missions, should also surely move all those who know anything of the great and gracious influence which those Missions are increasingly wielding in far-off lands.

All that here precedes is a mere summary. Let that be plainly borne in mind. Given only space, and this indictment would be vastly more effective, seeing that every item above-named, and many others, can be unmistakably set forth in the very words of the one sufficient and final authority of Eddyism, compared with which all that is found in the *Monitor* and *Sentinel*, and in Mr. Lea's much-advertised book, or in other pamphlets, is quite secondary. As a matter of plain fact, there is no single consistent Eddyist living—any more than Mrs. Eddy was herself consistent, when in her dental operation she availed herself of an anaesthetic. Her distinct avowal is that the laws of God, as represented by her 'system,' are the same in sickness as in health. In the former case, nothing is needed but thoroughgoing belief in the allness of God Who is good. But if in illness for that reason we need no drugs, then certainly also in health, on precisely the same principles, we need no food. So that every Eddyist who builds a house, or buys a coat, or cooks a meal, is a manifest self-contradiction.

But besides that, here are also some general facts—from a reliable authority—which I challenge any Eddyist to deny, in reply to the mad assertion (165) that 'obedience to the so-called physical laws of health has not checked sickness.'

'Typhoid fever, forty years ago, killed eleven times as many people as it does to-day. Eight years ago nearly four times as many people caught typhoid fever as catch it to-day. Forty years ago, scarlet

fever killed twenty-four times as many children as it kills to-day. Diphtheria was almost always fatal then; now, the prompt use of anti-toxin is almost always a certain cure. The total number of British children who died during the first year after their birth was 60 per cent. higher fifteen years ago than it is to-day.'

Much more than this might truly be said. But that is enough to warrant our asking how has this change for the better [come to pass? The unanswerable answer is, through doing exactly the contrary to all that Eddyism asserts and urges. That should suffice.

One might well be forgiven for asking, finally, why, if Eddyism so seeks to 'honour God,' and 'save men from sin,' it does not go to the great crowds of those outside all the churches and convince them, instead of winning all its converts from amongst Church-going people? If it can teach people how to dispense with food¹ as well as medicine, why not go to the slums and other places where there is a daily fight for sustenance, and convert them?

In all this, and much more which ought to be made plain, nothing is said about the personal character of Eddyists—though Paul was somewhat personal in his dealing with false doctrine in his day. 'If any man is preaching you a gospel contrary to what you have received, let him be anathema.' But whatever may be said, or thought, in regard to the personal convictions, or characters, of those who take this strange ambitious American woman as their spiritual guide, there is more than abundant warrant for quoting Tennyson's grave warning, as applying only too truly to their 'system'—

Hold thou the truth, define it well;
For fear divine philosophy,
Should push beyond her mark, and be
Procress to the lords of hell.

FRANK BALLARD.

¹ 'In divine Science, man is sustained by God, the divine principle of being. Knowing this, Jesus said: "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink," recognizing God the Father and Mother of all as able to feed and clothe man as He doth the lilies.' (530, &c.)

PSYCHOLOGY AND CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

THERE is a famous passage in the 'Excursion' where Wordsworth pictures a child with a shell held to his ear, listening to the noises of the sea :—

His countenance soon
Brightened with joy ; for from within were heard
Murmurings, whereby the monitor expressed
Mysterious union with its native sea.

We were all told this as children, and we believed it.

Wordsworth goes on to draw certain conclusions or parallels :

Even such a shell the universe itself
Is to the ear of Faith ; and there are times,
I doubt not, when to you it doth impart
Authentic tidings of invisible things ;
Of ebb and flow, and ever-during power ;
And central peace, subsisting at the heart
Of endless agitation . . .

A modern critic, reviewing such a passage, would not deny the fact, but he would most certainly challenge the interpretation. He would say that what the child heard was no message from the earlier home of the shell, but rather the echo of sounds within his own bodily organism. Similarly the message heard by faith comes not from any soul of the universe, but from the depths of a man's own being. He might go on to say that Wordsworth himself points to the true explanation. For only a few lines later on he says :

The estate of man would be indeed forlorn
If false conclusions of the reasoning power
Made the eye blind, and closed the passages
Through which the ear converses with the heart.

' Does not Wordsworth mean,' it would be said, ' that it is the heart of man which sends him messages which Faith interprets as coming to him from beyond himself ? And is not this the real explanation of those religious experiences to which such confident appeal is made for the guarantee of Faith ? They are just the converse of the depths of man's nature with his conscious self.'

It need not be said that this type of explanation is not new. In Mr. Frederic Harrison's *Oliver Cromwell* there is an admirable illustration of it. He writes, 'The zealot who felt himself in hourly communion with the divine will was really consulting his own highest standard of the Just and the True. When he sought God, he was probing his understanding to the depths. When he had found assurance, his resolve was fixed down to the very roots of his soul. And thus it depended very much on the zealot's own nature whether the result was good or bad.' Similarly Lord Morley pointed out long ago that the modern thinker does not deny the facts of Christian experience,—he explains them. In more recent days, especially since the publication of W. James's *Varieties of Religious Experience*, great attention has been given to the phenomena of the religious life. In the present generation, notably during the last few years, psychology, with its fresh emphasis upon the subconscious self, has urged once more that religious experience does not lead to reality in the sense that the experients claim. Let us begin by asking what we can learn about the subconscious, and then consider whether any real explanation of the facts of the religious life can be derived from it.

2. The word 'subliminal' is generally employed by psychology to represent those changes or processes below the threshold of consciousness which are required to explain what goes on in normal mental life. Thus Stout speaks of 'an organized system of conditions which have indeed been formed in and through bygone conscious experience, but which are not themselves present to consciousness.' This needs little exposition, it is so obviously true. It is clear that there are in us all strong tendencies or interests lying dormant which a chance word or event may rouse at any moment into intense activity. We know, for instance, how often a passing odour evokes a whole system of memories and experiences of the past. We may recall Myers's sug-

gestion that the part of our whole personality which is present to consciousness at any moment is like the small part of the iceberg that is above the surface of the water.

We may go further and say that the unconscious is the great storehouse of the inherited and racial instincts. We see that whenever we observe for the first time the father or the grandfather coming out in the child. Adam is present in all his descendants; more of him perhaps than they have ever known. Of modern writers it is Jung who has directed special attention to this truth.

At the present day, if a layman may speak of such matters, much is being made of this in the effort to cure nervous disorders by delving into the contents of the subconscious mind. This is done in two ways. In the first place we find there the source of dreams, of unreasoning fears, of fixed ideas, and the like. Especially it is suggested that instincts which have been refused expression, and driven forcibly into the unconscious, avenge themselves in dreams, and sometimes bring disorder into the whole waking life. The name of Freud is specially connected with this teaching. In the second place—a much more important point for us—we are taught to see that within this subconscious region there are present great stores of unexpended power, which may, if made available, be summoned to bring strength and healing to the whole man. Captain Hadfield's article on 'The Psychology of Power,' in the volume of essays called *The Spirit*, has many illustrations of this, of quite extraordinary interest. After speaking of what has been done under the influence of great emotions he says: 'It would look as if it were only when instinctive emotions like these are aroused that energies are liberated adequate to sweep away all obstacles and take complete mastery of our lives.'¹ He is able to do, from his experience as a doctor, many instances of permanent cures wrought by the liberation of these pent-up forces.

¹ *op. cit.*, p. 75.

It is not surprising to find that many now go on to say that all religious phenomena are susceptible of a similar explanation. Such an exposition is given, for instance, by Mr. Tansley in his widely read book on *The New Psychology*. Needing an explanation and a support for the impulses towards unification and the higher ethical life that come surging up from within, man projects them beyond himself on to an ideal source conceived of as without. 'The ideal,' he writes, 'may be projected upon God, represented as the Will of God, and when it is thus definitely externalized an added feeling of its security is often felt—the treasure is safe in a supernatural sanctuary. The mind, like an Indian juggler, can climb up a rope the end of which it has thrown into the heavens. But the mind may recognize the ideal as its own creation, into the likeness of which it tries to fashion reality, whether it is concerned with an ideal of conduct or personality, with a social ideal, or with something of more limited scope and more easily attained.'¹

The inadequacy of such an explanation is easy to see. In any exposition of religious experience we must of course be careful to allow for accretions and survivals of primitive custom and belief, but when all has been done, we are still left asking whether there are resident within us, regarded as individuals, powers that can—(a) Force men to perform unwelcome actions, to crucify self, to own the supremacy of the claims of morality; (b) Generate religious experiences which, as has been said, 'show themselves as spiritual forces of remarkable content and power, producing a lasting and growingly rich life, putting an end to inner strife, and endowing the subject with virtues he could never have acquired himself'; (c) Shift the whole levels of life for the race and raise humanity as a whole. 'Auto-suggestion' is a word of power to-day, but the most egotistic may well doubt whether his '*autos*' is capable of all this.

¹ *op. cit.*, pp. 139-140.

Here to be sure the whole criticism of idealism against materialism comes in once more. We have not only a new psychology, but a new materialism or sensationalism. In the eighteenth century Hume reduced all knowledge to impressions upon the senses and to the images of these impressions in ideas, and saw no need for a permanent self. Hume's successors no longer begin where he did. They have learnt, from McDougall, to start not from sensations but from the primary human instincts. But Kant's criticism of Hume is still relevant. It is no more possible to explain human experience from the working together of a group of instincts than from what Hume describes as 'a bundle or collection of different perceptions, which succeed each other with an inconceivable rapidity, and are in a perpetual flux and movement.' Modern rationalism has new tools to work with, but its tools are no more adequate to construct humanity than were those of its predecessors.

8. But it is necessary to follow a little further the thought of what the subconscious is. Is it true to say that the whole contents of the subconscious realm have been matters of experience, whether of the individual or of his ancestors? Must they all have passed through the consciousness, whether attended to or not? Another of Myers's metaphors suggests that some of them at least need not have done so. He compares our consciousness to the solar spectrum. There are rays beyond the red at one end and the violet at the other. So, says he, 'beyond each end of our conscious spectrum extends a range of faculty and perception exceeding the known range, but as yet indistinctly guessed.' Readers of his great work on *Human Personality* will remember the use that he makes of this idea in the explanation of certain obscure phenomena of supranormal perception and the like. But he goes further still when he writes—'The range of our subliminal mentation is more extended than the range of our supraliminal. At one end of the scale we find *dreams*, a normal

subliminal product, but of less practical value than any form of sane supraliminal thought. At the other end of the scale we find that the rarest, most precious knowledge comes to us from outside the ordinary field, through eminently subliminal processes.' It is more than a little confusing to have the same word 'subliminal' used to describe two such different groups of experience. It has been suggested that we need another word still, say 'super-conscious,' to express Myers's real meaning. But at any rate he means that only a part of the whole personality can express itself in the conscious life. It is not necessary to follow here the way in which this idea led him on towards his much longed-for faith in the life beyond the grave. Such a personality was, he was sure, 'not made for death.' Others have followed the same path. Thus Sir Oliver Lodge¹ writes—'There are grades of incarnation: the most thorough kind is that illustrated by our bodies; in them we are incarnate, but probably not even in that case is the incarnation complete. It is quite credible that our whole and entire personality is never terrestrially manifest.' Hence if the body be not the productive but the transmissive organ of the human personality, as is the piano of the player's music, it may limit the range of the self-manifestation of the human personality within consciousness. Such a thought finds many expressions in literature. One of the best is in Mrs. Browning's sonnet, 'The Soul's Expression':

With stammering lips and insufficient sound,
 I strive and struggle to deliver right
 That music of my nature, day and night
 With dream and thought and feeling, interwound.

This song of soul I struggle to outbear
 Through portals of the sense, sublime and whole,
 And utter all myself into the air:
 But if I did it—as the thunder-roll
 Breaks its own cloud—my flesh would perish there,
 Before that dread apocalypse of soul.

¹ *Life and Matter*, p. 123.

When we consider words like these we are again brought up against the old question of fact and explanation. Are we to say that the complete personality is present already, though disembodied, and is striving to express more of itself through our bodily organism? Or is it not truer to say that we have such strivings just because as yet we are not completely personal, but are always drawn out towards something beyond us? The teaching of Lotze that perfect personality belongs to God alone, and that we are growing upwards towards Him, points the way to understanding. That is why 'we who are in this tabernacle do groan being burdened.' If that is so, Lodge's explanation is needless. We are greater than we know not so much because of an unexpressed part of personality—though in Capt. Hadfield's sense that is true enough—as because of an unrealized destiny, because 'it hath not yet been made manifest what we shall be.'

4. It follows that the supposed fuller view of the subconscious does not take us much farther than the first. In so far, however, as it leaves open the possibility that influences may enter our subconscious life from beyond the limits of our own personality it may have something to tell us about religious experience. Let us start with James. In his *Varieties* he writes—'Let me then propose, as an hypothesis, that whatever it may be on its *farther* side, the 'more' with which in religious experience we feel ourselves connected is on its *hither* side the subconscious continuation of our conscious life. . . . The theologian's contention that the religious man is moved by an external power is vindicated, for it is one of the peculiarities of invasions from the subconscious region to take on objective appearances, and to suggest to the subject an external control. In the religious life the control is felt as 'higher'; but since on our hypothesis it is primarily the higher faculties of our own hidden mind which are controlling, the sense of union with the power beyond us is a sense of some-

thing, not merely apparently, but literally true.'¹ Such a conclusion is not helpful. It seems to mean that man objectifies the higher faculties of himself and regards the object thus created as external to his conscious self. It is true that James has something to say about the '*farther*' side of the subconscious—Myers's region beyond the violet rays—but he is vague and uncertain here. All that he says is that some of our ideal impulses originate in this region, and that it must be real since these impulses produce effects. But it does not seem possible from his exposition to show that religious experience brings men into contact with a living God.

Dr. Sanday made another attempt to explain the phenomena of the religious life from the facts of subconsciousness, going so far as to say that 'the proper seat or locus of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul is the subliminal self.'² He sought to prove this by analysing the religious consciousness. In our highest moments we find promptings coming from a hidden source within us. Finding in these promptings something which he is certain is higher than human, Sanday attributed it to the secret workings of the Spirit of God in the depths of personality, and quoted the words of St. Paul about the Spirit who helps our infirmity, and makes intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. In its degree this is undoubtedly true. Long ago Dr. W. B. Pope, writing about the mystery of grace and freewill, said—'In the secret recesses of man's nature the grace is given to yield.' But this is very different from affirming that the subconscious is the chief seat of the divine action. It does not seem that Sanday paid sufficient attention to the part played by our conscious self in the past in preparation for such promptings. Real impulses to prayer come for the most part to those who have formed the habit of prayer. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth,' but its breezes come

¹ *op. cit.*, p. 512 f.

² *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, p. 159.

to those whose sails are set to receive them. If it is true that in God 'we live and move and have our being,' so that He is to us an all-surrounding, all-sustaining Presence, then every influence that reaches us from Him is powerfully reinforced by all the subconscious tendencies created by our past experience. But the reality of religious experience is not safeguarded by saying that God only acts upon us by stimulating some of those tendencies. In ways more direct, in communications to our conscious self, especially on the ethical side, must the divine Spirit meet with the human if there is any real communion at all.

5. If now we ask whether this fuller view of the subconscious has anything that is vital to say as to the reality of religious experience we must again answer 'No!' It may help us to understand better the manner of our experiences, but it cannot decide as to their ultimate value. All the objections pressed above against the explanations of the more rationalistic writers on Psychology apply here with equal force. Dr. Rufus M. Jones, one of the most fruitful writers on these subjects, wrote in 1904—'The Christian minister of to-day is not anxiously reading books on biology. . . He is keenly watching the progress of psychology. . . . He has weathered geology and biology; can he peradventure bring his ship past this new headland?' The answer is becoming clearer. Psychology has much to teach us all about the mystery of human nature. It has much to say about the external phenomena of revivals of religion and of mysticism. But the verdict as to the ultimate truth of the devout man's confidence that he has met with God is beyond its scope. For that verdict we must turn back to the great masters of the spiritual life. To any who are troubled by the claims of psychology it may be suggested that they should turn back to John Wesley and ponder how long and how searchingly that keenly critical mind interrogated his own experience and that of his followers so that the danger of self-delusion might be avoided.

In the long run Wesley applied three tests. After saying that 'to require a more minute and philosophical account of the . . . criteria, or intrinsic marks, whereby we know the voice of God, is to make a demand which can never be answered; no, not by one who has the deepest knowledge of God,' he goes on to affirm—(a) There is an inherent essential difference between spiritual light and spiritual darkness, as great indeed as that between the light of the noonday sun and a glimmering taper. (b) This unique experience is confirmed by its moral power, manifested in the graces of Christian character and in positive works of goodness. (c) It is proved to be real by its repetition, with the presence of each of the previous marks, in the lives of many thousands of men and women. Wesley held and taught with great impressiveness that the ultimate source of all moral goodness is in God.

May we not say that the whole future of the Christian Church depends on its possession of this experimental knowledge of God? It may come to us through many channels, through the personal influence and teaching of others, and through the long line of Christian tradition and character. Yet we always recognize that though the broken bread is given by human hands the blessing comes from a higher source. And, beyond this mediated experience, to have direct and immediate communion with the source of all true life is, we believe, the right and the privilege of every Christian man. Only then shall we understand the full meaning of Charles Wesley's great hymn to the Holy Spirit:

God, *through Himself*, we then shall know,
 If Thou within us shine,
 And sound, with all Thy saints below,
 The depths of love divine.

WILFRID J. MOULTON.

THE RT. HON. GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL¹

THE present Spring and early Summer season is the third whose 'May meetings' miss from their platforms the pleasant presence of the best known among those nephews of Lord John (Earl) Russell, who lived and worked into the present century's first quarter. Like another scion of a political family, also an Harrovian, belonging to an earlier generation (Sir George Trevelyan), Mr. G. W. E. Russell found there had come the time when only the most iron of constitutions could combine literary productivity with Parliamentary and official work. Fifteen years in the House of Commons, including five of political office, gave George Russell just time enough to show his inheritance of the ancestral aptitude for public life, if not the iron physique which his ancestors had found not less necessary to public usefulness than the combined advantages of station and opportunity. 'I cannot,' Disraeli once said to Matthew Arnold, 'seriously do two things at once; when, therefore, I went in for politics in earnest I had to drop literature, and I envy you for never having had a like temptation.' Literature is not less hereditary in the Russell family than politics. When 'Lord John's' accomplished nephew followed Sir George Trevelyan's example and gave up his seat at St. Stephen's to occupy himself entirely with his pen, he was but obeying the same literary instinct, conspicuous not only in more than one of his own parliamentary ancestors, but also in one at least of the high Church and State sixteenth-century Northcotes, who found more attractions in their library and pen than in the wordy war of St. Stephen's. The Long Parliament's historian, also

¹ *A Pocketful of Sixpences* (1907) and *Afterthoughts* (1912), by G. W. E. Russell (E. Grant Richards, London); *Cheneys and the House of Russell*, by J. A. Froude (1879); *The Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone*, by G. W. E. Russell (Sampson Low, 1895).

a voluminous contributor to the *belles lettres* of his time, Thomas May, the sixteenth and seventeenth century Parliamentary official, though not a member of the House, in his various records of its doings presaged some at least of those various activities of the pen that were hereditary in the Russell line. Mr. George Russell's uncle, the historic Lord John himself, not only showed himself the literary heir of his sixteenth and seventeenth-century ancestors, but transmitted to his descendants, notably his nephew George, tastes and gifts which, had he never crossed the threshold of St. Stephen's, would have made him a link between the literary and political life of his time. More than six centuries of activity in State and Church, continued throughout successive generations, separated George Russell's entrance to the House of Commons as Mr. Gladstone's supporter in 1880 from the date when the Russell name and character first became known to that assembly in the person of the thirteenth-century John Russell, governor of Corfe Castle. With his descendant, a fifteenth-century Speaker of the Commons (1428-1450), begins the political story of the Russell family as represented by those who crowned its historic antecedents with the intellectual and political distinction belonging to our own times and augmented by none of the historic line with more fidelity to ancestral precedents than by the most earnest of its twentieth-century representatives now recalled.

'More,' wrote Froude, in the essay already mentioned, 'is expected from the sons of eminent parents than from other men, and if the transmitted quality be genuine, more comes out of them. It is not talent, which is only in part hereditary. The virtue that runs in the blood is superiority of courage or character. That, far more than cleverness, is the condition indispensable for national leaders.' The attribute thus described by the historian was transmitted in an unbroken succession throughout the Russell line. It was exemplified by no member of the

House more conscientiously and in its way usefully than by the cadet of the great family to whose high qualities and national service more than one tribute was paid at those gatherings which tend more and more to overflow the vernal limits that have given them their name.

But see our statesmen when the steam is on,
 And languid Johnny glows to glorious John !
 When Hampden's thought, by Falkland's muses dress'd,
 Lights the pale cheek, and swells the generous breast.

Bulwer Lytton's *New Timon*, from which these lines are taken, contained no happier portrait than this picture in words of G. W. E. Russell's famous uncle. Fidelity to the ancestral tradition of popular feeling, stronger than the silent consciousness of historic descent, had little to do with George Russell's self-dedication to things honourable, true, beneficent, and of good report, compared with the inspiring and directing influences of his early home life. His aunt by marriage, Lord Minto's daughter, had taken an interest in her nephew sustained throughout the first eighteen years of his political course. To know this great and good lady was of itself the best political and philanthropic training possible for a young politician who even before his public life began had prepared himself for the work of social and political reform. Her time for the most part was divided between Pembroke Lodge, Richmond Park, granted by the Crown to her husband for his life, and her son's house, Haslemere. Her long married life had given her the personal acquaintance of all that was most distinctive and interesting not only in the European but in the American life of her time. Before her marriage she had talked intimately with Thomas Moore; after it she had been the hostess and *confidante* of Carlyle, Tennyson, and Dickens. She was also one among the few Whig ladies by descent and marriage more than once characterized by Disraeli as the pride and inspiration of their order. It was fresh from Lady Russell's tea-table that Disraeli offered Carlyle a baronetcy or a G.C.B. The sage, in his

most characteristic manner of pride and reserve, told his patroness the next time he met her of his having refused both honours.

G. W. E. Russell's mother, Isabella Clarissa Davies by birth, of Penylan, Carmarthenshire, was scarcely a less remarkable person than her sister-in-law, George Russell's aunt. The two ladies shared the same literary interest, as indeed other intellectual tastes; they were further united by a common philanthropic interest in the welfare of the needy, in the intellectual as well as social civilization of the poorest classes. That tie between these two ladies, differing from each other so much as regards antecedents, habits, and tastes, went far towards explaining the common attraction for both of George Eliot's later novels, especially *Felix Holt* and *Daniel Deronda*. From boyhood a diligent reader of Disraeli's novels, George Russell, notwithstanding his lifelong literary receptiveness, was less impressed by the fascinating freshness of their literary style than by the doctrine of the social and moral obligation due from the well-to-do classes towards their less fortunate fellow citizens. The Christian Socialism of F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, and Thomas Hughes was before his time. Its traditions acted upon him as a social, moral, and spiritual force, giving a fresh impulse and a new sanction to his family traditions. Hence his lifelong sense of the obligations imposed upon the governing to the governed, and the spiritual not less than the moral responsibilities towards the masses of which wealth, power, influence in Church and State, could not well divest themselves. That constantly growing and deepening sense explains far better than any doctrinal preference Russell's connexion with the ritualistic party, because, as it seemed to him, the highest Churchmanship of his time, on its spiritual as well as on its social side, was in the closest sympathy with the divine Founder. Hence, too, his interest in that aspect of conservative thought, and especially those of Disraeli's novels, which, like *Sybil* and

Tancred, illustrated with a lasting charm and force the opportunities and obligations of the National Church and its leaders, lay not less than clerical, of ever rendering their generation the religious and secular service for lack of which the souls and bodies of the multitude perish.

Next to family traditions and influences, school and college made George Russell the loyal servant of his generation that throughout his whole course, literary not less than political, till its close (March 17, 1919), he continued to be. Vaughan had ceased to be Harrow head master before George Russell's school-time began; his spirit still animated the place, the most fervent and impressive of his staff were still among its teachers. Conspicuous in that number was F. W. Farrar, afterwards Canon of Westminster and Dean of Canterbury. With boys of character or temperament congenial to his own Farrar's influence for good of every kind was deep and often lifelong. In another of the Harrow masters, B. F. Westcott, subsequently Bishop of Durham, there resided a spiritual influence that might almost be called a contagion of holiness. So intensely devotional seemed the spirit exhaled by this good and great man as to make it a tradition of Russell's times that he prepared his sermons for the school chapel in a posture of prayer. George Russell's school friendships were part of himself: that with one at least of his Harrow masters bore some political and public fruit worth mentioning. In 1890 Westcott, the greatest and the most spiritually-minded theologian of his old school's staff, became Bishop of Durham. Two years later the proposed 18½ per cent. reduction on the Durham colliery wages provoked a strike of the miners, throwing close on 100,000 men out of employment. The immediate consequence was the suspension of the chief manufactures throughout the district. The Durham diocesan, now in the second year of his office, needed no external influence to play the part of peacemaker. George Russell, however, accidentally met him at the time; the conversation

turned on the mediatorial opportunities of the Church in the war between capital and labour. Russell, then member for North Bedford, most enthusiastic as well as growingly influential of Gladstonian M.P.'s, conferred with the miners' representative at Westminster, Mr. Thomas Burt, with the result that on the first day of June, 1892, the episcopal residence, Auckland Castle, witnessed a thoroughly representative gathering of mine owners and workers. Bishop Westcott, if his speech did not actually open the convention, brought together all the points in dispute. Mr. Burt, among the earliest of collier M.P.'s, present largely at George Russell's request, struck the conciliatory keynote of the conversation which followed. The result was the compromise whose terms restored industrial peace on Tyneside. Bishop Westcott, who had surprised as well as gratified his hearers by his mastery of the essential facts and figures, proposed to substitute a reduction of 10 per cent. for the 18½ per cent. originally demanded by the owners. The proposal was approved by masters and men. The injury done by the struggle to Wear and Tyne manufacturers could not, of course, at once be made good; but George Russell, at the Bishop's instance and by his co-operation in detail with Mr. Burt, had found means of generally improving the relations of masters and men. The success attending the episcopal intervention was felt at the time to have been promoted by George Russell's good offices under Thomas Burt's direction; they formed at least the useful preliminaries to the Auckland Castle meeting. With heart and soul deeply fixed on the living present, George Russell, by family rather than personal associations, habitually interested the House of Commons, chiefly during the tea-room intervals of debate, by recalling personal and political incidents connecting its present with its past. Lord John Russell died as Earl Russell three years before Lord Beaconsfield, his junior by a little more than a decade, though recent!y showing more signs of age.

than himself. Old age throughout Europe had its day towards the close of the seventies. The venerable J. G. Hubbard was member for London City, his contemporaries, Gortschakoff and Thiers, were chief among the personal forces that ruled Europe. In the spring of 1876 Lord Russell's pale face and slight figure were often rekindled by much of their old fire. Disraeli himself, not yet Earl Beaconsfield, still ruled his party and the chamber in which he retained his seat. His old Lower House opponent, now Earl Russell, seemed to have entered upon a rejuvenation something like that recently experienced by Disraeli himself. 'Ah,' murmured the Lord John of former days, apropos of the veteran with whom he had so often crossed swords, 'Disraeli is getting very old!' As a fact, Disraeli's apparent recovery of health was in steady progress when his old opponent thus dwelt on his advancing years. George Russell's chief contribution to political biography, mentioned at the head of this writing, does not ignore the resistance offered by Mr. Gladstone to the secularizing treatment of the Irish Church by the Whigs in general, and Lord John Russell in particular, during the period of the Gladstonian 'stern and unbending' Toryism. Lord John's own biography in the series containing Mr. Russell's *Gladstone* was written by Mr. Stuart Reid, and contains a document, then published for the first time, of equal Gladstonian and Russellian importance. The wisest system for conciliating Ireland, wrote Russell in his *Life of Fox*, had yet to be discovered. The same Whig veteran, addressing Chichester Fortescue (January, 1869), generally indicated Gladstone as his successor, and specially spoke of him as a statesman who might yet seek to perform a permanent and immortal service to his country by endeavouring to reconcile England and Ireland.

On that subject the Gladstonian development was not appreciably influenced by any Whig friendships or ideas. The Whig tradition during Mr. Gladstone's earlier

manhood had been in favour of complete justice, even generosity, to our fellow subjects on the other side of St. George's Channel, but had excluded any approach to actual Home Rule. As regards Ireland, the Whig faith and practice personified by the Russell connexion, from a material point of view, was so distinctly anti-Irish that in 1888, during the Irish Church Regulation debate, Lord Althorp, the supreme Whig chief, would have failed to carry the measure had he not sacrificed the appropriation clause. And this, though that provision contained the whole principle of the Bill itself—the right of Parliament to apply ecclesiastical property to secular uses. Lord Russell's recognition in Gladstone of the qualities necessary for Liberal leadership has already been mentioned. The qualities, however, on which the Whig chief based his opinion were to be fully witnessed only by his nephew, who for the first time, with much literary skill, interest, and instructiveness entirely his own, traced his old leader's progressive divorce from the strait ecclesiasticism of Oxford days and influences. That development, as was first made plain by Mr. Russell, owed little or nothing to Earl Russell himself or indeed to any other political preceptor; it was the expression of his political growth in a direction incidental to his own spiritual rather than political progress. As Mr. Russell reminds us, Mr. Gladstone's Liberal career opened in July, 1865, when he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Russell Ministry. He could not indeed accept the Radical motion hostile to the Irish Church Establishment; yet he admitted that as representing only one-eighth or ninth of the whole community, this Church was in a false position. From that declaration dated the knowledge that the Gladstonian statesmanship of the future would overthrow the alien establishment on the other side of St. George's Channel. So explicitly declared Sir Stafford Northcote and Chief Justice Whiteside (*Russell's Gladstone*, p. 168). This deliverance it was which portended

the inevitable and imminent separation of its maker from the old Church and State party whose ornament and hope he had so far been. His Oxford seat was now imperilled, or rather, already doomed. He was about to go to Manchester and in his own words, to go 'unmuzzled.' That development had been foreseen not only by the academic friends with whom in earlier days Mr. G. W. E. Russell lived much, but by Mr. Gladstone's chief, Lord Palmerston himself—'keep him in Oxford, and he is partially muzzled, but send him elsewhere and he will run wild.'

Family associations combined with a zeal for ecclesiastical independence to make George Russell the most earnest of Gladstonians, several years before he could support his leader with a vote at St. Stephen's. Tories and even moderate Whigs on the eve of the Victorian Age professed their horror at Lord John Russell's proposed secularization of the Irish Church revenues. Lord John's perseverance eventually enabled him to secure his point by a majority of twenty-seven votes. In the same way, more than a generation afterwards, the Gladstonian resolution for Irish Church Disestablishment won its way at Westminster. George Russell thus saw an episode of his family's politics repeated when in 1869 the Liberal leader, the statesman of his choice, showed himself a mightier instrument of legislation than Mr. Russell's famous relative, even in his own department of political enterprise.

Disraeli, in his *Runnymede Letters*, rallied Mr. Russell's famous uncle on his union of 'a strong ambition with a feeble intellect, tending to convert an aspiring youth into a querulous and discontented age.' That development was not fulfilled in the first Earl Russell's case. The evening of his life at Pembroke Lodge in Richmond Park was marked by a serenity of temper becoming the greatness of his course, as well as in an interesting and congenial environment. In the little grounds of his house stood a wind-gauge of his own invention. Among the historic treasures within was

a medal struck by the City Jews (July 26, 1858), and bearing the words :—

Have we not one Father !—
Hath not one God created us !

Lord Russell thus lived to see David Salomons the first Jewish Sheriff as well as Lord Mayor, and to read Sir Moses Montefiore's name in the list of City knights. It had taken a little less than a quarter of a century for the extension of equal citizenship to the chosen people. The struggle began in 1835 ; it ended when Baron Rothschild (1858) took his seat as member for the City.

To champion the cause of civil and religious liberty had a high place among the 'plain Whig principles' emphasized at each successive point in his career by Lord John. The influences of birth, training, and early association were apt to interfere, as in the case of his nephew George they never did, with the demands of full justice to the character and effects of the Methodism which formed a real preparation for that genuinely Anglican product, the Oxford movement. The reforming work of the Wesleys was never in truth estimated at its full and real value by G. W. E. Russell's famous uncle, in whom, to tell the truth, early Church and State associations had developed more of the stern, unbending Toryism than even Macaulay discovered in Mr. Gladstone. As a fact, Lord John's first tendency was to depreciate the evangelicalism of Whitefield and Wesley, and to charge it with producing a kind of paroxysm sometimes in some of its effects mischievous rather than beneficial, while it was always liable to be followed by a lassitude producing great moral and religious mischief (Vaughan's *Essays*, Vol. I., p. 52). Southey's *Life of Wesley* and Nightingale's *Portraiture of Methodism* were full of varied and interesting instruction for popular readers : they were not quarries from which, as Dr. Robert Vaughan shows, a serious biographer should have hewn his facts. Mr. G. W. E. Russell himself used to admit

that his illustrious uncle, in referring to the earliest eighteenth-century religious revival, did not always draw his conclusions from the most trustworthy evidence supplied by historic writers on the subject.

His criticism based on partial and imperfect knowledge has already been cited by Disraeli as one of Lord John's besetting weaknesses. As a consequence the Whig leader of Mr. Russell's early youth did much less justice to the first great eighteenth-century religious revival than was done by his nephew. 'Very Methodistical' might have been Lord John's description of the methods pursued by the religious revivalists. Any reproach inherent in the estimate could never have been endorsed by Mr. Russell himself. The religious atmosphere of Mr. Russell's early days was agitated by confusing and disturbing influences, constantly changing in their character or in generation after generation mingling with fresh forces of unsettlement. From all experiences like these, Mr. Russell came forth with a faith in Christian revelation and development not shaken but strengthened, ever more and more forming an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast. Earnest religious convictions and devotion to the duties they inspired were the spiritual inheritance of his childhood and the dominating note of his youth and early manhood. The English classics, headed by Shakespeare, had been the favourite literary nourishment of his home circle from childhood. He grew up with an ever-increasing delight in our national poet; while during his visits to Hawarden or his long walks with Mr. Gladstone under the Buckinghamshire beeches, his own endless power of Shakespearean quotation often set his political master on capping some Shakespearean passage with Homeric lines suggesting some resemblance or analogy to thought or phrase in George Russell's Shakespearean quotation. The aptest of Virgilian tags did not rise more readily to the lips of the younger Pitt amid the inspiration of debate than, whatever the subject of conversation,

George Russell spontaneously illustrated it by some feather from the plumage of the Swan of Avon. A monthly magazine for whose conduct the present writer was then responsible had published an article attracting much attention, with the seventh letter of the alphabet by way of signature. It was variously attributed to several well-known people whose name contained that letter, in each case without the slightest foundation on fact. Amongst those thus mentioned was George Russell. At a certain dinner-table conversation had no sooner turned on the subject than Mr. Russell, who happened to be of the party, disposed of the rumours connecting his name with the composition by repeating some strikingly apt lines from the first act of *King Richard III* :—

He from the cross-row plucks the letter G,
And, for my name of George begins with G,
It follows in his thought that I am he.

The zeal of the Whigs in general, and of the first Earl Russell in particular, for the cause of religious as well as civil freedom, did not save George Russell's uncle from Robert Vaughan's criticism of 'not distinguishing, in the spirit of a high Christian philosophy, between the wisdom and the folly, the good and the evil, of the great moral revolution brought about among the English people by those called Methodists' (Vaughan's *Essays*, Vol. I., p. 58). That criticism, however true, of the famous uncle, would be entirely inapplicable to his favourite nephew. Oxford and personal accidents first drew George Russell to Pusey, Liddon, and Bright, less as Anglican leaders than as spiritual lights for an age and a nation darkened by indifference to the higher interests of life. It was in conversation with the great Christ-Church theologian that George Russell heard him regret the modern evangelical decadence; 'They have lost,' he said with a sigh, 'the unction.' George Russell himself took a more hopeful view. It was not so much the Anglo-Catholic ritual or creed that chiefly appealed to Russell

in those who came after Pusey, as the practical fidelity to the apostolic example of caring for the most necessitous and the meanest of their fellow creatures which first won George Russell's admiration for those who, like the Wells Street clergy and the apostle of the London docks, Charles Stanton, made their lives a continual sacrifice for their outcast fellow creatures.

As he grew up he saw the most self-sacrificing and successful of these home missionaries in the men who had grafted the philanthropy of John Howard and Wilberforce upon the High Church or Ritualistic stock. It thus became George Russell's life-labour to quicken, as well as physically and spiritually to adapt Whig philanthropy to those necessities and evils in which he saw a growing cause of social, moral, as well as political mischief. This work no weariness in well doing, no lassitude born of health often unsatisfactory, or the discouraging effects of slow progress and apparent failure, prevented his continuously pursuing to the last. His brave but often exhausted spirit found inspiration not only in the consciousness of duty upon the whole successfully performed, or at least never shirked, but in that species of literary composition a natural taste for which had been strengthened and trained by his intimacy, itself due in the first place to family traditions, with Matthew Arnold. To serve his generation in all the opportunities he could command and in all the causes that seemed to him of the most vital moment was the single and successfully accomplished object of the man whose influence for good still survives, and the readable variety of whose writings is itself the monument of well-directed industry pursued with success from early youth till the threshold of middle age had been crossed.

'The honour of the school' was an old Harrow motto, if not often audibly on his lips, yet constantly inspiring George Russell's action and guiding his course. As a frequent listener in those days to House of Commons debates,

I recall two instances in which George Russell decisively proved his inheritance of the Parliamentary aptitudes marking in a greater or less degree every generation of his family at St. Stephen's. The first of these instances belonged to the year after he first entered the House as a Gladstonian member. On that occasion the Irish Coercion Bill was the subject, on which he spoke with a temper and a mastery of his subject, as well, as he went on, of his audience, winning the plaudits of the assembly equally for the performance itself and the promise that it gave. Later in the same year (July, 1881) he crossed swords on the third reading of the Irish Land Bill with no less an opponent than Lord Randolph Churchill, who, prevented from moving an amendment on the proposal before the House, opened a general attack upon the Gladstonian policy in Ireland. The Fourth Party creator and leader had attacked the Government in Disraelian temper and phrase for plundering the friends of English supremacy on the other side of St. George's Channel that they might bribe the enemies of English rule and gloat over the murdered majesty of law itself, now 'as dead as the mummied inhabitants of an Egyptian tomb.' This immediately brought up George Russell on the ministerial side; the Randolphian invectives and taunts, all couched in the choicest Disraelian phrase, were answered by Mr. Russell in a speech full of the best Parliamentary point and flavour. This, by the way, was not only a duel between two younger Parliamentary bloods, but the occasion of a new party movement. Sir Stafford Northcote, then nominally the Conservative leader, left his seat on the front Opposition bench. 'Elijah's mantle,' to use the Randolphian phrase, had now fairly fallen on the ducal scion whom John Bright, with felicitous forgetfulness of the ducal borough's exact name, had called 'the member for Woodcock.'

T. H. S. ESCOTT.

THE ALLEGED EARLY MARTYRDOM OF THE APOSTLE JOHN

IN recent years radical critics like Wellhausen, Schmiedel, Moffatt, and Bacon, in order to discredit John's authorship of the Fourth Gospel, have seized upon a story that is supposed to go back to ancient times that he was martyred, and presumably early. What are the reasons for this, and are they valid over against the unanimous tradition of the second century that he lived to old age and wrote the Gospel? It will be convenient to take Charles's exhaustive summary of the evidence in the introduction to his great *Commentary of Revelation* (1920), pp. xlv.-l. For clearness, as we come to each piece in Charles let us estimate it before we pass to the next.

1. Christ prophesied that James and John would drink of His cup and be baptized with His baptism (Mark x. 38, 39). This means that they were to be put to death as He was, — 'the same destiny that awaits Himself,' says Charles. This came true of James (Acts xii. 2), it must also of John. Well, if we must take Christ's prophecies *au pied de la lettre*, it did not become true of even James. Christ was put to death with lingering agonies and with immeasurable disgrace, James with the instantaneous and comparatively honourable dispatch with the sword. But is it necessary to interpret Christ so very literally? The radicals themselves would do it in no other case. No apostle could live in the first century without undergoing a baptism which in the imagery of the East could be compared to Christ's, whether actually put to death or not. Much more John, on account of his long life, whether or not it was he who suffered on Patmos. Exile and work in the mines was a punishment so horrible in antiquity that it was not much to be preferred to death itself. Mark x. 39 does not require the slaying of John, except on a hard Western literalism.

2. (a) A monk of the ninth century, Georgios Harmartolos (George the Sinner), is thought (since 1859, when Muralt published an edition of his works in Petrograd, and especially since 1862, when Nolte discussed the matter in *Theologische Quartalschrift*) to have said that John survived the rest of the Twelve and then suffered as a martyr, 'for Papias [first half of second century], the bishop of Hierapolis, having been an eye-witness of him, says in the second book of his *Oracles of the Lord* that he was slain by the Jews, having, as is clear, with his brother James, fulfilled the prediction of Christ . . . "Ye shall drink my cup."' Now, inasmuch as Eusebius the historian (about 324) was thoroughly acquainted with Papias, and was especially anxious to get information about the lives and deaths of the apostles, and knows nothing of any such statement, the very careful Lightfoot in 1875 says downright that George 'cannot be quoting directly from Papias, for Papias cannot have reported the martyrdom of John.'¹ Lightfoot assumes that in a copy of an intermediate writer which George followed, words had dropped out, and what the writer really said is probably this: Papias says that John witnessing was condemned by the Roman emperor to Patmos, while James was slain by the Jews. But it is now known that the above words are only in one manuscript of George, and that there they are evidently an interpolation. This manuscript is a working over of George's chronicle with excerpts from different writers. In the chronicle itself, and in fact later in this manuscript, several patristic witnesses are quoted, all of which speak of the peaceful death and burial of John the apostle, in Ephesus.²

(b) There is a manuscript in Oxford of the seventh or eighth century which purports to give an epitome of the Chronicle of Philip of Side, of the fifth century, which says :

¹ *Essays on the Work, 'Supernatural Religion,'* 1869, 212.

² See Zahn, *Die Apostelschüler in der Provinz Asien*, in his *Forschungen zur Geschichte*, u.s.w. vi. 147-8 (1900).

' Papias in the second book says that John the Divine and James, his brother, were slain by the Jews ' (published by De Boor in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 1888, ii. 170). Here again we have a late interpolation into Philip's Chronicle, or Philip himself, who was a ' wild historian,' was quoting at second-hand from worthless authorities, who could not have read Papias, or, if they did, quoted him wrongly or interpolated him.¹ For, however ' advanced ' New Testament critics may like to avail themselves of an eighth-century manuscript against positive witnesses of the second and third centuries, when historians trained to the weighing of evidence—even so very liberal an one as Harnack—speak on these De Boor fragments they hold another language. For even Harnack says: ' As little as Papias could have written that Paul died a natural death, so little could he have written that John was murdered by the Jews, unless it might be that he meant another John, the presbyter [which he could not, for the excerpt says John the Divine and his brother James]. But this is not even probable; for as his (Papias's) readers, Irenaeus first, held the presbyter John as the apostle, then the violent death of the presbyter (elder) must have been indicated in the older literature. This, however, is not only not the case, but the very old *Mestase* of John—probably second century—relates something altogether different.'² On evidence as flimsy as this you could support any superstition of the Roman Church, say, perhaps, the removal through the air of the Holy House of Loretto.

3. Clement of Alexandria quotes in his *Stromata*, iv. 9 (about 200), Heracleon, a Valentinian Gnostic of about 145, as saying that ' Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others confessed with the confession made with the voice, and departed.' The inference is that they were not martyred

¹ This is shown at length by Chapman, *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1911, 95-99.

² *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, i. 666 (Leipzig, 1897).

by death, and as he does not mention John the further inference is that he was martyred by death. This is a very risky inference. For (1) Heracleon does not say they were not put to death, and old legends have it that some were put to death; (2) he is not giving an exhaustive, much less exact, account of what became of each of the apostles (he makes Matthew and Levi different persons), but a general statement that some gave their witness for Christ by word of mouth. He says nothing about John one way or the other. Why should he, when John fought the Gnostic beginnings?

4. In the ungenue and late *Martyrium Andreæ* the worthless story is given that the apostles cast lots to see to which land or people they should go. As a result Peter 'was allotted to the circumcision, James and John to the east, Philip to the cities of Samaria and Asia,' &c. Since there is no mention of any residence of John in Asia, why, he never lived there! But there is no mention in the *Martyrium* that Peter resided in Rome and was martyred there, in spite of his being assigned to the circumcision. And I suppose the lot could have indicated the east for John, and Providence later Asia Minor.

5. Clement of Alexandria in *Stromata* vii. 17, says that the teaching 'of the apostles, embracing the ministry of Paul, ends with Nero.' 'These words presuppose,' says Charles, 'the death of all the apostles before 70.' Do they? They neither say it, nor imply it. Clement is arguing for the lateness of the heretics as compared with the Church teaching,—'their human assemblies were posterior to the catholic Church.' For Christ finished His teaching, He says, in the middle of the times of Tiberius, and the ministry of the apostles was completed by the end of Nero, the heresies coming later. But Clement, with the disregard common to all antiquity for close historic accuracy, is speaking only generally, for we know that the teaching of Christ did not begin with Augustus, that some apostles in all likelihood

survived the year 68, and God knows there were enough heresies before Hadrian! While John's ministry was full and perfected (τελειώθη) by the time of the death of Nero, Clement does not say that his life might not have extended beyond.

6. Charles says that a 'tradition of John's martyrdom is attested in Chrysostom's *Homily 66* on Matthew (20, 28, about A.D. 389). Chrysostom speaks of no tradition whatever, but is giving in the most general homiletic style the meaning of Christ, that 'Ye shall be counted worthy of martyrdom, shall suffer these things which I suffer, and shall close your life by a violent death' (p. 399 of *P.-N. F.*). On a point of historical minuteness as to the relative difference between the later fates of James and John, Chrysostom says nothing. But when in this same series of Homilies he comes to speak definitely of John's later life, he says that he 'lived a long time after the taking of the city' (*Hom. 76, 2, p. 458, col. 1*), that is, a long time after 70.

7. There seems to be a reference in Gregory of Nyssa (about 385) to Peter, James, and John as martyrs; but even Charles rejects this passage as proving what it is brought forward to prove, and therefore we might dismiss it were it not that it gives us welcome light here, as Gregory explains why in the third, fourth, and following centuries John also could be entered upon the list of martyrs. I follow Harnack, who reproduces Gregory's words mostly in Greek, partly in German. Harnack says: 'In the address on Basil (year 379) Gregory relates that it is customary in the Church to celebrate the festival of Stephen, Peter, James, John, and Paul after the Christmas festival (*Migne*, vol. 46, col. 789). In an earlier address upon Stephen (col. 725), however, he explains why these heroes are celebrated together. Gregory says that the apostles must follow upon the protomartyr (Stephen), "for neither martyrs without apostles nor again apostles without these. All the dear stones struck together this Stephen—the

divinest heralds of the gospels, after which the martyrs and after these again those shining through with saving virtue—chiefly those at present remembering much and lighting the lamp, the beauty of piety,—I speak of Peter and James and John, those leaders of the apostolic chorus and crowns of the ecclesiastical glory.” Moreover, these “majestic ones had to-day attested themselves by their witnessings for Christ, though in different ways of witnessing,” viz., Peter crucified, James beheaded, and John first accomplished an oil martyrdom, and further attested his martyrdom by his constant will to die for the name of Christ.’¹

The legend of John’s immersion in boiling oil in Rome during the persecution of Domitian (reigned 81–96), from which he emerged unscathed, goes back to about 200, viz., Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.* 36, and was widely believed in following times. This martyrdom in effect gave the honour the Church wished for him, and thus enabled her writers and calendar compilers to class him with the apostles who had really given up their lives.

8. Charles brings in the Muratorian Canon, and though it really has no bearing on the alleged early martyrdom of John a word must be given to it. He thinks it makes Revelation earlier than Paul’s epistles because it says: ‘The blessed apostle Paul, following the rule of his predecessor John, writes to no more than seven churches by name, in this order: the first to the Corinthians,’ &c. The Canon belongs to about 180, and is a fragment and anonymous. We know that Paul did not follow the rule of John or of any one else. Knowing that John was an apostle before Paul, and that John wrote to seven churches, the author of the Canon, without giving any critical judgment as to priority of Revelation over Paul’s epistles, of which he probably knew nothing, says in passing—‘following the ordinem of his predecessor John.’ All we can

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1909, col. 11.

build on this is that the author believed that John wrote Revelation. These radical critics build a pyramid on a very acute apex. Charles makes two other large inferences without sufficient foundation, viz. that the Muratorian Canon represents composition of John's Gospel prior to the dispersion of the apostles, and plainly states the revision of that Gospel. And this is the apex-foundation: 'The fourth Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples. When his fellow disciples and bishops entreated him [here the author of the Canon assumes only that there were fellow workers around and even bishops, which last would seem to point to a late time], he said: Fast ye now with me for the space of three days, and let us recount to each other whatever may be revealed to each of us. On the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should narrate all things in his own name, all recalling.' Of course the whole story is a legend, the only true kernel being the fact that the author believed that John wrote the Gospel, and that at about 180 there apparently was no other belief known. The context seems to require the ordinary meaning of *recognoscentibus* as recalling, but even if it means certifying or reviewing it does not mean that after John wrote his Gospel it was revised.

9. The anonymous *De Rebaptismate* against Cyprian in favour of the Roman practice of not rebaptizing those baptized by schismatics or heretics, written between 250 and 300, says: 'He said to the sons of Zebedee: Are ye able? For he knew the men had to be baptized, not only in water, but also in their own blood.' Here also we have one of those general statements which prove nothing unless we knew (1) that the writer intended deliberately to include John with James in the latter's fate, and (2) that 'in their own blood' he meant not simply sufferings and bloodshed, but actual death by bloodshed.

10. The same lack of definiteness in uncritical general statements is that of Aphraates (844), 'James and John

walked in the footsteps of their Master Christ.' Would Aphraates be satisfied if John suffered but was not slain, or did he think he was slain in his old age?

11. Lastly, one of the flimsiest of all the reasons for the early martyrdom of John is the fact that he is entered with James opposite the date in fifth-century calendars or martyrologies. For instance, 'Dec. 27 John and James, the apostles in Jerusalem.' But men who are known not to have been martyred at all were enrolled in these lists. They were drawn up in haphazard way, their compilers had to put some one opposite each date, and since James and John were associated together they naturally were written together in the calendars, which are without any critical value. Everyone knows that John was not killed when James was, and that he was killed before 70, as Charles thinks, is a pure hypothesis for which there is no certain evidence. Says Harnack, in reviewing these calendar entries: 'The usual ancient celebration of Peter, John, and Paul immediately after Stephen was originally no martyr-celebration, but the choir of the leading apostles who witnessed for Christ was to be celebrated after the Protomartyr. Perhaps this order in the Church is older than the emergence of the Christmas festival in the East on the 25 December [last part of fourth century]; but one need not settle this now. It is very easy to understand, however—the persons to be celebrated according to the calendars were almost all martyrs, and the days dedicated to them were, therefore, martyrs' memorial days—that soon the original motive vanished, and the celebration was understood as a martyr-celebration, especially as Stephen the Protomartyr—stood first. Perhaps Aphraates so conceived it when he wrote in *Hom.* 21 [see above]. To reckon John among the martyrs was not difficult, as the legend of his oil-martyrdom was widely spread in the Church.'¹ In the same review he says of these very late quoted alleged Papias sentences:

¹ *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1909, 11-12.

‘The alleged Papias-witness is so recent and in its terms so confused that it is an entirely uncritical caprice to prefer that to the choir of opposing witnesses.’

A word in closing on these opposing witnesses. They are early, they are clear, they are undisputed. From the standpoint of historical evidence they have all the notes of authenticity lacking in the late testimonies recently brought in for the new view of the early martyrdom of John. Polycarp was the disciple of John, later bishop of Smyrna, martyred at the age of 86 in about 155. Irenaeus was the pupil of Polycarp, lived in Asia Minor, later in Rome, later bishop of Lyon in Gaul, who wrote about 180. As to Polycarp’s relation to the apostles see Irenaeus iii., 8, 4. In his letter to Florinus, his brother pupil of Polycarp, Irenaeus says: ‘These are not the teachings which the elders who preceded us and who lived after the apostles handed down to thee; for I saw thee when I was still a child in lower Asia with Polycarp. . . . And I could still show the place where he sat when he taught and gave an account of his relations with John and with the others who saw the Lord, and how he spoke of what he had heard from them respecting the Lord, His miracles, and His doctrine, and how he recounted, in full accord with the Scriptures, all that which he had received from eye-witnesses of the Word of life’ (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 5, 20). Irenaeus says again: ‘All the elders who met with John, the disciple of the Lord, in Asia, give testimony that he conveyed to them these things; for he lived with them, even to time of Trajan [began to reign, 98]. And some among them saw not only John, but also other apostles’ (ii. 22, 5). The context shows that Irenaeus uses the word disciple as equivalent to apostle, just as the Gospels frequently do. ‘Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, he who leaned on His breast, published the Gospel while he dwelt in Ephesus in Asia’ (iii. 1, 1). ‘The church of Ephesus which was founded by Paul, and in which John lived until

the time of Trajan, is also a truthful witness of the tradition of the apostles' (iii. 8, 4). In his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, Irenaeus says that Polycarp had observed the 14th of Nisan as Paschal day 'with John the disciple of the Lord and the other apostles with whom he had lived' (in Eus. *H.E.* 5, 24). There are other testimonies of the second century which connect John with Ephesus. Charles seeks to break the force of Irenaeus's testimony by saying that he was occasionally inaccurate, but the points alleged to prove this are trivial, and some do not prove it. We cannot say from 8, 12, 15 that he confused the two Jameses. Irenaeus was not a Plato, but one does not have to be an Augustine to testify to what he has seen and heard and known.

If the reader wants more light, see Ramsay, *The First Christian Century*, 1911; J. Armitage Robinson, *Historical Character of St. John's Gospel*, 1908; Bernard, *Studia Sacra*, 1917; Chapman, *John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel*, 1911, and the still very important books by Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, 1908, and Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel*, 1904. See also Iverach, in *International Standard Bible Encyc.*, iii. 1707-8 (1915).

J. A. FAULKNER.

Notes and Discussions

BERNARD LUCAS

THE Rev. Bernard Lucas, who died at Bournemouth on February 20, will be remembered in the London Missionary Society as a most wise administrator and counsellor. From 1886 to 1920 he worked in South India, and when death seized him he had not abandoned the hope of returning to Bangalore. He was a great missionary, but by his writings he touched a wide circle of readers who knew little of his work in India; and it is fitting that something should be said of him as a writer. In 1904 there appeared a book by 'a Disciple' with the title *The Faith of a Christian*. It attracted so much attention that in 1905 Macmillans brought out a popular sixpenny edition. There was much speculation upon the authorship, and some bad shots were made; it came as a surprise when the 'Disciple' was identified as the Rev. Bernard Lucas. The book is marked by a union of logical severity with a warmth of experience; the style is grave and clear without any attempts at cleverness or extravagance of statement; the book, indeed, strikes the reader as the work of a man who sought simply and directly to state what had come to him in his experience as divine truth. He is never afraid of the big themes. He deals with the relation of God to the universe, with the problem of moral evil, with the restoration of man, with the doctrine of the Trinity. As an example of his admirable diagnosis the passage may be quoted in which pessimism and optimism are contrasted: 'The error of both pessimism, and its opposite system, optimism, is practically the same. They each leave out one of the two factors without which life is inexplicable. Those two factors are the divine purpose, as it is revealed in man's constitution, and the equally important human self-assertion as revealed in man's history. Pessimism sees too much, and infers too little; optimism infers too much and sees too little. The pessimist sees only the self-assertion of man with its terrible consequences; he draws no inference as to a very different purpose which man's constitution prophesies. The optimist draws his inference from the prophecy, and shuts his eyes to the very different fulfilment revealed in man's actual history. To neither, therefore, is there any moral problem to discuss. Where all is evil there is no good to which it can be opposed. What good there seems to be is a pure delusion. Where all is as good as it is possible to be, there is equally no evil to which that good is opposed. What evil there seems to be is a delusion. The moral problem confronts us with its perplexity when the prophecy in man's nature is contrasted with the actual in his history.'

This quotation will show how the problems which Lucas had to meet in India had absorbed his mind ; and how true was his insight into the real questions at issue between Hindu thought and Christianity. When once the clue is given, it is not difficult to see that the 'Disciple' was a missionary whose mind had been disciplined by his experiences in India. The Indian scene had brought into sharp relief the distinctive truth and power of the gospel. The writer saw definitely what India had to give to the unfolding of Christian truth ; but the spell of India never made him cease from being a missionary ; he knew that Christ had something to give, without which the Indian mind would grope in vain after the last realities of this world and eternity.

In recent years many books of general interest have come from missionaries in India. We need only refer to Professor Hogg's *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, or to *The Incarnation of God*, or to *The Great Church Awakes*. But among these notable books from the Indian scene there must be a place found for *The Faith of a Christian*, and it is interesting to know that it is translated into Chinese. No doubt the author would have written had he settled in England, but it is equally clear that his books would have been different in outlook and perspective.

Of the books which followed it is enough to mention *Conversations with Christ*, a work translated into German by the express wish of the ex-Kaiser. There is a story that he inquired of a company of English divines what they knew of Bernard Lucas ; and was surprised to find that his name was little known. A better-known work was *The Fifth Gospel*, a valuable attempt to read the Gospel as it was interpreted by the Apostle Paul ; everything is made to follow upon the personal experience of Paul himself. 'His presentation of Christianity, when it is translated into the language of modern thought, is as applicable to-day as it was in the first century. We need to get back to Paul in our estimate of the great facts of the Christian faith, quite as much as we need to get back to Christ. If to Jesus we owe the true revelation of God, to Paul we owe the true revelation of the Christ.' To unfold this thesis the book is written ; and in spite of the vast literature which gathers around the Apostle, there is still and there is likely to be a value in this experimental treatise. His treatment, for example, of the Cross in close relation to Paul's experience is an illuminating piece of work ; 'Paul had seen himself standing as it were among the religious leaders of his nation taking part in that death,' ; but after the light came to him 'he identified himself no longer with the slayers, but with their victim. He felt that he had been spared, but at the sacrifice of the Son of God.' In such ways as this Lucas approached his theme ; and it is not difficult to imagine how living a book he would make of so great a subject.

Some of his later books had to do directly with the Missionary Appeal. *The Empire of Christ*, *Christ for India*, *Our Task in India* were all eager and passionate pleas for the work to which he gave

his life. Very early he saw the way of true progress in India: 'Christianity must not come to India as a Western exotic system. Christ must be set free.' But this belief did not lessen his passion for the missionary cause; it was because he cared most of all for Christ that he was a missionary. He revered the greatness of Hindu thought; he knew what it might bring to the feet of Christ; but he never lost his sense of what was lacking there. 'No race in the world has been so richly endowed with the spiritual capacities as the Hindu, but he has become the slave to a conception of the universe evolved out of his own imagination, which has paralysed his whole being.' In his last published essay he summed up his position in these words: 'We have not to teach Christianity to the followers of other religions, we have to make them disciples of the Universal Christ, that, having learned with us of Him, they may be able to co-operate in formulating the Christianity that is yet to be.' Such a prophet with this great purpose could not be patient with a lagging Church. 'Let it be said at once, and as emphatically as possible, that mere "interest" is not worth keeping up, and the sooner it dies of starvation the better, both for the Church at home and the missionary abroad. . . It is not interest, but passion, the passion that comes from deep living and high thinking, that the Church needs.' Not interest, but passion! That remains true to-day—a Church willing not only to spend, but to be spent.

Of the many occasional writings which came from this missionary's pen there is no time to speak; but readers of *The Harvest Field* will know how keen a fighter he was, and yet how clean a sword he wielded. In the discussions of Church Reunion in India he took a leading part, pleading not for a united Church, but for a Federal Church whose basis would be 'Christ as Lord,' and 'All Christians are Brethren.' If he hesitated before the ideal of a great united Church with a common creed and worship, it was because he wished to preserve the large and varied liberty in Christ which he had loved. Death found this man with his interest in the kingdom of God undiminished, and his heart full of plans for work still to be done. But he had given his best and only his best; and that work will not be lost.

EDWARD SHILLITO.

THE SOLUTION OF THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

IN *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem*, by Robinson Smith (Watts and Co., 10s. 6d.), we have a careful and detailed study for which its author claims finality. He considers that he has established beyond question that Luke used Matt. as a source just as fully as they both used Mark, and sweeps away as non-existent both Q and any earlier form of M^{rk}. This position is not, as thus stated, so very revolutionary. Several scholars, notably Archdeacon Allen in his Commentary on Matt., have allowed that Luke may have known and used Matt. to some small extent. But the

method employed in this case is extended much further, with amazing results. In brief, Mr. Smith's thesis is that the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which he dates A.D. 80-90, is the *earliest* gospel source. All the great Pauline epistles are later, A.D. 90-100, then Mark, about A.D. 100, Matt., A.D. 120, John, A.D. 140, Luke, A.D. 145, and Acts A.D. 170. The main result of the study is thoroughly to discredit Luke as an historian. He is shown up as the clumsiest sub-editor imaginable, being possessed by a perverse love of contradicting his own sources and turning their phrases topsy-turvy, apparently for the mere fun of the thing. 'He knew very little of what he was writing about, committing blunder after blunder, and thus discredits the Christian message as a whole. Luke's most striking literary quality is his habit of stating the direct contrary to his source' (p. 7). 'His sole method was to change his originals, result as it might. But he practically never effaced his tracks' (p. 81). For instance, the account of the trial of Jesus before Herod was built up upon a hint in Ignatius' Epistle to the Smyræans, the phraseology being mostly derived from Mark. The story of the trial and death of Stephen is fabricated out of Hegesippus' account of the trial and death of James the Lord's brother. Not only is the residence of our Lord at Nazareth a fiction, but there is no certainty that such a place existed at all at that time. The whole story has been spun out of the reference in Matt. ii. 23, to the fact that Jesus was a Nazarene. The crucifixion of two thieves with Jesus was suggested by Isa. liii. 12, 'He was numbered with the transgressors.' Again, 'How Luke, writing a hundred years after the event, came to picture one of the thieves as penitent, we cannot say. Possibly because Buddha converted a penitent thief with a few gentle words' (p. 56). The Journey of the Disciples to Emmaus is expanded out of two verses of the appendix to Mark (though by a slip this is dated *after* Luke's Gospel in the chronological summary on p. 274). The Birth-stories of Matt. and Luke are derived from the Protevangelium of James. Such examples do not give one a high opinion of the critical judgement of the writer, and the accumulation of such judgements and arguments (of the same sort) does not by any means produce conviction.

However, the claim is made that all this is a stringent and necessary deduction from purely literary data, examined without any historical or theological bias, and this position we want to test a little more closely. The main postulate of the whole argument is that 'when two writers use the same words in describing the same event one writer is copying from the other' (p. 6). The principle is accepted by all critics, but the results depend entirely on the way in which it is applied. There are many cases of literary dependence in which it is hard to decide which author depends on the other; but few unbiased critics would regard Luke's Journey to Emmaus as secondary to Mark and the Birth-stories to the Protevangelium of James.

The extreme example of this inversion of probabilities is the

claim that most of our Lord's discourses as given in the Gospels are really derived from the Epistles. A good deal of the Sermon on the Mount, for instance, is taken from the Epistle to the Romans, and the discourses in John from the First Epistle of John; but few students could work through the list of parallels between John and 1 John given on pp. 265, 266, without concluding that the attempt to prove the direct literary dependence of the Gospel on the Epistle is utterly preposterous. The same mind is at work in the same class of ideas, but direct dependence is in most cases completely barred by the context. Another assertion of the same sort is that most of the Parables are derived from the Talmud and other sources; for example, the Parable of the Prodigal Son is pieced together from Tobit, the Story of Ahikar, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, with some idea from Philo as the centre (p. 52). An attempt is made, on the same lines, to prove the dependence of Luke on John. None of the examples given are at all convincing. If there is direct dependence, it may just as well be of John on Luke. Also the contingency must be allowed for that Luke had access to a cycle of tradition that is also represented more fully in the Fourth Gospel.

The key-argument of the book is that in which the use of Matt. by Luke is demonstrated. If it were as conclusive as its author claims, it would certainly modify the Synoptic theory generally, though it would not by any means make inevitable all the other readjustments of early Christian literature. The proofs offered are five in number, and we will briefly examine them.

1. A set of twenty-two examples is given, in which Mark has two consecutive phrases, often duplicates, of which Matt. copies one only, and Luke the other only. In eighteen cases Matt. has the first phrase and Luke the second, and in four cases the reverse happens. The argument is that Luke, having Matt. before him as well as Mark, and noticing that Matt. has copied the first phrase only, himself copies the second. Matt. has first choice, and Luke second; therefore Luke follows Matt., both as to method and time.

The first example given is the simplest. In Mark i. 82 we have, 'At even, when the sun did set.' In the parallels, Matt. viii. 16 has 'When even was come,' and Luke iv. 40 has 'When the sun was setting.' It is claimed that this is a new argument and a new body of evidence. It may be at once allowed that as presented on pp. 10 and 11 it is impressive, and if all the cases were like the first it would have considerable force; but when the other cases are examined *in situ* it becomes evident that it is neither so simple nor so convincing as the first glance would suggest. The second instance is the list of places in Mark iii. 7, 8, where six districts are named, from Idumæa in the south to Tyre and Sidon in the north. Matt. iv. 25 omits the two extremes, but adds Decapolis. Luke omits Galilee, which is first in Matt. and Mark, but gives Tyre and Sidon. Here we are to suppose that Luke, noticing that Matt. omits Tyre and Sidon,

at once decides to put it in, and then by way of compensation to omit Galilee. But Luke's reasons both for insertion and omission can be easily surmised in this case, and are not so hopelessly mechanical. Three cases are given in the story of the Raising of Jairus' Daughter. In Mark v. 24 we read, 'A great multitude followed Him, and they thronged Him.' Matt. ix. 19 omits the crowd, and gives 'followed him' to the Ruler, not to Jesus. But Matt. is severely condensing; for he gets fifty lines of Mark into twenty. Luke has four-fifths of Mark, and naturally retains the crowd. He also has an equivalent for 'followed Him.' Here both alternatives of the argument fail. In Mark v. 38 we read, 'He beholdeth a tumult, and the crowds weeping and wailing.' Matt. ix. 23 transposes, and puts 'flute-players and the tumultuous crowd.' Luke viii. 52, has the wailing mourners, but not the crowd, though its presence is implied. Here Matt. has both elements, and it is not a case of mechanical dropping or inserting on either side. In this passage it happens that there are several details in which Matt. and Luke agree, as against Mark, notably in the reference to the 'fringe' of our Lord's mantle. The best explanation of these is that they come from the text of Mark which Matt. and Luke used, which was in many small matters different from that of Mark as we have it. Perhaps such details cannot be discussed convincingly in a short review; but if the eighteen or twenty-two examples are worked over carefully with a Greek or English Harmony, it will be seen that in nearly all cases the argument will not hold at all; but its value depends on the number of straightforward cases it can adduce.

2. The second proof is derived from the fact that in about 150 cases (see E. A. Abbott, *The Corrections of Mark*), Matt. and Luke agree against Mark in phraseology, in Marcan passages. This might result from Matt. copying Luke, or vice versa, or from the common use of a type of text slightly differing from canonical Mark. Elsewhere I have tried to show (*Journ. Th. St.*, January, 1920) that the facts are best accounted for by the theory that (a) the minor agreements against Mark are due to the use of such a recension, and (b) the major agreements are the result of the fact that at these points Mark and Q cover the same ground and overlap.

3. The third proof is that in several cases where Matt. has changed Mark a little Luke has carried the change a stage further. Nineteen such cases are given. The first example is from Mark i. 16, 'Simon and Andrew the brother of Simon.' Matt. iv. 18, has 'two brothers' and Luke v. 2, 'two boats.' The suggestion is that Luke has expanded the two brothers into two boats. But the duplication in the two cases is quite independent. In Matt. the 'two brothers' is a very natural otiose expansion of Mark, if it were not actually in Matt.'s copy of Mark; but Luke gives a totally different story from a different source, in which there are two sets of partners and therefore two boats. To suppose that Luke's whole narrative is built up out of Matt.'s incidental 'two brothers' is absurd. Every other example in the set given could be similarly contested.

4. Proof four is a set of cases in which it is claimed that Luke has chosen a detail of Mark and another of Matt. and put them together, though really they are quite inconsistent. But in such cases Luke may just as well be combining Mark and Q, and deliberately leaving them as he found them, because he had not the knowledge necessary for deciding between them. The last of eleven examples given is Mark xv. 37, where we read 'Jesus expired.' Matt. xxvii. 50, has 'Jesus sent forth His spirit,' and Luke xxiii. 46, 'Jesus said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit; and He expired.' Here the comment is, 'No better instance could be cited to show us how far the paraphraser can lead us astray' (p. 16). But after all, Luke may be reporting facts, and our Lord upon the cross may have quoted the thirty-first Psalm just as well as the twenty-second.

5. The fifth argument is said to be 'the most obvious of all.' It is from the occurrence of doublets, where Luke first copies a passage from Mark, and then a similar passage from Matt., who had himself taken it from Mark, but put it in a different context. Some cases are given in which it is said 'all scholars would, if questioned, unhesitatingly affirm' that Matt. had copied Mark, and therefore Luke must have copied Matt. These four cases are Matt. v. 15; x. 26; x. 83; and x. 40. In the first three cases there is good ground for believing that Matt. is *not* copying Mark, and in the fourth, though Matt. may be influenced in form by Mark, Luke is certainly not copying Matthew.

On the whole question it may be said that Matt.'s treatment of Mark is very much more arbitrary than Luke's, for Matt. wishes to group the various elements of our Lord's ministry in such a way as to present a summary of each one in the order he considers best. Hence we have specimens of (1) the Teaching, (2) the Miracles, (3) the Mission-work of the Disciples, (4) Adverse Criticisms of our Lord's Work, and (5) Parables, all in the earlier chapters. This arrangement involves a very drastic modification of Mark's order, and though few sections are omitted, many are severely condensed. On the other hand, Luke keeps very much nearer to Mark's order, but owing to the variety and fullness of his sources he omits a good deal. Now we are justified in arguing from the methods of Matt. and Luke in dealing with the known source Mark to their methods in dealing with the hypothetical source Q. Matt. is likely to give us nearly all of it, as he has of Mark; but to treat its order with much freedom, whilst, by reason of the nature of its material, even more grouping is to be expected. On the other hand, Luke may omit a good deal, but will probably give us the order of his source more faithfully. It is then probable that our Lord's teaching where it is recorded only by Matt. and Luke was found by both in the discrete condition reproduced in Luke. What Matt. did was to gather into connected blocks, and it is altogether more probable that Matt. so treated a source common to himself and Luke (Q) than that Luke took the trouble to pull to pieces and disperse, for no imaginable

reason, material which he found in Matt. very well grouped under various heads. Nothing brought to light by Mr. Smith in any way lessens the force of these considerations. This brief survey ought at least to show that the five key proofs are not conclusive and unquestionable. I have not the least desire to evade at any price the theory that Luke knew Matt.; but I cannot admit that we have a good case here. Even if the proofs were sound, the many other consequences deduced by Mr. Smith would not necessarily follow, particularly the nonchalant relegation of the whole of the Pauline epistles to a date later than A.D. 80. The Synoptic Problem has probably been solved, but not by Mr. Smith.

THOMAS STEPHENSON.

THE OCCASIONAL PAPERS OF AN HISTORIAN

NOR only the old students of Sir A. W. Ward, Master of Peterhouse, and sometime Professor of History in the Victoria University of Manchester, but a wider public will welcome the appearance in permanent form of papers and reviews contributed by him at odd times to various journals, together with certain lectures delivered on various occasions. The work when complete will fill five handsome volumes, the publication of which appears to be mainly due to the enterprise of the Cambridge University Press, and the only drawback of which is its rather large price. The first instalment of this very valuable collection of papers comprises two volumes which consist entirely of historical matter. Not only the professed student, but the general reader with a taste for historical reading, will find in their perusal both instruction and delight. A wide range of topics is dealt with in these most interesting papers. For the more part they are concerned with the history of Germany. That this should be the case is not at all surprising to those who know how close a student of German history their author has been for many a long year past. Nor is it a disadvantage; for, though at the present moment the very name of Germany has an unpleasant sound in English ears, this does not alter the fact that, for a thousand years or more, the history of Germany has been the key to the general history of Europe, though Englishmen of education are now no doubt much more alive to the fact than they were a generation ago, thanks very largely to Lord Bryce's epoch-making *Holy Roman Empire*—which forms the subject of one of the most interesting and suggestive papers in Sir A. W. Ward's second volume, written in 1878, and a postscript added in March, 1919—the essentially German character of the mediæval Empire, and the significance of the work of Otto the Great in relation thereto, is not so clearly grasped by many usually well-informed readers of history and politics as might be wished. Sir Adolphus Ward has, of course, for more years than most of us can recall, been fully alive to this, and the contribution to our knowledge of German history which he makes in these volumes is therefore doubly welcome. One of the

pleasing features of these papers is that we are not infrequently led from the main thoroughfares of history into some interesting by-road, a knowledge of which greatly assists us to get a comprehensive grasp of the terrain in general.

Among the studies which are in the main biographical may be mentioned that dealing with Elizabeth, the 'Winter Queen' of Bohemia, daughter of the weak successor of her greater namesake, Elizabeth of England. This paper is welcome, for while all are familiar enough with the name of Elizabeth of Bohemia, most of us know remarkably little about the woman herself; our author supplies just the kind of information we require. A second paper deals with another Elizabeth, Princess Palatine, daughter of the last-named, and sister of Rupert of the Rhine and Maurice, names familiar in the story of our own civil war; sister also of Sophia, mother of our present line of kings. This will be much appreciated as, shall we say, a bit of royal family gossip dealing with the various fortunes and marriages of the members of a large family which has a double claim upon our interest as at once an offshoot of ancient British royalty, and the source whence sprang the royal line whose present representative, worthy son of a great sire, so nobly fills the imperial throne of Britain as to show to all the world what royalty can be at its best. Of greater historical importance than either of the foregoing royal ladies is Mary of England, wife of the greatest of kings, William III, whose portrait, sympathetically drawn by the master-hand of Macaulay, has made her a quite familiar figure. Since Macaulay wrote, however, new material for forming an estimate of the character of this noble queen has become available. Of this new material Sir Adolphus Ward has availed himself. Her own *Memoirs*, published rather more than a generation ago, in the words of our author, 'for the first time place her character in unmistakably clear relief, and prove it one which, though it has suffered from excessive praise almost as much as from hasty blame, deserves to be called truly feminine, and in some respects, we do not scruple to say, heroic.'

Of first-rate historical importance is the Father of modern Prussia, the Great Elector, who forms the subject of another essay which finds an appropriate continuation in others, dealing respectively with *The Prussian Crown*, *Rheinsberg*, *The Outbreak of the Seven Years War*, *The Decline of Prussia under Frederick William II*, and *Sixty Years at the Prussian Court*. When even the latest written of them was composed there was no indication of the catastrophe by which the work of Frederick the Great was to be undone, and his dynasty swept into the abyss.

It must suffice to mention Tilly, the Roundhead officers, Hutchinson and Ludlow, Leibniz, Frederick of Württemberg, Prince Charles Leiningen, Gents, Sir Robert Morier, S. R. Gardiner and his historical work, and Prince Hohenlohe, whose *Memoirs* form the subject of a brief but extremely interesting essay. Among more general topics are the Hanseatic League, the Thirty Years War, the Second

Partition of Poland, English History in the Eighteenth Century, and—especially striking when read in the light of recent events—a study of The Aims and Aspirations of European Politics in the Nineteenth Century, originally published in 1904, with a brief note added in 1920. The rôle of Germany has indeed been widely different from that dreamed of by one of her greater sons, to which attention is drawn in this able lecture,—for such this essay really is, having been originally delivered at a Summer Extension Meeting at Cambridge in 1902. It only remains to refer to the opening paper of this collection, entitled *The Peace of Europe*, written in 1878. It is really an essay on the idea of a League of Nations. The subject is here treated historically, and the proposal and attempts to accomplish something upon the lines of a League in the past are carefully considered. From the abortive attempts and the failures of the past not a little may be learned which should prove relevant to success in the present. The conclusion to which our author himself has been led by his historical survey is, or perhaps we should rather say was twenty years ago, that in future arbitration will be had recourse to with increasing frequency, but that it would be rash to infer that this would be done in cases of primary importance, or to avert immediately impending war; nor does arbitration appear to him to be an expedient capable of a forced universal application. He closes this most suggestive study by expressing the hope that increasing knowledge, and fuller recognition of mutual interdependence as between nations and as between classes within the nation will tend more and more to preserve international and domestic peace. How ill that lesson had been learned was revealed by the outbreak of the Great War. The war and its aftermath has taught the world again the lesson of mutual interdependence—but at what a price! Yet costly as it has been, has the lesson been taken to heart? The Coal Stoppage at home and troubles abroad reveal how much it still needs to be learned.

W. ERNEST BRET.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

Thought and Expression in the Sixteenth Century. By Henry Osborn Taylor. 2 vols. (Macmillan & Co. 50s. net.)

THE author of this scholarly and instructive survey of the Reformation-Renaissance period will be recognized as one whose claims to attention are already well established. The publication of similar studies under the titles *Ancient Ideals* and *The Mediaeval Mind* proved that Mr. Osborn Taylor possessed in high degree the special powers necessary for the kind of work to which he has devoted himself. Wide reading, sound scholarship, sympathetic insight, and (especially) mature and well-balanced judgement are all necessary for such extensive estimates of thought and literature as are contained in these successive works. These gifts, to which must be added the attraction of a clear and easy style, are manifest in these latest as well as in the author's earlier volumes, and we welcome a fresh study of a period on which the right kind of historian always finds something fresh to say.

Mr. Taylor does not confine himself to the study of literature. He lays under contribution the science, the philosophy, the art, and the religion of the sixteenth century in order to complete the picture of its 'thought and expression.' His pages include careful studies of such variously representative men as Petrarch, Ariosto and Machiavelli, Erasmus and Luther and Calvin, Rabelais and Montaigne, Wyclif, Latimer and Hooker, Da Vinci and Bruno, and the writers of the 'spacious times of great Elizabeth,' with Shakespeare at their head. Some of the notices are necessarily short, but others are full-length portraits—fifty pages being given to Luther—and some of the slighter sketches, as for instance, those of Louis XI, Ronsard, and Nicholas of Cusa, are as carefully worked out and at least as successful as those of more prominent figures. But Mr. Taylor's method includes general estimates as well as individual portraits. Much patient study has gone to the preparation of such chapters as those on 'Italian Self-Expression in Painting,' 'The Spiritual and Political Preparation for Luther,' 'Anatomy, Physiology, and Disease' and 'The Revolution in Astronomy and Physics.' Every one must recognize that the gradual but revolutionary changes in all departments of thought and life, so characteristic of the sixteenth century, claim the full attention and tax the utmost powers of any competent historian. It is a great gain that Mr. Osborn

Taylor is able to include in one comprehensive work a combined picture of such various processes and developments.

It is a cinematographic picture that our artist draws. He well says that 'the truthfulness of events lies in the process of *becoming* rather than in the concrete phenomenon which catches our attention.' Mr. Taylor objects to the separate study of 'periods' or 'centuries,' marked out by imaginary boundary lines of arbitrary time-divisions, which the historian is forbidden to cross. If he would 'follow facts in their progeny' he has an infinite task before him; for 'every event has as many forbears as a human being.' But a judicious biographer confines himself to notes concerning the very few ancestors that matter, and Mr. Osborn Taylor only sketches in outline the continuity between the period which he covered in 'The Mediaeval Mind' and the fruitful period of achievement and advance with which these volumes are concerned. The mediaeval cathedral, Dante's *Commedia* and Aquinas' *Summa* were typical great achievements of the Middle Ages, 'culminations of prior stages of appropriation and attainment.' But in a wider survey they may be viewed rather as beginnings, on which later constructions were to be raised, even as the artists and thinkers of the whole mediaeval period embodied the results of classical culture, whilst giving to them wholly new shape and development and application.

Many detailed illustrations of Mr. Taylor's method might be given, did space permit. We may mention, as one interesting example, the peculiar character of the English Reformation. How did it come about in this country as distinct from the Continent, what specific features did it develop, why did it proceed so far and no farther? These are questions which have often been asked, and the answers given in these volumes do not profess to be entirely new. If they were, they could not be entirely true and they would probably be entirely misleading. But the comprehensive survey presented by Mr. Taylor sheds new light on a familiar picture and illustrates afresh the complex moral and spiritual forces at work upon social, political, economical, and national material, and which in England produced not Luther, nor Calvin, nor Zwingli, but the Elizabethan Settlement, Richard Hooker, the Anglican *Via Media*, and the Puritan Reaction.

To some readers Mr. Taylor's pages may appear colourless, and we could have welcomed a richer glow of constructive imagination in the attempt to depict a period so full of irrepressible vitality and animation as the sixteenth century. But the sober, lucid, and well-balanced style of the author is best suited for the complex and difficult task he set out to accomplish, and we heartily congratulate him on the large measure of success that he has achieved. His work is not a study of the Renaissance, nor of the Reformation, nor of the Art and Literature of a great formative period, but of all these combined. This complex and wonderful whole is viewed both as a result of the Middle Ages which closed with the fifteenth century and as a new, original, and most fruitful movement of the human

mind. We can heartily commend these suggestive volumes to ministers and all thoughtful students of an endlessly diversified and fascinating period of history.

Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job, together with a new Translation. By the late S. R. Driver, D.D., and G. B. Gray, D.Litt.

On the Epistle to the Galatians. By E. De Witt Burton. (T. & T. Clark. 85s. each.)

Dr. Driver began the actual writing of this Commentary on Job eighteen months before his death. When the serious nature of his illness became evident, he wrote a memorandum on the state of his MS. with suggestions for the completion of the work, which he hoped that Dr. Gray would undertake. Dr. Driver had already invited Dr. McNeile to prepare the exegetical notes and the Introduction, but the pressure of other work compelled him to withdraw his consent, and Dr. Gray had to undertake this labour also. He is entirely responsible for the Introduction, for the translation of chapters 1, 2 and 39-42, most of the Commentary, and a third of the philological notes. The Introduction covers 66 pages, and deals with the literary form, the origin and history of the book, and kindred subjects. Job differs from all the Wisdom literature in its combination of prose and poetry and its use of dialogue. The prologue and epilogue are prose; the speeches poetry. Dr. Gray says if the book is not history, it may be based on or derived from popular tradition or literature. This is quite certain if the book is rightly inferred to have been written after the Exile, for Ezekiel xiv. 14, 20, refers to Job, along with Noah and Daniel, as a conspicuously righteous man. The book was most probably written in the fifth century B.C. The translation may be judged by the famous passage—

But I know that my vindicator liveth,
 And that hereafter he will stand up upon the dust.
 And . . .
 And away from my flesh I shall behold God.
 Whom I shall behold (to be) on my side,
 And mine eyes shall see (to be) unestranged.
 My reins fail with longing within me.

The comment on the passage is of peculiar interest. The philological notes, gathered together in the second part, also deal at length with this passage.

Prof. Burton, of Chicago, began his preparation for the Commentary on the Galatians in 1896. He has emphasized the meaning of words, the course of thought in the Epistle, and the relations of the problems discussed to those of our own day. In his introduction he discusses the question where were the Galatian churches, and finds the balance of probability in favour of the South Galatian view, and that the letter was written to the churches of Derbe, Lysta,

Jeonium, and Pisidian Antioch between 50 and 55 A.D. The introductory matter covers 89 pages, the commentary 862, and the notes on important terms of Paul's vocabulary 159 pages. The notes on 'the Jerusalem above is free' are of special interest. The form of expression 'which is our mother' is derived from the allegory of Hagar and Sarah. The idea literally expressed would be, 'of which community we are members.' It is a fine piece of work, well-balanced and full of insight. Scholars will rank both volumes among their choicest treasures.

Saint Jean L'Apocalypse. Par Le P. E.-B. Allo. (Paris : Victor Lecoffre. 54f. net.)

The writer is Professor at the University of Friburg, in Switzerland, and dedicates his prophecy of 'the dragon constantly vanquished and of the Lamb now and for ever victorious' to Cardinal Mercier. It is a stately tome of 641 pages, 268 of which form the introduction and 373 the French translation and notes. The introduction opens with the historic environment and the purpose of the Apocalypse. The early Christians had, as a rule, interpreted Christ's promises in the sense of a Parousia, almost imminent. The precursory signs seemed to be there. Persecution, at first dull and sporadic, took under Nero a character of atrocious violence. Nevertheless the gospel seemed to have overrun the world. Paul had traversed almost all the countries north of the Mediterranean and had perhaps borne the message to Spain. Egypt probably had received it. Syria and Asia Minor were full of flourishing Christian communities. The great events which the faithful considered inseparable from the end of the age, the ruin of the Temple and the political annihilation of Israel, were accomplished under Vespasian. Yet Christ did not appear in the clouds of heaven. The Apocalypse was given to the Church in Asia Minor in the period between the death of St. Paul and the end of the first century. People speak of its sombre horror, and the very name has become something fearful. The impression, however, is not just. The inspired writer really wished to strengthen wills, to arm Christians with an inextinguishable confidence in the omnipotence and fidelity of the Saviour whom they awaited. His book holds fast to the gospel. It is the complement of the gospel, and like it is a message of hope, of courage, and of joy. When it portrays their future to the faithful, it has lines and pages of a freshness and sweetness incomparable, such as can only be found in the second part of Isaiah or in the Fourth Gospel. The author speaks with an authority which he does not fear to see disputed. He makes no apology for speaking so freely as to the angels of the Seven Churches, nor does he care to explain why the message has been entrusted to him rather than to another. Prof. Allo discusses the theology of the book, those to whom it is addressed, the apocalyptic form of the message and its material symbols, the literary composition. There are chapters on the eschatology of the

Apocalypse compared with that of other New Testament books, on the language and unity of the book, and on the authorship and date. A critical estimate is given of the commentators on the Apocalypse, from Victorin, bishop of Pettau in Styria, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian, down to Swete and Ramsay. There is also a full list of manuscripts of the text. Prof. Allo thinks that the Apocalypse was written by John the Apostle in Patmos and sent secretly to Ephesus. Such conditions account for the faults of grammar and for a certain incoherence or imperfect harmony in its symbolism. As a literary work it is so extraordinary that Prof. Allo can only account for its blemishes on the supposition that it was not produced under normal conditions. It bears traces of difficult circumstances and of haste. When Herod annulled the acts of the tyrant Domitian John was able to return to Ephesus, where he found his Apocalypse already read in the services. Some years later he was able to give to the Church a still sublimer work, his Gospel. It is a fine piece of ripe scholarship, on which immense labour and skill has been lavished.

The Pulpit and American Life. By Arthur S. Hoyt. (Funk & Wagnalls Co.)

Prof. Hoyt holds that in no country has the pulpit had such an opportunity as in America, but it needs in the face of current criticism to be heartened as to its place and function in modern life. The age also needs to be shown that the ideals of personal and social progress, the principles of individual character and national worth, are vitally connected with the men who have taught through the generations the shining truths of the Christian gospel. His lectures seek to interpret the work of preachers who have represented their age and been prophetic and directive of spiritual and social advance. He begins with the Puritan preacher, who was the best expression and the true leader of the new-world Puritanism. Sermons were of goodly length, but were not usually considered an infliction. They were essentially doctrinal—as much so as the lecture of a theological class-room. This general survey is followed by studies of leading preachers, beginning with Jonathan Edwards and Lyman Beecher, and ending with Henry Ward Beecher and Phillips Brooks. They are masterly sketches, from which preachers will learn much about their art. Five chapters follow on The Old and New Evangelism, Some Distinctive Contributions to the American Pulpit, The Present American Pulpit, The Pulpit and Social Welfare, The Pulpit and the Nation. There is an interesting account of the Methodist pulpit, which dwells on the work of Asbury and Peter Cartwright, and singles out Stephen Olin and Bishop Simpson as examples of the best Methodist preachers. Dr. Hoyt does not speak particularly of living preachers, but the names of Bishop Vincent, Bishop Quayle and Bishop McDowell and Bishop McConnell tell us that the old-time fervour and popular sympathy have not been lost but tempered and disciplined to newer conditions.' The book is delightful reading for preachers.

The Ways of the Gods. By A. S. Crapsey. (New York: International Press.)

This is an attempt to explain the growth of the influence of the gods of the world, whom men of various ages fashioned after their own supposed views of help and protection. It begins with the gods of the house—who were called demons and heroes by the Greeks and were known to the Latins as the Manes, Lares, and Penates. The Penates were keepers of the fire and the store, who inhaled the odour of spices, the flavour of the meat and bread. Mr. Crapsey has much to say about the gods of the Roman world, but these were superseded by Divus Cæsar, the god of the organization. 'This god was no figment of the imagination living beyond the sky; he was a dread reality, present in every open place and in every nook and corner of the Roman world.' The book is a rationalistic attempt to explain the religion of Israel and the Christianity which was its successor. The attempt to explain the appearance of Jesus to Peter after His resurrection as a case of 'psychic projection' is really too absurd. 'In times of cerebral excitement, when the objective mind is in abeyance, the psychic force projects the images of the subjective mind on the lenses of the eye, and the man sees what he thinks.' Rationalism is evidently more credulous than faith, and, judging from this book, has less to commend it to men of reason and insight.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has added two important works to its *Translations of Christian Literature*. One is *Philosophumena, or the Refutation of all Heresies*, by F. Legge, F.S.A. (2 vols. 80s. net.) It is the first adequate treatment of the subject in English by a scholar thoroughly familiar with the mystical cults and astrological speculations of the early imperial period. A short treatise, of which four MSS. were preserved in Rome, Florence, and Turin, had long been known, but in 1840 the last seven books of this treatise were discovered at Mount Athos. It was thought that the work was by Origen, but it is now regarded as by Hippolytus, who flourished about 220 A.D. In 1860 the Abbé Cruice published a text and translation, and from that text Mr. Legge has made his version. His Introduction discusses the authorship, composition, style, and value of the work. It throws much light on the religious beliefs of the early Christian centuries and shows the true meaning of the worship of Attis and Cybele. We see that the period was one of fierce persecution from the pagan emperors and of sharp conflict with schools led by some of the greatest minds of the age, and all combining some of the main tenets of Christianity with the relics of heathenism. It is a work of extraordinary interest for students of the period, and Mr. Legge's notes throw light on many obscure points.—*The Proof of the Gospel, being the Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea.* By J. W. Ferrar. (2 vols. 80s. net.) The work was written at the time when the Church's struggle with

paganism was nearly over, and is regarded as the finest flower of Christian apologetics. In the third book 'by an elaborate *reductio ad absurdum*, the impossibility of Jesus Christ being aught but Perfect Man and Divine also is dramatically and cogently shown.' As a piece of apologetics it is extraordinarily full and to the point. The Introduction and Notes are of great value.—*Immortality and the Unseen World*, by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. (12s. 6d. net), is a study in Old Testament religion. It discusses the demonology of the Semites and of the Old Testament, the Angelology, Sheol, Ancestor-worship and the Cult of the Dead, Mourning and Burial Customs, and then reaches the doctrine of immortality. With the Exile a new relationship between God and man, in which each individual was able to recognize his personal part, came into being. The sacrificial system ceased. The Exile thus became the great turning-point in the Israelite belief in immortality. Dr. Oesterley describes the stages by which this belief was reached in his valuable study.—*The Life of Otto, Apostle of Pomerania, 1060-1189*. By Ebo and Herbordus. Edited by Charles H. Robinson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net.) The story of Otto's labours as the apostle of Pomerania forms one of the most striking chapters in the evangelization of Europe, yet it has never been translated or told at length in English. He was a teacher in Poland and afterwards went to live in Ratisbon, where the Emperor Henry IV made him Bishop of Bamberg in 1102. The Life records his labours and successes in a very happy style. Three months led to the baptism of 22,156 persons. It is a great record. *Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament*, by J. M. Harden, B.D., of Trinity College, Dublin (4s. net), is based on the smaller Oxford edition of the Vulgate New Testament published in 1911. Pronouns, prepositions, and numerals are omitted, and words like *corruptio* which have the same meaning in English and Latin. The passages where a word occurs are given. It is very clearly printed and will be of great service to students.—*Why Men Believe*, by Clement F. Rogers, M.A. (2s. 6d. net), gives five lectures on apologetics. The psychological ground; Christianity and art—the argument from beauty; reason and faith—the place of the intellect; faith and the will—the argument from experience; the claim of authority. It is the best and freshest little book of evidences that we have seen.—The S.P.C.K. publish the epistle of the Lambeth Conference in Latin: *Ad Universam Christi Plebem* (4d. net), and in German: *Ein Aufruf an alle Christen* (1s. net), with the encyclical added; also the *Terms of Intercommunion* suggested between the Church of England and the Churches in communion with her and the Eastern Orthodox Church (6d. net). It gives also the propositions adopted by the Bonn Conference and the formulæ of ordination in the Eastern and English Churches. Such publications will do much to make the work of the Lambeth Conference known abroad and to promote a better understanding between all Churches.—*The Christian Faith and the Social Revolution*. By G. C. Binyon, M.A. (2s. 6d. and 3s. 6d. net.) The writer's object is to aid Christian people to recover that social ideal-

ism which lies at the back of the social revolution and is also contained in the Christian faith. In five chapters he examines the idealist and moral basis of socialism and the social idealism of the Christian Church and shows that they are practically identical. If there is to be active co-operation between Christians and Socialists, the basis of it can only be the possession of a common social ideal. Such a study will be of real service to many thinkers and social reformers, and is likely to promote good understanding and attitude.—*The Hymn of Cleanthes*, with the Greek text and an English translation, introduction, and notes, by E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (6d. net), is a valuable addition to the *Tests for Students*. It is a scholarly edition of what Lightfoot called the noblest expression of heathen devotion which Greek literature has preserved to us.

From the Abingdon Press, New York, we have received *Evangelism*. By F. Watson Hannan. (\$1.50 net.) The writer has tested the principles and plans of his book in his evangelistic ministry. His aim has been to give young ministers a broader view of evangelism than is sometimes held by showing how fundamental it is to all church activity. The man is to be saved in his entirety, which means that Society must be saved as well as the individual. 'That is the modern note in evangelism. It aims to establish the kingdom of God in the earth.' The subject is divided into four sections: general, pastoral, and Sunday-school evangelism, and practical evangelism conserving results. It is a wise and stimulating treatment of a most important subject.—*The Future Life: Facts and Fancies*. By F. B. Stockdale. (\$1 net.) The writer has no faith in mediums, and regards the best in *Raymond* as childish, and much of it as puerile. 'The idea that death is master of anything is heathenish and untrue.' It is a book that many will want to read.—*The Boy who lost his Name*. By Christine Ware. (\$1 net.) Dick lost his name by cheating and bullying, but he got it back and grew into a fine manly fellow. It is a racy story and on quite novel lines.—*Handbook of Church Advertising*. By Francis H. Case. (\$1.25 net.) How to bring the work of the Church to the attention of the public is the subject of this book. It is very much alive and is full of practical suggestions.—*The Beginner's Book in Religion* (\$1.75 net), by Edna D. Baker, President of the National Kindergarten and Elementary College. It describes the young child and his religion, and gives sixty-four lessons in religion which embody the ripe experience of an expert teacher. It is a book that almost makes one wish to be young again. There is not room for a dull moment in this curriculum.—*The Life and Times of Jesus*, by Frederick C. Grant (\$1.25 net), belongs to the same series of education texts. It is clear and complete, and the arrangement in paragraphs is very helpful. Study topics are suggested at the end of each chapter. The illustrations are very beautiful. The book will be of great service to teachers and parents.—*What must the Church do to be saved?* By E. F. Tittle. (\$1.25 net.) These are the Mendenhall Lectures.

of De Pauw University for 1920. The Church is not going to die, but if she is to play any large and vital part in the building of a better civilization she must clothe her message in the living language of the present time, and must be a thoroughly unselfish organization—an embodiment of democracy, with faith in the improvableness of man, of human nature, and so, eventually of society. Dr. Tittle draws upon his experiences as chaplain in the Great War and writes effectively on the changing conception of God, who is regarded to-day as present in all literature and in all history. It is a suggestive and stimulating study.—*The Return of the Redeemer*, by George P. Eckman (50 cents net), is one of the best books on the subject. Dr. Eckman shows that the expectation of the Second Advent is an 'apparently indestructible sentiment of Christendom,' and brings out the 'several comings of Christ' in an impressive way. The doctrine of the Second Coming has suffered much from 'persons of a freakish imagination and a perverse disposition.' It is a comprehensive and well-balanced survey of the subject.—*The Portrait of the Prodigal*. By J. H. Greene. (\$1.50 net.) Ten life-studies of the prodigal's experiences, which are wrought out with discernment and skilfully illustrated.—*Rural Social Organization*. By Edwin L. Earp. (\$1 net.) Prof. Earp deals with good roads, marketing farm products, rural health, and the social functions of the rural church and Sunday school. It is all most lucid and practical.—*Primary Method in the Church School*. By Alberta Munkres. (\$1.50 net.) The writer is Professor of Religious Education in Boston University, and seeks to show how to teach religion to children of six to eight years old. It is an expert study, full of practical suggestions which will be of the utmost service to teachers.

The Epworth Press publishes three booklets of much interest. In *Christian Theism Justified* (2s. net), Dr. Ballard submits two booklets of the Rationalist Press to a searching examination. Preachers and open-air speakers will find it full of suggestion for their own evidential work.—*Christian Union and Methodist Fusion*, by J. Ernest Rattenbury (1s. net), pleads for a federal scheme instead of union. It puts the writer's views clearly and forcibly, and will be of service to many in their consideration of this vital question.—*Spiritualism*, by R. Winboul Harding (4d. net), discusses the evidence brought forward in defence of spiritualism, and maintains that its claims are invalid and the pursuit attended with grave perils. It is a timely booklet and one likely to save many from being led astray.—*The Children's Great Texts of the Bible*. Edited by James Hastings, D.D. Vols. 4, 5, 6, Jeremiah to Revelation. (T. and T. Clark. 2s. net each vol.) No one need be at a loss for sermons and talks to children who is fortunate enough to have the six attractive volumes of this unique work. It has an extraordinary wealth of matter and its pages are really alive. We turned to the homily on Obadiah 2, 'Who's to Blame?' with its vivid little sketch of Coleridge Patteson, and found it full of interest. The texts are happily chosen,

and the titles are arresting. These sermons cover three or four pages, and there is much to learn and much to enjoy in them all. It is a work that does honour to the editor and to the publishers, and it is one that will bear much fruit.—*The Beatitudes and the Decalogue*. By Rev. Thomas Torrance. (Skeffington & Sons. 8s. 6d. net.) Mr. Torrance is a missionary in West China who has worked out an interesting scheme of connexion between the Beatitudes and the Ten Commandments. No previous attempt has been made to trace an orderly relation between each Beatitude and a corresponding Commandment. Mr. Torrance finds his key in the scriptural law of parallelism, and he uses it with no little ingenuity and skill. He does not always carry conviction, but he is always suggestive, and there is much to learn from his mode of treatment. The book will also be a valuable aid to those who wish to grasp more clearly the order and purpose of both the old law and the new. Christ's disciples are aptly described as 'the products of the fifth and tenth commandments who have been reborn and sanctified by His Spirit.'—*Addresses on the Lambeth Conference*. By Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A. (Skeffington & Son. 5s. net.) No one could have unfolded the meaning of the Lambeth Conference more skilfully than Mr. Cohu. He describes its methods of procedure, and deals in a most lucid way with the subjects of Reunion, the Ministry of Women, the League of Nations, Industrial Problems, Marriage and Divorce, Theosophy, Spiritualism, and Christian Science. It is a most interesting and instructive survey, and is broad-minded as well as whole-heartedly loyal to the soundest teaching of the Church of England.—*The Life of God in the Life of His World*. By J. M. Wheton, D.D. (Funk & Wagnalls. 2s. 6d. net.) This restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity will help many who are perplexed. Dr. Wheton thinks that the conception of a Trinity in the substance of God must give place to the conception of a Trinity in the activities of God in the life of the world. We do not see why the two conceptions should not exist side by side, but 'the larger truth brings necessary nourishment' to the half-starved religious life with which many have been content. The idea is ably and persuasively worked out.—*The City of God and the Way to find It*. By John Coutts. (1s.) There is a mystic note in this study. The man who conforms to the will of God in all his thoughts is in the city of God and the city of God is within him. 'The race of Adam will not believe that there has been a true and real incarnation of heaven in the man, the Lord Jesus Christ. Salvation in Christ cannot now be denied; the unbelievers, and their unbelief, have been swept away as by a flood.' There is much to think about in this volume.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

Glimpses of Bengal. Selected from the Letters of Sir Rabin-dranañh Tagore, 1885-1895. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d. net.)

THE charm of this book is not in its glimpses of Bengal, though these are beautifully given, but in the revelation of the poet's mind and heart. Looking back after more than a quarter of a century the writer of these letters regards them as 'a form of literary extravagance only possible when a surplus of thought and emotion accumulates.' Each day he thought about being reborn, and then his greatest fear was lest he should be reborn in Europe! 'For there one cannot recline like this with one's whole being laid open to the infinite above—one is liable, I am afraid, to be soundly rated for lying down at all. I should probably have been bustling strenuously in some factory or bank, or parliament.' The second letter in the set was written when he was twenty-seven. He felt unable to provide things that might profit the multitude. It seemed sad to disappoint those who expected other things from him. But he took his own way to the enriching of the world. He loved life, and his descriptions of the gypsy encampment, of the children's games, of the elephants feeding by the river, and the parting of friends when the boat sails are gems. He is not born to be a recluse. 'I count it enough to live and die as a man, loving and trusting the world, unable to look on it either as a delusion of the Creator or a snare of the Devil.' He finds joy in his poetry, and wonders why the writing of pages of prose does not give anything like the joy of completing a single poem. 'One's emotions take on such perfection of form in a poem; they can, as it were, be taken up by the fingers. But prose is like a sackful of loose material, heavy and unwieldy, incapable of being lifted as you please.' The more he lives alone on the river, or in the open country, 'the clearer it becomes that nothing is more beautiful or great than to perform the ordinary duties of one's daily life simply and naturally. . . . And, indeed, what little of beauty and peace is to be found in the societies of men is owing to the daily performance of small duties, not to big doings and fine talk.' Here is another gem: 'This very cruelty of work proves, perhaps, man's sternest consolation.'

The Sadhu: A Study in Mysticism and Practical Religion.
By B. H. Streeter, M.A., D.D., and A. J. Appasamy,
M.A. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d. net.)

Prolonged personal interviews with Sadhu Sundar Singh have laid the basis for this book. It is not a biography, but the first section, on 'The Man and his Making,' supplies much information as to his

long quest for peace and the rough path he has had to travel as a witness to Christianity in Tibet. He once said that he had been to the best theological college in the world, which was his mother's bosom. She fostered and guided his unique religious bent and held before him the life of a sadhu as the ideal to follow when he grew up. She died when he was fourteen, and the means which she had pointed out to him utterly failed to lead him to peace. The Bible repelled him as being utterly subversive of the religion of his fathers and offensive to the proud traditions of his Sikh blood. He tore it up and burned it whenever he got a chance. Three days after burning the Bible he awoke determined to commit suicide if God did not show him the right way. Then he had a vision of Christ, who asked: 'How long will you persecute Me? I have come to save you; you were praying to know the right way. Why do you not take it?' He thought, 'Jesus Christ is not dead but living, and it must be He Himself,' 'so I fell at His feet and got this wonderful Peace which I could not get anywhere else. This is the joy I was wishing to get. This was heaven itself. When I got up the vision had all disappeared; but although the vision disappeared the peace and joy have remained with me ever since.' His family sought to shake his determination to be a Christian but he stood fast and bore the loss of home and wealth for Christ's sake. He has many leanings towards the life of a hermit, but says, 'I was told once in an ecstasy that the present life is the only opportunity that will be given me for helping others in this world. That is a privilege which even angels are not allowed.' The volume describes a mystic's creed: 'a Christocentric Mysticism,' a mystic's peace, a mystic's way, and devotes chapters to his teaching on ecstasy and vision, and on suffering, sin, and judgement. His Table Talk may be judged from this specimen: 'Let us never be discouraged by our weaknesses. The sun has many spots. On that account does it cease to give light? So let us shine with the light which He, the true Light, gives us. He will remove our defects and make us perfect. Our duty is to shine. The firefly is one of the smallest of insects; yet it gladdens the heart of the traveller with its tiny light.' The closing chapter broaches the great subject of 'An Indian Christianity.' In an interview with the Sadhu, Baron von Hügel was impressed by the fact that he was most rightly proud of being an Indian, and was 'anxious to remain as Indian as deep Christianity allows.' He hopes to see a completely Indian Church. Missionaries are required to train Indian Christian leaders, who must gradually be given more and more responsibility. It is a volume of extraordinary interest and one that is rich in promise for the future.

Illustrations of the History of Mediaeval Thought and Learning. By Reginald Lane Poole. (S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d. net.)

This is a revised second edition of a work which Dr. Poole published in 1884. It has long been out of print and is still asked for. The writer resigned his post in the Department of Manuscripts in the

British Museum in 1881 and spent two years in study at Leipzig and Zurich. Next year this volume appeared. The introduction gives an account of the Irish missionaries, who had 'a classical spirit, a love of literature for its own sake, a keen delight in poetry,' and of learning in England. Then we pass to Claudius of Turin and Agobard of Lyons, to John Scotus, the Dark Age, The School of Chartres, Abailard, John of Salisbury, the pupil of Abailard and 'in many respects the fairest type of the learned men of his time,' and Wyclif's Doctrines of Dominion. In only two chapters—those on the School of Chartres and Peter Abailard—has Dr. Poole made extensive alterations, but changes and corrections have been made throughout and occasional notes added as to works which have appeared since 1884. The estimate of William of Ockham is of special value. The volume is one of extraordinary interest to students of mediæval thought and learning, and many will be grateful to the Curator of the Bodleian for this revised edition and to the S.P.C.K. for the way in which it is printed and got up.—*The Swedish Rite*. By E. E. Yelverton, O.B.E., B.D. (S.P.C.K. 8s. 6d. net), is a translation of the 'Handbok' of the Church of Sweden, as revised in 1917, which contained the offices of high mass, of morning and evening prayer, the litany, and other forms of prayer and of service. In view of the recommendations of the Lambeth Conference that intercommunion should be established this Swedish Prayer Book is of great importance. The introduction by the editor and translator supplies some details as to the various offices of the Handbok, and Dr. Swinstead, late English Chaplain at Stockholm, is preparing a companion volume on *The Swedish Church and Ours* which will be published in the summer. It is based on his volume with that title which has been well received in Sweden. The work will be studied with very great interest.

John Patrick, Third Marquess of Bute, K.T. (1847—1900). A Memoir. By the Right Rev. Sir David Hunter Blair. (Murray. 18s. net.)

Disraeli's *Lothair* was popularly supposed to be modelled on Lord Bute, 'though never, in truth, did any hero of fiction bear less resemblance to his fancied prototype.' He had 'a compelling sense of duty, a penetrating sense of religion, a curious tenderness of heart, a singular tenacity of purpose, and a deep veneration for all that is good and beautiful in the natural and supernatural world.' He was a descendant of George the Third's prime minister, the third Earl of Bute, and great-great-grandson of Selina Countess of Huntingdon. His father died when he was six months old; his mother, Lady Sophia Hastings, died when he was eleven. She had a warm heart and was a devoted Protestant who dreamed fondly of the conversion of the Irish Catholics who had been attracted to Cardiff. Her boy's relations to his guardians made his youth anything but a happy one, and before he came of age he had become convinced, by his own

study, that 'to remain outside the Catholic and Roman Church' would be to make himself 'an accomplice after the fact in a great national crime and the most indefensible act in history.' He was much attached to Mgr. Capel, but made it clear that there was no truth whatever in the popular idea that he was a convert of Capel's. He proved himself a tolerant as well as a devoted member of his own Church and won the esteem and affection of such men as Dr. Metcalfe, an Established Church minister of Paisley, who edited the *Scottish Review* for him and was invited by him to be his assessor during his Rectorship of St. Andrews University. The Marquis was a great reader, and his liturgical studies bore memorable fruit in his translation of the Roman Breviary. Despite his freedom from prejudice in any subject of research, he was not always patient when he met opposition to his favourite plans. He was a great builder, who loved a difficult task and was reluctant to let it get out of his hands. His generous gifts to Cardiff, to Bute, and to St. Andrews University show how nobly he used his vast wealth. It is a record that will be read with deep interest not only by members of his own Church but by all who wish to understand the motives which led him to join it.

Notes on Life and Letters. By Joseph Conrad. (Dent & Sons. 9s. net.)

Mr. Conrad arranges his papers in two divisions: Letters and Life. The first includes studies of Henry James, Alphonse Daudet, Guy de Maupassant, Anatole France, Turgenev, Stephen Crane, and half a dozen shorter papers. Twenty years of attentive acquaintance with Henry James's work makes it clear that his mind is steeped in the waters flowing from the fountain of intellectual youth. In its volume and force it is like a majestic river. He is the historian of fine consciences. Daudet felt life as it is: 'Thinner than air and more elusive than a flash of lightning.' Maupassant was 'a true and dutiful lover of our earth,' who looked upon her august and furrowed face with the fierce insight of real passion. Anatole France has been called the Prince of Prose. 'He is a great analyst of illusions. He searches and probes their innermost recesses as if they were realities made of an eternal substance.' The pleasant little paper on Stephen Crane will appeal to all who admire his *Red Badge of Courage*. The papers in the second section dwell on such subjects as Russian autocracy and the partition of Poland. The first essay was written in 1905 and ends by endorsing Gambetta's saying: 'Le Prussianisme—voilà l'ennemi!' as 'a warning, so far as a future of liberty, concord, and justice is concerned.' For autobiographical interest, the 'Poland Revisited' will attract most attention. In Cracow Mr. Conrad spent the last eighteen months of his father's life. He visited it with his family in 1914 and was caught there in the meshes of the war. The journey brought back his experiences when he first came to London in 1878 seeking employment as a seaman. At Cracow there was much talk about the war. One man asked:

'What do you think England will do? If there is a ray of hope anywhere it is only there.' Mr. Conrad replied: 'If England comes into the war, then, no matter who may want to make peace at the end of six months at the cost of right and justice, England will keep on fighting for years if necessary. You may reckon on that.' 'What, even alone!' some one asked. I said: 'Yes, even alone. But if things go so far as that, England will not be alone.' He adds: 'I think that at that moment I must have been inspired.' The book has a manly ring about it, like all its writer's work.

The Social and Industrial History of Scotland from the Union to the Present Time. By James Mackinnon, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 16s. net.)

Dr. Mackinnon has published an earlier volume on the Social and Industrial History of Scotland from the earliest times to the Union. The first part of this volume deals with the eighteenth century, the second part with the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Agriculture, mechanical invention, education and culture, art and religious life are all discussed in the most instructive and interesting fashion. Up to 1754 there was only a monthly stage-coach between Edinburgh and London, which did the journey in twelve to sixteen days. Letters took six days. The roads underwent no improvement till the second half of the century, but about 1760 better roads led to better vehicles and more rapid communication. There were two stage coaches daily from Edinburgh to London which covered the distance in 60 hours. 'New mansion houses, better furnishings, a more varied diet, and more sumptuous fashions came in.' Lanarkshire has been the leading colliery county. In 1900 it produced more than 17 million tons. Dr. Mackinnon calls attention to the widespread shortage of sanitary houses in both town and country. The Royal Commission on Housing found that out of 1,041,591 inhabited houses in Scotland, 57,669 required demolition and 55,761 more new houses were needed. The shortage works out at 118,480. 'The drink demon lurks in every corner of the land and among all classes, and its shadow is a blot on the fair name of Scotland.' There is a hopeful change in public sentiment on the subject, and the necessity of temperance reform is urged on moral, physical, and economic grounds. The sections on art and religious life are full of valuable and interesting detail. The book embodies the results of an immense amount of skilled research.

Fijian Society; or the Sociology and Psychology of the Fijians.
By Rev. W. Deane, M.A., B.D. (Macmillan & Co. 16s. net.)

Mr. Deane's position as a Fijian missionary and as Principal of the Teachers' Training College at Ndávuilévu, Fiji, gave him special opportunity for the preparation of this volume. The old Fijians who have 'an intelligent knowledge of the past' are dying out.

Very few remain with sufficient vigour of memory to relate accurately what they have seen. Fiji is the meeting-place of the Polynesian and Melanesian races. Every shade of colour, from light brown through copper colour to dark brown, appears among the people. Vanu Levu is linked to the Melanesian aborigines and has many distinct signs of the matriarchate. The women have rights to which those of Viti Levu are strangers. Mr. Deane describes the initiation ceremonies of the youths and maidens, the customs connected with childbirth, the games and the religious practices of the people before Christianity came. Mr. Deane has seen them converted by scores and hundreds. They love to work in companies, and intensity of purpose is often in inverse ratio to the numbers who accept the gospel. There is one good result, however. They become voluntary pupils in a religious school, where they gain teaching that may inspire them with a worthy ideal of life. Every Christian Fijian seems to be able to give a sermonette of ten to fifteen minutes. There is a paucity of ideas and a multitude of words. The greatest difficulty in training preachers is to make them think for themselves, but there is hope that by dint of perseverance and careful tuition, volubility will decrease and originality of thought and utterance will increase. In Fiji, Sunday is a day to be enjoyed—work ceases and scarce a sail is to be seen on the blue-green waters. 'Apart from immorality, no very serious crimes are committed,' and there is warrant for 'hoping that the peculiar character of the Fijian has the possibility of rising to an estimable moral height.' The chapter on cannibalism is important. Mr. Deane thinks the true explanation seems to lie in a combination of the simple hunger theory and the revenge hypothesis. The book is a careful and well-balanced study of a deeply interesting subject.

Westminster Abbey: The Last Days of the Monastery as shown by the Life and Times of Abbot John Islip, 1464–1582. By H. F. Westlake, M.A., F.S.A. (P. Allan & Co. 5s. net.)

John Islip was born at Islip in Oxfordshire in 1464. Edward the Confessor was born in the same village, and as far back as the time of Henry III. (1216–1272) it had a small chantry chapel, the priest for which was appointed by the abbot and convent of Westminster. That probably accounts for the fact that he came to the abbey as a novice in 1480. He was professed and ordained priest in his twenty-second year, and was appointed chaplain to the abbot. Other offices followed, by which he became familiar with all the concerns of the abbey. He visited the estates in various parts of the country. He became prior in 1498 and abbot in 1500. He was a friend of Wolsey, and was in some danger of being involved in the charges brought against him. Under his rule the nave of the abbey was finished and the Jesus Chapel, commonly known as the Islip Chantry, was built. During his thirty-two years of power, the abbey gained

a glory which it had never had before. Mr. Westlake has used Islip's diary and the abbey documents to produce a living sketch of the life of the monastery. It is a fascinating little volume.

Messrs. F. Warne & Co. have just issued a new edition of Sale's Translation of the Koran (10s. net), with explanatory notes from the most approved commentators and Sale's Preliminary Discourse, which is the best Introduction in any European language to the study of the book and its environment. The work has been entirely reset in beautifully clear type. Sir E. D. Ross has written a brief Introduction, in which he points out that the Koran is not only the canon of his faith to the Muhammedan, but the text-book of ritual and of the principles of Civil Law. Sale's translation appeared in November, 1784. He died in 1786, before he was forty, in Surrey Street, Strand. He was solicitor to the S.P.C.K., and ten years earlier had begun to work on its Arabic New Testament. He expressed his obligation to Luigi Marracee's translation of the Koran published at Padua in 1698, but his debt was greater even than that tribute would suggest. His numerous allusions to Rabbinical writings show that he must have been well versed in Hebrew. There are some good full-page illustrations in this fine edition.—*The Tower of London*. By W. G. Bell. (John Lane. 6s. net.) These chapters were written for *The Daily Telegraph* in order to interest London in one of its most famous buildings. They are full of historic incidents, and everything is put in the most attractive way. There is no other short book on the Tower, and the illustrations of this volume by Mr. Hanslip Fletcher add much to its charm. Mr. Bell begins with a general study of the Fortress, and then describes the Keep built by William the Conqueror, the Traitors' Gate, the Bell, the Church of St. Peter ad Vincula with its illustrious dead lying in front of the altar, the Bloody Tower and Regalia, the Beauchamp Tower, the King's House, the fine Norman St. John's Chapel, and the entrance towers. It is a book that every one ought to read.—*The Turkish Restoration in Greece, 1718-1797*, by William Miller, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 1s. 8d. net), is one of the valuable *Helps for Students of History*. In the first part of this period Athens was mildly governed, lightly taxed, and locally autonomous. In 1760 the government became a manor and many pashas had to receive fees. Mr. Miller has ample knowledge and much skill in setting out the facts.

GENERAL

An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. By Ernest Weekley, M.A. (Murray. 42s. net.)

STUDENTS of English words and names owe much to the Professor of French in Nottingham University, and this handsome volume of 1,659 double-column pages will sensibly increase their debt. It is intended for lovers of our language who have an educated interest in words, and an intelligent curiosity as to their origins and earlier senses. It has gradually grown till it is the most complete etymological dictionary in existence. The vocabulary is, roughly speaking, that of the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* and Cassell's *New English Dictionary*. Some of their scientific and technical words are excluded, but others, which they omit, are included. Many slang words and expressions hitherto excluded by etymologists are here historically explained, for 'in the past the slang of one generation has often become the literary language of the next, and the manners which distinguish contemporary life suggest that this will be still more frequently the case in the future.' As a rule the proper name is only admitted to such a dictionary when it has attained the small initial, but Prof. Weekley's interest in the etymology of proper names, and his conviction that the part they have played in the creation of our vocabulary is not yet realized by etymologists, has led him to include a much larger proportion of them than usual. Dates for the appearance of foreign words are given in cases where that seems of interest, but these must be regarded as subject to revision. Quotations add much to the value of the dictionary, and they range from Bede to Mr. Horatio Bottomley, and represent the results of 'nearly fifty years' omnivorous reading stored away in a rather retentive memory.' Prof. Weekley does not agree with phonetic etymologists, who hold that 'the laws of sound-change admit of no exception.' He belongs to the Semantic school, who are guided by the parallelisms and contrasts to be observed in sense-development in language. 'Phonetics will explain general laws, but can hardly tell us by what process the schoolboy converts *swindle* into *swiz*, how *bicycle* becomes *bike*, or why the Prince of Wales should be known to his Oxford intimates as the *Pragger Wagger*.' Every page of the dictionary has its bypaths of knowledge. *Huxley* coined *Agnostic* from Acts xvii. 28; *demarcation* was used by Pope Alexander VI when he divided the new world between the Spaniards and Portuguese; *hooligan* was the name of a lively Irish family in the Borough, so a house-surgeon at Guy's who spent some of his time about 1896 'in patching up the results,' told Mr. Weekley. *La-di-da* and *lardy-dardy* date from the sixties, but their great vogue was due to a music-hall song of 1880: 'He wears a penny flower in

his coat, La-di-da'! Yorker represents a ball favoured by Yorkshire bowlers, or it comes from *yark*, to jerk. Eucalyptus was coined by L'Héritier in 1788 from the Greek word for covered, the flower before opening being covered by a cap. *Time's Telescope* for 1820 speaks of a Mr. Day, who had an estate in Essex not far from Fairlop Oak, where on the first Friday in July he fed his neighbours on beans and bacon. For several years before his death the pump and block makers of Wapping went there in a vehicle drawn by six post-horses, the whole adorned with ribands, flags, and streamers. That is the probable explanation of bean-feast. Photograph was introduced by Sir John Herschel in 1839, perhaps as a compromise between the rival photogene and heliograph. It was at once adopted into French. Such are a few of the plums picked out at random from this lordly pie. It is a dictionary that ought to be in every library.

The Logic of the Unconscious Mind. By M. K. Brady
(Frowde & Hodder & Stoughton. 16s. net.)

Mrs. Brady's interest in logic was kindled by the works of John Stuart Mill and the teaching of Miss Constance Jones. Prof. Freud's *Dream Interpretation* opened up to her the hinterland of the unconscious mind. Her book traces the rational characteristic of mind at different levels of consciousness in the individual and in its development in the race. Logic has been looked upon as a dry and abstract study, but it takes a fresh start in view of the discoveries of psychoanalysts concerning the unconscious mind. With a new understanding of human motives, the student 'has to look at people's reasonings, his own and others', and see what connecting principles may be observed, what general laws are actually in operation.' The unconscious background to conscious reasoning opens an interesting field of study. Mrs. Brady turns to Fabre for illustrations of the operation of instinct in insects. Instinct has inherent defects which put it on an altogether lower level than reason. 'The insect is entirely baffled by any obstacle, any change in external conditions, against which it is not provided by Nature with a regular way of acting in accordance with an inherited quasi-mechanical bodily structure.' When we 'act on intuition' 'we have a reason for what we do, which we should recognize were it set out clearly before us, but as things are we remain unconscious of it. If we try to give our reason, it is ten to one we give it wrong, and say, not what is true, but what we are able to express, our actual reasons not being sufficiently conscious to admit of expression.' The unconscious mind is the background of reason and intuition, out of which reason emerges. Dreams are exclusively concerned with the self at mental levels below the conscious, and the study of mental traits in them is of great interest. Not less important is the discussion of fallacies of observation and of conduct caused by unconscious motives. Trained observers are liable to see objects amiss, and psycho-analysis ascribes these errors

to unconscious bias. Typical cases of illogical conduct are adduced, such as Joseph Chamberlain's change of his opinions in his political career and Sir Edward Carson's action in Irish affairs. The criticism will not always carry conviction, but it adds spice and point to the discussion. Much attention is given to fallacies in reasoning, and it is no dry-as-dust study but bristles with debatable points. The third part deals with some outstanding problems of our own time, such as education and spiritualism, and indicates how they are likely to be approached by the average citizen of the future with the aid of a rejuvenated science of logic. The pages given to the Lord's Supper dwell on 'the fellowship in love of Christ's followers which found expression in their joint communion with Himself.' The pursuit of logic, as Mrs. Brady conceives it, confirms that larger faith which is taking possession of men's minds. It shows that man 'is not left comfortless, that what he loses is but an outer husk which protected and concealed the seed of spiritual life; that a message put into the mouth of One who suffered is still the solace of a suffering world—"Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."' There is much food for discussion in this volume, and those who cannot accept all its conclusions will find that it always provokes thought.

The Tempest is the first volume in the new edition of Shakespeare which is being issued by the Cambridge University Press under the editorship of Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. Dover Wilson. It is a beautiful volume bound in strong cloth with gilt tooled lines. The Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare from the First Folio is the frontispiece. There is also a portrait of Elizabeth of Bohemia and a facsimile of sixteen lines from what Sir E. M. Thompson holds to be the Shakespearian addition to *Sir Thomas More*. It is beautifully printed with good margins and can be slipped into a pocket. A complete recension of Shakespeare's text, based on a study and comparison, line by line, of the existing materials, gives peculiar importance to this edition. The delightful introduction by Sir A. Quiller-Couch covers all the topics on which light can be thrown. Mr. Wilson writes on the text and the punctuation. The stage-history is not overlooked. Notes and a glossary are also included in this attractive and workmanlike edition.

Later Essays, 1907-1920. By Austin Dobson. (Milford. 6s. 6d. net.)

These six biographical studies are really fine art. They are so free from exaggeration in their estimates, so natural and easy in style, and so full of incident that one is drawn on from page to page with deepening interest. 'Edwards's Canons of Criticisms' tells how Bishop Warburton's emendations of Shakespeare's text were turned into deserved ridicule by a gentleman of Lincoln's Inn. 'An eighteenth-century Hippocrates' is an account of Dr. William

Heberden, the leading physician of his time; Hermes' Harris is a pleasant picture of a literary country gentleman. 'The Journeys of John Howard' is a worthy tribute to the great prison reformer; 'The Learned Mrs. Carter' is a charming account of that clever linguist and brilliant talker; whilst 'The Abbé Edgworth' takes us amid the horrors of the French Revolution, in which the abbé played a noble part as the priest who attended Louis XVI through his last night and on the scaffold. It is a story which leaves its peculiar thrill. 'A Casual Causerie,' with its incidents and its verse, brings the papers to a delightful close. There is much real pleasure to be got in poring over Mr. Dobson's essays.

Blind: A Story of these Times. By Ernest Poole. (Macmillan & Co. 8s. 6d. net.) Larry Hart was brought up with a sister and two small cousins by his Aunt Amelia, who is the central figure of this story. His father developed a small foundry in Connecticut till he became a millionaire. His second wife knew how to make his money fly, and we see much of the gay life of the wealthy American. Larry turns to journalism and his friend Steve becomes a clever surgeon. Vivid pictures are drawn of their lives in slum and in hospital, and we see the young folk choose their paths and work out their fortunes. Then comes the war. The West holds back till at last all its reluctance to cast in its lot with the Allies is swept away and the only question is: Shall we be in time? It is a brilliant study of the temper of the United States at a crisis of her history, and when peace comes questions of reconstruction are almost as difficult as the problems of war. Larry loses his sight at the front, but after a hard struggle with himself he begins to build a new world which is lighted up by a woman's love. Mr. Poole draws on his Russian experience for some living pictures of peasant and noble in the grip of Bolshevism. The book is not merely a story but a study of the soul of America such as one is thankful to ponder over.—*The Wreck.* By Rabindranath Tagore. (Macmillan & Co. 8s. 6d. net.) English readers do not often get such an insight into the Indian view of marriage as this story gives. The interest is sustained from first to last, and the novelty of the situations has a charm of its own. Ramesh Baba is in a difficult position between the lady he loves and the wife that his father had found for him and whose life seems strangely linked to his after the terrible wreck. One girl is highly educated on European lines, the other is an Indian beauty with a heart of gold and with rare skill as cook and house-keeper. The minor characters are as vividly sketched as the four chief figures of the story, and the little descriptions of scenery and life in Calcutta and Benares are drawn with skill and poetic vividness.—*Mainwaring.* By Maurice Hewlett. (Collins & Co. 7s. 6d. net.) Mainwaring first appears on the scene as an impecunious Irishman, a teacher of English in Marseilles. He had soaring ambitions, and when he came to England played the part of labour leader with dramatic success. He made a name for himself and had won

a seat in the Cabinet before he died. He was 'a genius, and could drive men like sheep down steep places into the sea.' His wife was a lovely peasant girl with a sturdy conscience, who came to disapprove intensely of him and his ways. His success in Parliament, his bearing in society, and the famous lawsuit out of which he emerged with triumph are described with rare skill, but the charm of the story centres round the wife and the friend who wins her heart and hand after Mainwaring's death. Lizzy is one of the noble women of English fiction, and she gets a mate at last who is worthy of her.—*Tales of the Samurai*. (Tokyo: Methodist Publishing House. 10s. net.) These tales are based largely on fact and give an insight into the thought and feeling of the knights of old Japan, which Western readers will find intensely interesting. They have been adapted from traditional stories told by the professionals who nightly delight large audiences with romances and noble adventures. The Samurai class has vanished, but its sentiments, motives, and moral principles remain in some measure at the bedrock of Japanese character. The servant who became a priest in order to get revenge for a wrong done him by his master, found when the opportunity came that the revengeful feeling had given way to gratitude for an event which had really led him to greatness. Fighting and adventure and love are all mingled in these striking stories, and the illustrations in colour by a Japanese artist give added charm and novelty to the volume.—*The Mountebank*. By W. J. Locke. (John Lane. 7s. 6d. net.) It is no small feat to turn a mountebank into a victorious general and then send him back to his clown's life again, keeping him all the time a chivalrous gentleman. Lady Auriol learned to love him as a British soldier, and though the obstacles in the way of their happiness seemed insuperable, Mr. Locke gets them happily married at last. The scenes are chiefly laid in France, but the English country-house has a pleasant place in the story. It is one of Mr. Locke's most ingenious plots and keeps us well in suspense to the end.—The marked success of the *Selected Short Stories*, published in *The World's Classics* in 1914, has led to the preparation of a Second Series (Milford, 2s. 6d. net), which should prove equally popular. It gives twenty-eight stories, beginning with Mary and Charles Lamb and ending with Gerald Warre Cornish. Four are from Nathaniel Hawthorne, three from 'O. Henry,' two each from Poe, Bret Harte, and Henry James. Dickens, Wilkie Collins, Mark Rutherford, R. L. Stevenson, Oscar Wilde, George Gissing, and others are represented. No living writers are included. It is a little volume that will win a welcome wherever it goes.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Edinburgh Review (April).—‘The Austrian Derelict’ urges that unless the Allies take energetic measures Austria will be engulfed, and her fate will be an ever-abiding reproach to the conscience of mankind. In ‘The Organization of the Empire,’ Mr. J. A. R. Marriott recognizes that the machinery of the Empire must ere long be overhauled, but, in view of suspicions of any centralized institution, prudence whispers, *festina lente*. Admiral Cyprian Bridge and Mr. Colbeck discuss the ‘Naval Situation,’ and ‘The Future of Naval Construction.’ The Editor writes on ‘The New Protection.’ He thinks there is grave reason to fear that the country is about to witness the revival in an acute form of the old fiscal controversy. He holds that certain question-begging cries now being made are ‘merely excuses put forward by various groups of manufacturers who want to obtain favour for themselves at the expense of their fellow citizens.’ Only on rare occasions is any public attempt made to show the activity, the extraordinary adaptability, and the general prosperity of the more important British industries. The general prosperity gained under the old commercial system was manifest in the way that England bore the financial burden of the Great War, and nothing, he holds, has since occurred to throw doubt on the wisdom of the policy which we pursued with such wonderful success for seventy years.

Hibbert Journal (April).—The first article, by Evelyn Underhill, on ‘Sources of Power in Human Life’ shows the practical value of mysticism, how distinctly weakened life may be—and the spiritual life of to-day is—by a lack of the power and joy of which the mystic has learned the secret. Readers who are impatient of mysticism and all its ways may find much that is suggestive in this well-written paper. With it may suitably be read the article that follows on Loyola’s ‘Spiritual Exercises,’ by Father Walker, S.J., though the title of the latter may not sound promising. The Dean of Carlisle replies to Prof. McDougall’s criticism of his ethical views in an instructive article entitled, ‘Is Conscience an Emotion?’ Professor Bacon’s paper, ‘What did Judas betray?’ contains a minute discussion of the meaning of Messiahship as claimed by Jesus. Dr. Bacon’s argument cannot be briefly summarized, but he holds that Jesus did claim to be the Christ, as ‘Founder of a new social order of peace and good will,’ to be established on earth among men. He suffered through fidelity to His message; some of His disciples were content to suffer with Him that they might reign with Him, others shrank from the issue, and some maligned and betrayed the sacred cause. A very interesting, though not particularly original

article on 'Wordsworth's Interpretation of Nature' is by Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D. Other articles are, 'Shinto,' by T. Batty, D.C.L., 'The Newest Freedom,' by G. Speranza, and 'Mediæval Conceptions of the Kingdom of God,' by Prof. Hearnshaw. The number as a whole is full of good matter—perhaps too full and too good for some readers.

Church Quarterly Review (April).—Canon Quick writes on 'The Miracles in the Creed.' He says it rests with the experts to say whether the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of the Buried Body belong to the original picture of our Lord or are additions to it. The experts are 'the pure and the Christian in heart, who are best qualified to recognize the Master's work because they have His Spirit in them.' The Rev. A. E. Baker discusses 'The religious development of Mr. H. G. Wells.' 'If his hopes, and guesses, and intuitions are at all typical of the modern spirit (and there is no man who so reflects the age, both in what he sees, and in what he misses seeing), then the modern spirit has set out on a pilgrimage in which a few steps further will bring it face to face with Christ.'

The Constructive Quarterly (December).—Five articles on various aspects of the Lambeth Conference stand first in this number. Prof. Jordan, of the University of Paris, writes on 'The Centenary of Dante and the Church.' 'His whole work, in its own way, is an act of faith toward "Holy Church," on which human weakness may imprint its stains, but which none the less remains the society of the elect of which the Prophet foretold.' Baron von Hügel deals with 'Christianity and the Supernatural.' He gives examples under seven heads of the heroic heights to which the supernatural lifts human life. Dr. Wotherspoon has a most interesting account of 'John Macleod of Govan.' (March).—Bishop McConnell writes on 'The Church and the Larger Freedom.' The newer doctrine of freedom tries to see men as they are, in all their weaknesses of mind and heart and will. There is an increasing attempt to get hold of the inner springs of intellectual strength in growing minds, and an attempt to fit the life into larger and larger relationship. In the world of labour the new spirit aims at self-expression and self-control. 'The Church is set toward the largest freedom for men, but that freedom involves self-realization, self-expression, self-control, self-determination.' 'Christianity means the freedom of the advance into larger life,' and the organization of the Church should be such as to give 'the contagion of religious life the very largest opportunity.' Dr. Eugene Stock urges that as the Early Church waived its condition so far as to enrol uncircumcised men as members, so those who hold to Apostolic Succession might with equal confidence admit that men not thus ordained might 'have authority to minister the Eucharist or power to make it effective—whatever that may involve.'

Journal of Theological Studies (January).—Dr. Lock's opening article on 'William Sanday' contains an appreciative account

of Dr. Sanday's life and work. Such a teacher will be sorely missed. Dr. C. H. Turner presents an instalment of the late Abbé Bessières' work on St. Basil's correspondence, which he has edited with erudite care. Brief notes are contributed on the Slavonic Enoch by Archdeacon Charles, on the use of *ἀνατύπωσις* in Clem. Alex., by F. H. Colson, and on the Odes of Solomon by Father Connolly. The reviews of books are full and interesting.

Holborn Review (April).—The leading article in this number is Prof. Gilbert Murray's H. Sidgwick Lecture on 'Poesis and Mimesis'—in other words, on Aristotle's description of the function of poetry, 'a making or manufacture based upon an imitation.' We can be sure, says Prof. Murray, 'with Plato that the two things that determine the way of life for each one of us are, as he puts it, the road of our longing and the quality of our soul. That is our Mimesis and our Poesis, our choice of subject and our execution.' Dr. Lindsay's essay on 'The Metaphysical Aspects of Immortality' does not undervalue the moral argument, but seeks to strengthen it from the purely intellectual side. 'We do not merely hope, we know, that we are immortal.' But unfortunately all metaphysicians do not agree with him. Another metaphysical article, by Prof. Atkinson Lee, deals with an abstruse subject, 'Space, Time, and Deity' as expounded in Prof. Alexander's new volume of Gifford Lectures. Dr. Alexander's doctrine is neither Theism nor Pantheism, but Cosmism, a faith in the greatness of the universe. If it be a religion, Mr. Lee well says, 'it is likely to be the religion of a chosen few.' Other articles are on 'The Religious Use of Imagination,' and 'British Labour Conditions during the War.' Dr. Peake's 'Editorial Notes' are full of interest, especially those on Prof. Gilbert Murray and the Greek tragedians.

Expository Times (April).—Rev. J. G. Drummond's paper on 'The Problem of United Worship' advocates a more carefully thought-out plan for each religious service as a whole. The suggestions made appear to be too elaborate for the edification of most congregations. The article on 'The Power of the Cross' provides a translation of one of the ancient 'encomia' on the Cross, as edited by Prof. Deissmann, of Berlin, and translated by L. R. M. Strachan, of Birmingham University. The account here given of these 'encomia' will be new and interesting to many readers. Prof. J. E. Macfadyen contributes a further instalment of 'The Spirit of Early Judaism'—a thoughtful study of Old Testament religion. The Editor's Notes on Dr. C. H. Turner, Dr. Kirsopp Lake, Prof. Headlam's Lectures on Early Church History, and other subjects, are interesting and valuable, as usual.

Science Progress (April) has important articles on 'The Physical Investigation of Soil,' by Mr. Keen, of the Rothamsted Experimental Station, Sex Heredity, and on the appearance of New Stars, by the Rev. A. L. Cortie. Prof. Bickerton has strenuously upheld that these new stars are due to a grazing impact between two suns.

Others incline to Seeliger's view that they are due 'to the entrance of a star into a nebula, on the analogy of the luminous appearances that accompany a shooting star in the earth's atmosphere.' The late Sir William Mather's service to science is gratefully recorded in a Note. In 1898 he established the forty-eight hour week at his iron-works at Salford and secured, as he expected, a great improvement in the quality and quantity of output. He equipped the mechanical training workshop at the Gordon College at Khartoum, and for a number of years was President of the British Science Guild.

The Interpreter (April).—Prof. Burkitt writes on 'Eucharist and Sacrifice.' The English Reformers rejected transubstantiation, but Cranmer 'did not turn the Eucharist into a real, but pagan, sacrifice of bread and wine.' He was much influenced by St. Augustine and turned the Mass into a Communion. The congregation having assisted at the due consecration of the bread and wine and received these elements, offer themselves to God to be a reasonable sacrifice. 'By what has gone before, so far as ritual both of words and actions can effect anything at all, the congregation have been hallowed into the Body of Christ. It is a difficult conception, but perfectly Augustinian.' The Rev. J. C. Mantripp has an interesting paper on 'The Peril of Discipline,' and the Rev. E. J. Fripp on 'The Religious Significance of Falstaff.'

Review of Reviews (April-May).—Sir Philip Gibbs describes a short interview with President Harding, who told him, 'Friendship between the United States and Great Britain is essential for the welfare of the world. Americans of the old stock look upon England as the Mother Country, and we regard that always as a cherished inheritance, not to be forgotten.' He describes the life of the smaller towns of America which he visited and shows the goodwill of the thoughtful men and women towards England. He pleads for a warmer welcome for American visitors.

Economica (January), is to be issued in January, May, and October by the London School of Economics and Political Science. A lecture by the director of the School, Sir W. Beveridge, deals with Economics as a liberal science. Prof. Cannan writes on 'Bank Deposits,' Miss Bushell on 'The Relative Importance of Co-operative and other Retail Traders.' It will prove a very useful guide to students.

AMERICAN

Journal of Religion (March).—Prof. Fitch, in answering the question, "What is the Present Attitude of College Students towards Organized Religion?" finds pathos in the fact that so many students 'regard the Church of to-day as an organization hostile to mental freedom, indifferent to beauty, and insistent on a procrustean morality.' For this serious situation he evidently thinks that the Churches are much more to blame than the 'boys.' Prof. Shailer Mathews writes on 'The Functional Values of Doctrines of the Atonement.'

While highly commending Dean Rashdall's Bampton Lectures on the subject, he criticizes the 'moral influence theory' of the Atonement as inadequate in practice. No doctrine of the Atonement, he says, 'is likely to function in our world which does not integrate the divine forgiveness with our best moral practices.' The article 'Religion and the Concept of Progress,' by C. M. Case, opens up a fruitful subject of study, which really requires a volume. It is made clear, however, that the connexion between progress and religion is close, and the advancement of both in the world depends upon the establishment among men of a spiritual view of life. Other articles are on 'Resources of the Modern Preacher,' 'Is there a Religious Breakdown of the Ministry?' 'Why do Religions Die?' and 'Does a Philosophy of Morals tend to undermine Faith in a Personal God?' Only brief contributions are offered towards the solution of such great questions as those indicated above, but their appearance is a sign of the renewed life and energy infused into this attractive periodical, which now takes the place of the *American Journal of Theology*, and of the *Biblical World*.

Harvard Theological Review.—Dr. Preserved Smith has made valuable contributions to our knowledge of Luther and the Reformation. In the April number he shows, in an article entitled 'A Decade of Luther Study,' that intensive research has shed much light on the subject since 1910. Historical students will be grateful for a comprehensive survey of the literature; they would have welcomed a more detailed judgement of many of the works mentioned. No help is given, for example, towards the understanding of the connexion between the Reformation and the Great War by placing in juxtaposition opinions so diverse as that 'Luther was largely responsible for the war by his teaching of blind obedience to the State, by his separation of inward justification from outward works, by his express approval of war, and by his brutality and chauvinism' (Paquier); that 'the war is an apostasy from Luther's doctrine' (Weiss); and that he may be mobilized 'in favour of an active prosecution of the war' by quoting 'his severe judgements of French, English, and Italians.' On 'The Religious and Moral Situation in France,' much information of the deepest interest is given by M. Victor Monod, who served as a chaplain in the war, and is now a minister in Paris. 'The true dictator is to-day the producer of wheat, milk, meat—the peasant of France.' By its immense sacrifices the peasant class has gained primacy of influence; the Socialist party has lost much of its power owing to 'the resolute determination of the peasant class to secure social stability.' Catholic and Protestant churches alike have acute difficulty in filling up the ranks of the clergy; but 'the war has taught the French Republic the importance of religious and moral factors in the world'; hence the French Government is more polite in its dealings with the Churches.' The collapse expected by the enemies of France never came; 'gratitude for this is due to the spiritual educators of the nation, who kept its soul up to the level of its exigencies.'

Princeton Theological Review (April).—Since the last number of this review appeared its able and indefatigable editor, Dr. B. B. Warfield, has passed away. A brief obituary notice appears in this number, and probably later some fuller account will be published of the life-work of the late learned and able Professor of Theology at Princeton College. The second instalment of an article by him on 'Oberlin Perfectionism' is here published. Other articles are 'Smooth Stones out of the Brook,' by W. L. Baxter—the Goliath to be slain being the critical views of the Old Testament which the writer denominates 'Driverism'; 'Faith and Fellowship,' by Daniel E. Jenkins, and 'The Bible in Shakespeare,' by Philip W. Crannell. The Reviews of Recent Literature form a distinct and characteristic feature of this ably conducted theological review.

Bibliotheca Sacra (April).—Prof. Graham, of Oberlin, gave an address on 'The Place of America in the World to-day,' on Washington's birthday. The ideal of democracy in government has been her lordliest contribution to mankind, and has been for 150 years a ferment in the souls of men. He refers to President Wilson's action in the war and to those who held America back after the war from assuming a responsibility that was rightfully ours. 'After all that France has done for us we are turning a too ready ear to that whining nation, the defeated that seeks now to escape the just punishment of its sin.' There are articles on the Holy Spirit, The Problem of Evil, and other important subjects.

Methodist Review (March-April) (New York).—President Tipple of Drew Seminary, writes a highly appreciative notice of his predecessor, beloved by all who knew him, Dr. H. A. Buttz—of whom also an excellent portrait is given. 'A Potential Luther of the Fifteenth Century' is Nicholas of Cusen, of whose times an instructive study is contributed by A. W. Nagler, of Garrett Institute. An article on 'The Aesthetic Aspects of Puritanism' concludes with the words, 'Like Greek art, Puritanism rested its case upon the simplicity of truth.' Many will turn with special interest to a short paper in the 'Arena' section on 'James M. Buckley—Human Being,' a title which speaks for itself. The reminiscences here given of a notable figure in American Methodism are very characteristic. The titles of some other articles, 'Naturalism in Psychology and Ethics,' 'The Atonement—to me' and 'The Biblical Conception of the Firmament,' illustrate the variety of intellectual fare provided by the present editor of the review, to suit various palates and appetites.

Methodist Quarterly Review (Nashville, Tenn.) (April).—This is an excellent number. The first article, on 'Ministerial Orders and Reunion,' by Rev. S. H. Wainwright, of Tokyo, does service in pointing out that the difference between Roman—and to some extent Anglican—and Protestant Communions on the question of orders depends on the deep-lying difference between the prophetic and priestly points of view. Till this chasm is effectively

bridged, attempts at reunion must fail. The short article by Prof. J. Arthur Thomson, of Aberdeen, contains an admirable summary of the meaning of evolution. No one but a master could have written it; it embodies some of the chief results reached in the author's recent Gifford Lectures. 'The Only Social Solvent,' by A. M. Pierce, shows the meaning of 'Christian Love' as a panacea for the world's woes. An interesting sketch of 'R. L. Stevenson in California' is illustrated by a photograph which the editor uses as a frontispiece to this number of the review. Other articles in a number of marked and varied excellence are entitled, 'What is Christian Education?' 'In Memory of Hegel,' by Rudolf Eucken, 'Studies in the Philosophy of William James' (concluded), and 'Greek Tenses in the New Testament' by Prof. A. T. Robertson. The editor's Notes on Southern Methodist questions are interesting. We greatly regret to hear of the sudden death of this cultivated scholar and writer. Dr. Thomas was a native of Kentucky and served his country in the war with Spain.

FOREIGN

Analecta Bollandiana (Tomus 39, Fasc. 1 and 2).—This quarterly number has a portrait and a sketch of Père F. Van Ortrøy, who was the doyen of the Society and Bollandists. He was born at Alost in 1854 and died in September, 1917. After his course at Louvain he became Professor in Liège, first of Latin and then of rhetoric. He then studied theology in Louvain, was ordained in 1886, and completed his studies at Ditton Hall, in England. He proved a great acquisition to the Society of Bollandists. No task was able to damp his jovial impetuosity. He had all the gifts needed for his work and did notable service. Two valuable articles on 'Martyr and Confessor'; a discussion of a miracle; the life of St. Hilary Auciacensis; a study of the list of martyrs at Lyon in 177 A.D.; and an account of the letters of Jean de Tagliacozzo on the Siege of Belgrade are some of the treasures in this number.

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques (Jan.—March, 1921).—The main articles are on *La Science et les Sciences Spéculatives d'après S. Thomas d'Aquin*, by M. Sertillanges, and on the theory of matter and form in Occam, by P. Donceur. There is an extended note by M. F. A. Blanche on the meaning of certain terms used by S. Thomas when speaking of Analogy. The *Bulletin of Philosophy* is devoted to psychology, especially to recent work on the psychology of religion, and this no less than the succeeding bulletin on Biblical theology will be found of the greatest service to students. They both give able notice of all the recent books on both these subjects in Europe and America.