PRICE, $2 PER ANNUM SINGLE NUMBER, 50 CENTS

VOL. LXI.—NO. 1 WHOLE NO. 213

THE METHODIST REVIEW

QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

GROSS ALEXANDER, S.T.D.

JANUARY, 1912

I. *The Social Teaching of the Old and New Testaments* . . . . . THE EDITOR

II. *Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel* . . . PROF. WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

III. *Wesley's Relation to Theological Standards* CHANCELLOR BURWASH

IV. *Charles Dickens After a Hundred Years* PROF. GEORGE HERBERT CLARKE

V. *The History of the World-Wide Movement for the Liberation of Woman* . . MISS BELLE BENNETT

VI. *The First Life-and-Death Struggle of Christianity* . . . PROF. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER

VII. *George Eliot and Elizabeth Barrett Browning* . . . . . MRS. GROSS ALEXANDER

VIII. *The Poet-Singers of the Land of the Maple* NEWTON MACTAVISH

IX. *Christianity and Recent Philosophical Tendencies* . . . . . H. MALDWYN HUGHES

X. *Wordsworth's Healing Power* . . MRS. F. L. TOWNSEND

XI. *The Resurrection of Jerusalem* . . PROF. GEORGE B. EAGER

XII. *Editorial Departments:*

1. THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS ON THE CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES.
2. BOOK REVIEWS.

A PRAYER (Poem). Mary McKinnon McSwain.

REPENTANCE (Poem). Francis McKinnon Morton.

For full Contents, see page back of inner title.

PUBLISHED FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH

SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

LONDON: J. ALFRED SHARP, 25–35 City Road

TORONTO: WILLIAM BRIGGS, Wesley Buildings, Richmond Street, W.

Entered at the post office at Nashville, Tenn., as second-class matter.

What Is the Best Commentary on the Bible?

ONLY TEN CENTS

The Editor of the REVIEW, being asked again and again what is the best commentary in existence on the Bible, requested Dr. McFadyen, now a professor in the Free Church College, Glasgow, Scotland, to select from all the commentaries and series of commentaries in the English language the very best one on each book of the Old Testament for scholarly students and the very best one for general use, and make two lists accordingly. He did so.

Professor C. W. Votaw, of the University of Chicago, made two similar lists of best commentaries for the New Testament. These four lists are printed, with much other valuable information on books for various departments of Bible study, in a small paper-covered pamphlet which, while worth ten times the amount, is offered for sale by Smith & Lamar for only ten cents. Every student of the Bible should by all means have a copy of this booklet.

BEST BOOKS

FOR

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

ESPECIALLY THE BEST COMMENTARIES

CAREFULLY SELECTED BY

JOHN E. McFADYEN

Professor Old Testament Exegesis and Literature, The Free Church College, Glasgow

AND

CLYDE W. VOTAW

Professor New Testament Exegesis and Literature, University of Chicago

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

GROSS ALEXANDER

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH
SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS
1911

THE

METHODIST REVIEW

QUARTERLY

EDITED BY
GROSS ALEXANDER, S.T.D.

JANUARY, 1912.

PUBLISHED FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH
SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS
NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.; SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
LONDON: J. ALFRED SHARP, 23-35 City Road.
TORONTO: WILLIAM BRIGGS, Wesley Buildings, Richmond Street, W.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I. THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. By THE EDITOR. Address at the Ecumenical Conference 3

II. MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, Professor of Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York..... 21

III. WESLEY'S RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL STANDARDS. By CHANCELLOR BURWASH, Victoria University, Toronto..... 34

IV. CHARLES DICKENS AFTER A HUNDRED YEARS. By GEORGE HERBERT CLARKE, Professor of English Literature, University of Tennessee 41

V. THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD-WIDE MOVEMENT FOR THE LIBERATION OF WOMAN. By MISS BELLE BENNETT, President of the Woman's Council 54

VI. THE FIRST LIFE-AND-DEATH STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY. By JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, Professor of Church History, Drew Theological Seminary 73

VII. GEORGE ELIOT AND ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. By MRS. GROSS ALEXANDER, author of "Light Through Darkened Windows" 83

VIII. THE POET-SINGERS OF THE LAND OF THE MAPLE. By NEWTON MACTAVISH, Editor *Canadian Magazine,* Toronto..... 97

IX. CHRISTIANITY AND RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL TENDENCIES. By REV. H. MALDWYN HUGHES, Southport, England.. 118

X. WORDSWORTH'S HEALING POWER. By MRS. F. L. TOWNSEND, author of "In the Nantahalas" 122

XI. THE RESURRECTION OF JERUSALEM. By GEORGE B. EAGER, Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 131

XII. EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

I. THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS ON THE CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES..... 144

II. BOOK REVIEWS. 160

SCHLEIERMACHER: *The Christian Faith* (160)....Gross Alexander.
BRUCKNER: *The Fifth Gospel* (165).....John C. Granbery.
MOFFATT: *Introduction to the New Testament* (168)..Thos. Carter.
HASTINGS: *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (173) .....Gross Alexander.
MURRAY: *Christian Faith and the New Psychology* (176) .....G. B. Winton.
COULEVAIN: *On the Branch* (178).....Mary Stuart Smith.
GLADSTONE: *Correspondence on Church and Religion* (180). J. L. Kirby.
DU BOIS: *Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders* (185) J. M. Moore.
ROBERTSON: *The Glory of the Ministry* (189).....Thos. Carter.
CLARKE: *The Ideal of Jesus* (191).....John A. Kern.
BEACH: *Missionary Atlas and Directory* (193).....W. W. Pinson.
MOUZON: *Life and Sermons of Bishop Ward* (195)....J. M. Moore.
BROWN: *Elkanah Settle, His Life and Works* (198) Gross Alexander.
LELIEVRE–OSUNA: *Juan Wesley, Su Vida y Su Obra* (200) G. B. Winton.
ROBERTSON: *Commentary on Matthew* (202).....Thos. Carter.
MRS. WALTER B. NANCE: *The Love Story of a Maiden of Cathay* (204).....Gross Alexander.
FORSYTHE: *The Person and Place of Christ* (205).....L. D. Lowe.

A PRAYER (Poem). *Mary McKinnon McSwain*..... 117

REPENTANCE (Poem). *Francis McKinnon Morton*..... 130

THE
METHODIST REVIEW
QUARTERLY

VOL. LXI., NO. 1. WHOLE NO. 213. | JANUARY, 1912 | THIRD SERIES. VOL. XXXVIII., NO. 1.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

I. THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

IN studying the social teaching of Jesus we should exercise great care that we do not, in our zeal to fit his message to the social ideals, theories, and programmes of our age, rob it of that which makes it the message for all ages.

It will be necessary, therefore, at the outset to get as clear a conception as possible of the primary aim of his mission and the fundamental principles of his teachings. He was not a social reformer in the modern and conventional sense of those words. His primary aim was not the reorganization and reconstruction of human society. He had a higher aim and a broader one, which, however, included and provided for this lower one—a plan which, if carried out, would involve the solution of the social problems of this world. His primary object and his supreme concern was the spiritual regeneration of the individual human being through the revelation of God and his true relation and attitude toward men, that they might become subjected and conformed to his will.

In the nature of the case this process and this result was an individual matter, which could be realized only through individual action. Jesus' message, then, as has been well said, was primarily about God, and it was primarily to the individual. This does not imply that it was intended for the individual only, or

that it ended with the individual. By no means. On the contrary, it gave the individual a new relation to others, to all others, and laid upon him an unescapable obligation to love them and to serve them with a self-denying and sacrificial devotion.

Jesus' doctrine of the necessity of the regeneration of the individual and his doctrine of social righteousness are complementary; indeed, they are organically one and inseparable. His standard and his demand of social righteousness are so high and so inexorable that without a renewal of the nature, a change of heart, a second birth (whether realized all at once or gradually), it is a simple, primary impossibility. "A bad tree *cannot* bring forth good fruit." Take, for example, his teaching on the subject of chastity, or the relation of the sexes, which is a social question: "Blessed are the pure in heart; whosoever casteth a look with lustful thought, desire, intent, is a criminal, guilty of adultery." Take again his teaching on the nonresistance of evil, the guilt of retaliation; or his teaching concerning one's attitude toward his enemies. Once more, take his insistent and emphatic teaching on the subject of wealth (a social question), which is the hardest, the most unwelcome, and the most persistently rejected of all his teachings. Speaking specifically on this subject, he said, expressly and explicitly, that only the power of God, to whom alone impossible things are possible, can make it possible for the possessor of wealth to enter the kingdom of God.

Spiritual Regeneration Makes All Righteousness Possible.

On the other hand, when the spiritual regeneration and transformation of the nature, "the change of heart," has taken place, which the teaching of Jesus explicitly demands or implicitly assumes, and which he makes possible, then all righteousness is made possible, inevitable, spontaneous, second nature, easy—"a good tree *cannot* bring forth evil fruit"—and specifically, all *social* righteousness is potentially provided for. Not that there is no longer need for specific prescription and instruction, such as that which we find in the Sermon on the Heights, the greater part of which is devoted to social duties, or that express and lucid teaching which we find on the duty of service, with himself as the object-lesson, and the tender-hearted Samaritan as the illustration. These are given that they may furnish a plain objective rule of

action, an objective test of the genuineness of the process of transformation, and as the stimulus and inspiration of lofty ideals to noble striving.

And, by the way, this is quite in accord with what our own great Wesley, who had in a singular degree the mind of Christ, insisted on. For does he not say, at the conclusion of those General Rules which give such explicit and inclusive directions for the regulation of the lives of the people called Methodists, "All these things we know the Spirit writes on truly awakened hearts"?

In short, to be a disciple of Christ is to be a servant of men, and one who does not serve men is *ipso facto* shown not to be a disciple of Christ. The distinguishing mark of his followers is service, and the *degree* of service determines place and rank in his kingdom. In order the more effectually to enforce the necessity of service, Jesus lays on the colors in depicting a scene the most awful and awe-inspiring to be found in the Bible or out of it. It is the emphasis of the final judgment and of eternal destiny laid on the duty of loving service to the poorest, the lowliest, and the neediest, and that to their physical wants. And it may not be amiss to say that we need to be reminded in these days, when we are so willing to spend our money in ways that will gratify our pride or pleasure, that the Judge is not represented as saying, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom, for I was without a fifty-thousand-dollar church and a ten-thousand-dollar organ and ye gave me both"; but rather as saying, "Some of the lowliest of my brethren were hungry and ye gave them food, strangers and ye took them into your homes, without clothing and ye clothed them, sick and ye visited them, in prison and ye went to see them. And all that ye did to them, ye did to me." All this is a complete answer to those superficial interpreters who say that the so-called individualistic interpretation of the message of Jesus excludes social teaching and leaves no room for social ethics.

No Specific Directions about Forms of Organization.

But Jesus did not give his disciples any specific directions for associating themselves together, nor did he prescribe any form of organized activity. He was content to implant the principle and power of love, and leave it to work, the very nature of which is to draw men together and to unite them in some, though

it be at first only the most rudimentary, form of association. And there has never yet been anything quite equal to the triumphant illustration of this principle which we find in the scenes of the first Pentecost, a more disinterested and beautiful realization of Utopian conditions than has ever elsewhere been seen. (Acts iv. 31-35.)

In the second place, Jesus, with a wisdom deeper than that of any socialistic theorist or dreamer of schemes, knew that no one form or type of organization, whether religious or social or even political, would suit all ages, and places, and circumstances, and kinds of men. If Jesus had prescribed authoritatively any one form of government or organization or organized movement, it would have meant that that particular form was to be permanent, unalterable, universal. For in accordance with his profound insight he dealt only with what was permanent, unchangeable, universal. How carefully and with what far-seeing wisdom he avoided it! He did not do this even for his Church. Indeed, according to the record of his life in the Gospels, he did not use that word but twice during his ministry, and those cases are thought by some to have been editorial insertions of a date when the Church had been organized under the potential organizing impulse of which I have spoken—though that is by no means certain.

Jesus trusted his regenerated disciples, under the inspiration and guidance of his still living presence in their hearts and midst, to take care of outward forms of organization. And here again one cannot help thinking of that marvelous and matchless man whom we Methodists have a sanctified pride in calling our Father and Founder. He said with reference to the various peculiarities of Methodism, "Everything arose as the occasion demanded." Jesus did not, then, give instruction to or for any form of organized society. He did not even instruct his individual disciples as to how they should act or deport themselves as members of any civil or social or religious organism. Does this mean that all the coöperative social movements of our day for righting social wrongs, for bettering social conditions, for reconstructing the entire social order, are ruled out and have no place in the teaching of Jesus and the mission of his Church? No! A thousand times no! The so-called individualistic and the current social

(or socialistic) views of the teaching of Jesus ought not to be thought of as different theories, antagonistic, exclusive, irreconcilable; they are both included in his teaching and are parts of one whole, and for both there is full provision in the amplitude of his thought and purpose. The potency of all social adjustments and fulfillments is latent in the far-reaching principles of his teaching and his plan. Certainly, society must be saved as well as the individual, and environment must be changed as well as character. For we know that environment is influential and often decisive in shaping character, and the individual is, as a matter of fact, in a large measure, what society makes him. And for these reasons it is the bounden duty of all Christian men and women to unite and coöperate in all social movements of all kinds for the speedy and complete removal, on the one hand, of all social evils and wrongs, such as that monstrous and unspeakable iniquity, the liquor business, the circulation of demoralizing literature, the toleration of indecent plays and shows, hard conditions of the laboring classes, degrading and dehumanizing poverty, the employment of child labor, the oppression of employees (especially women) by employers, plutocratic and monopolistic combinations for the appropriation of nature's resources, the dishonesty, despotism, and cruelty of soulless corporations as well as soulless individuals, corruption in politics, illiteracy and insanitation among the poor, etc.; and on the other hand, for bringing to all, even the poorest of the poor, all possible advantages, comforts, and blessings, physical, intellectual, educational, social, æsthetic, and especially moral and spiritual. The various churches, *all* the various churches, ministers, laymen, and women, ought to take the initiative and the leadership in all such social enterprises and to thank God for the opportunity and privilege of employing their time, their talents, and their money in making them successful; and that for two reasons, (1) because these things are good in themselves, and (2) because when accomplished, they would make it immeasurably easier to win the masses, thus relieved, to Christ and salvation. The Church of Jesus Christ cannot afford not to give its coöperation and leadership in all these social reforms. If they excuse themselves, they pay the penalty in their own spiritual declension and deteri-

oration, in losing all power with God and all influence with men, and in becoming despised and rejected cumberers of the ground.

Silence as to the State.

As to the State or civil government, Jesus had nothing to say. It is to be supposed that he tacitly assumes—certainly he did not say anything which implies that he denied—the necessity of some form of civil government. He seems to recognize it in what he said about taxes to be paid to Cæsar. Paul and Peter, in their epistles (we may infer under the influence of the Christian spirit), exhort Christians to obey the civil government. But Jesus does not indicate the province or functions of civil government; he does not define the relation of his disciples to it, or its relation to the kingdom of God.

This is another instance of his deep wisdom and in accordance with his invariable method. He reveals the great Personality, he declares great germinal principles, he releases potent spiritual and ethical forces, brings these to bear on men, and leaves them to produce their legitimate effects in quickening men's capacities and powers, transforming their natures, and guiding their activities. (The way to make a good State is to make good citizens; the way to make good citizens is to make good men; the way (and the only way) to make good men is to bring them face to face with God, to awaken in them a sense of the ugliness, the guilt, and the ruinousness of sin, and the beauty and blessedness of righteousness, and to subdue their wills and willfulness, and win their hearts, by the appeal of God's fatherly love and forgiving grace.)

Least of all does Jesus teach, or say anything that can be twisted to imply, that (at any time or under any circumstances) the kingdom of God is to be identified with the State or that it is to take the place of the State. We know the disastrous results of several experiments that have been made in this direction, and notably those made by the Roman Catholic Church at sundry times and in divers places. "My kingdom is not of this world," he said as explicitly as language can be made to say it. The kingdom of God exists simultaneously with, and in the midst of, but still in rigid and perpetual separation from, the State. Otherwise we should witness a repetition of the history of Europe from Hilde-

brand to Pius IX. We can but sympathize with and admire the patient efforts which the noble army of our Nonconformist brethren in England are making to bring about the separation of Church and State; and we pray God to give them success.

Some of our enthusiastic Christian Socialists, like my gifted and honored friend, Prof. Walter Rauschenbusch, in his beautiful and inspiring book on *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* and Dr. Samuel Newton Clarke, in his recent book, *The Ideal of Jesus,* come perilously near to the doctrine of the ultimate identification of the kingdom of God and the civil State.

Jesus and the Family.

It has been said in this paper that Jesus gave no instruction concerning any kind or form of social organism. There is one notable and profoundly significant exception. He did give some very explicit instruction, and he laid down inexorable law for safeguarding the integrity and preserving the sanctity of the Family.

The Family is a social organism of a nature and kind radically and essentially different from any and all others. It is an organism of nature, so to speak. According to the Old Testament and the interpretation of it by Jesus, "it was instituted of God in the time" of the race's infancy. Without it, natural society is chaos. Without it, the kingdom of God is not possible. Two things are elemental—the individual and the Family, the individual unit and the social unit. These two secured in accordance with the ideal and the teachings of Jesus, all other organisms and forms of social life will take care of themselves—the community, the State, the Church.

Forbids Divorce.

In keeping with his lofty teaching as to the origin and sacredness and the divine sanctions of marriage and the Family, are his explicit, repeated, insistent, impassioned utterances on the subject of divorce—the dissolution of the marriage bond and the separation of the husband and wife with liberty to form a marriage (sexual) relation with a third person. If the family is fundamental, divorce is fundamental. This is why Jesus devotes to this subject so much attention—seemingly out of all proportion in the opin-

ion of those—shall I say of *us?*—who have not thought so deeply as he did.

The old law (Deut. xxiv. 1), on account of the hardness of the hearts of the men of that primitive time (as Jesus said), tolerated divorce, and, as it was interpreted by the rabbis, for any cause that might seem good and sufficient in the eyes of any husband who had found or was looking for a new "affinity." The only thing required was that the husband give his wife a certificate of dismissal. Jesus forbade divorce for any but one cause, and many of the best scholars think, for *any* cause, in view of the fact that the exceptive clause ("saving for the cause of fornication") is not found in the parallel passage in Mark (x. 11), the earliest Gospel, or in Luke (xvi. 18), which probably follows the earlier form.

Jesus did not explicitly or implicitly forbid simple separation and living apart where conditions became intolerable, but not with the right and privilege of forming a new (sexual) union with some other "affinity." If people knew absolutely that it was absolutely impossible to get divorces, they would be pretty sure to find a *modus vivendi,* and be willing to make all necessary concessions and compromises rather than forego marriage altogether. But Jesus saw clearly what our modern moralists and lawmakers do not see—that the easy disruption of the marriage bond means the ultimate destruction of the family; and the destruction of marriage and of the family inevitably leads to free-love, which even now prevails to an extent which, if known, would be appalling.

We need more preachers like Dr. Hammond, of Philadelphia, who so fearlessly and mercilessly exposed the iniquity of the recent marriage of a divorced millionaire of high degree. All honor to him, and equal honor to the poor Methodist preacher who flatly refused a fee of $10,000 to perform the ceremony and afterwards declined a large gift offered to him as a reward for doing his duty!

"Honor Thy Father and Thy Mother."

As to the authority of parents and the honor due them, as well as the sacred duty of providing for and supporting them in time of need, Jesus approves with impassioned emphasis the stringent

and inexorable law of the Old Testament (see Matt. xv. 4, 6; Mark vii. 9, 13). The way in which, till his thirtieth year, he himself was subject and obedient to Joseph and Mary is a commentary on his teaching which is as charming as it is illuminating.

The interest that Jesus took in little children, his unfailing fondness for them, the beautiful things he said about them, and the estimate he put on the beauty, the purity, the glory of childhood in making it the ideal of discipleship and the symbol of fitness for the kingdom of God—these are but another, if incidental, way in which he paid tribute to the sacredness of the marriage relation and the sweetness and beauty and holiness of family life.

With all this in our minds, we can better understand the significance of his presence at the marriage in Cana and his contribution to the joy of the occasion. Does it not mean much that the first act of his public career was the performance of an appropriate miracle at a wedding? Was it an accident that when he was at a wedding, the hour struck for him to leave his retirement and to inaugurate by a miracle his world-redeeming mission and ministry?

Christ's Teaching as to Wealth.

The persistent attitude of Jesus toward wealth, and his consistent and insistent teaching on the subject, constitute the most extraordinary and revolutionary element of his social ethics. All sorts of methods have been employed and efforts made to explain it away, to evade it, to tone it down. It has been systematically ignored. It has been denounced as Socialistic and Anarchistic. It is his one teaching that men will not accept. It is his one teaching that his followers will not put in practice. All men are afraid of it, as if it had dynamite in it; and it has.

But it will not down. If there is any one subject upon which he speaks with more frequency and with greater emphasis and earnestness than upon any other, it is the subject of Money. If we may trust the Gospel records of his teachings, and if we may judge by the frequency with which he talked about it and the various terms and figures which he used, it may be unhesitatingly asserted, (1) that it was to Jesus the subtlest and deadliest of all perils to its owner, and (2) that with the single exception of religious hypocrisy no sin struck him as did the sin of unconse-

crated wealth. Wendt, the great German scholar whose work on *The Teaching of Jesus* is the greatest in existence, declares that Jesus made the renunciation of riches a condition of entrance into the kingdom of God, coördinate with repentance and faith. And surely nobody can accuse Wendt of being an Ebionite.

Wealth has possession of many a man who honestly thinks he has possession of his wealth. For so it is that when wealth gets possession of a man's heart *it puts out the inner light,* as Jesus says, and chloroforms his capacity of spiritual discernment. But he doesn't know it, of course. The drunkard, the prostitute, the robber, the murderer, know that they are wicked, and they have at least seasons of maddening remorse, but the man who is guilty of wealth *never suspects* that anything is wrong with him. Catholic priests have said, as quoted by Professor Rauschenbusch, that people confess all sorts of sins and crimes, but that nobody ever confessed the sin of riches. Few of us have progressed to the point at which we appreciate and accept the views and teachings of Jesus concerning wealth. John Wesley had. We need only to recall his consistent practice through more than fifty years, and his unwaveringly strong and searching words on the subject.

And yet Jesus does not teach asceticism, socialism, or communism. He believes in the joys and enjoyments of life, and himself partook of them. He gives to no man or set of men, to no community, church, or council, the authority to take away or to touch another man's property or wealth. His appeal is to the rich man himself to relinquish his hold on wealth, or rather to break its hold on him, and by using it for the relief of the poor, the destitute, the helpless, and the suffering, or for the great enterprises of social amelioration or missionary evangelization, save himself from the curse of inner darkness and the hopeless doom of Dives, whose only sin, according to the parable, was that he rioted in luxury while a fellow human being just outside his bronze gate was rotting with disease and dying by the slow process of starvation on scraps that he picked out of the garbage pile. And there are plenty of church members who are doing to-day as Dives did, but they think it is all right.

Nor did Jesus, save in exceptional cases, require that a man shall part with his wealth all at once or cease to have the use and control of it. When, in the course of his ministry, he came across

one rich man who proved, by giving half his fortune away on the spot and devoting a good part of the other half to restitution, that he could be trusted to use the rest without peril to himself or selfish deprivation of others, he accepted it as a demonstration that that man was savingly converted, and he left the remainder in his hands with his blessing.

Charles N. Crittenton, of New York, had a legitimate, honest income of $60,000 a year, all of which but a living (after the manner of Wesley) he devoted regularly to the establishment and equipment of rescue homes for our unfortunate sisters, in all the leading cities of this country. This is *exactly* in accordance with the ideal and teaching of Jesus. Jesus himself no doubt would have forbidden his giving away the capital through which this income was made. If all who are members of the various Christian Churches would use their wealth as Charles Crittenton used his; in other words, if all those in the world who bear the name of Christ and permit themselves to be considered and called Christians should begin to-morrow, and from to-morrow *continue* to live in accordance with the teachings of Jesus on the single subject of Money, as Crittenton did, there would come throughout the world a social, industrial, economic, moral, and, lastly, spiritual, revolution inside of a hundred days, of vaster extent than that which Christianity wrought in the world in its first hundred years. Do you doubt it? Stronger words than these have been said by secular economists. Laveleye, a great European writer, in his work on *Primitive Property* (Chap. xxxi.), says: "If Christianity were understood and taught (and practiced) conformably to the spirit of its Founder, the existing social organism *could not last a single day.*" And James Russell Lowell said, in his *Essay on the Progress of the World:* "There is dynamite enough in the New Testament, if illegitimately applied, to blow our existing institutions to atoms."

But it is objected, and the objection seems to have force: If wealth is a sin, and if a man ought not to use it as he wishes but should use it for the needs of others, for the social good, you take away all incentive for making wealth and effectually prevent the production of wealth. But this objection, though plausible, is groundless. Instead of the love of wealth for its own sake, which is consummately deadening, demoralizing, and debasing; instead

of the self-indulgence which wealth ministers to and which is destructive of mind, soul, body, and character, one may substitute the far nobler motive of love and loyalty to Christ, the pure and ennobling joy of giving, the delight and the blessedness of relieving poverty and misery and of helping on the cause and triumph of Christ and righteousness in his own land and throughout the world. If these are not great and kindling motives both to enthusiastic initiative and sustained service, *there are none.*

Certainly, this should not be a hard or unwelcome doctrine to the followers of John Wesley, whose teaching and practice it was throughout a career that has changed the moral and spiritual climate of this world.

If, by the grace and blessing of God, the deliberations and discussions and exercises of the Ecumenical Conference should result in a return of the people called Methodists throughout the world to the teachings, the standards, and the example of John Wesley, it would make a new epoch in the history of Methodism, in the history of the world, and in the history of the kingdom of God on this planet.

II. The Old Testament.

In treating a subject of so great scope and such variety of details, it will be impossible to do more than consider a few general principles. It will be convenient in studying the teachings of the Old Testament to follow the usual division of its contents into the Law and the Prophets.

There is in what we call the Decalogue, a fairly comprehensive digest of the moral law of the pre-Christian dispensation. The first three commandments have reference to God and the relations and obligations of the individual to him. This is true in part also of the contents of the fourth commandment—concerning the Sabbath. The fifth commandment has reference to the family, and safeguards its integrity in requiring that the parents—not one, but both, and equally—shall be forever held in honor. Parents are put next to God. Incidentally, the seventh, forbidding adultery, and the tenth, forbidding the coveting of another's wife, have reference to the family in teaching the inviolability of the marriage relation and the sacredness of the wife's person. Otherwise the last five have reference to one's

duties to individuals, whether as individuals or as together composing society. So that while in the decalogue God is first and forever to remain first, social duties, duties to others, come next and occupy a larger half of this *magna charta*. Here and throughout the Bible the two are organically and inseparably woven together as warp and woof of one seamless vesture of complete righteousness; and neither one nor the other can be left out without unmaking and destroying the whole fabric. This decalogue may be called the Constitution of the Theocracy. All other laws were but applications to particular relations or situations of principles involved in these Ten Words. And, indeed, to this day we call the Ten Commandments the Moral Law.

This digest is further summarized in two great commandments (to be found in later books),[1] which condense the whole law in one single word, and comprehend it all in one attitude and disposition of heart, whether toward God or one's fellow-men. That great word is too sacred to be further hackneyed and desecrated by using it again here.

But in addition to this digest of the decalogue and this arresting summary of it in the language of the heart and in a single word which is the greatest in the vocabulary of the earth, or of heaven, there is some special legislation which is very remarkable. It might be called class legislation. Its object is the protection of the poor, the dependent, the socially incompetent, from the selfish injustice and oppression of the rich and the powerful.

The same spirit breathes in the prophets. As has been truly said: "Their sympathies were entirely on the side of the poorer classes and against the rich who ground them down with injustice and oppression. The prophets conceived Jehovah as the special vindicator of the poor and friendless, and they preached insistently that it is one chief duty of religious morality to stand for the rights of the poor." Indeed, this was a *specialty* of the preaching and teaching of the prophets as a class. They rise to a higher pitch of passion in denouncing the oppressions of the rich and powerful than in dealing with any other problems of their time. And I may say, in passing, that if there is any man in our day who comprehends their messages, who enters into

[1] Deuteronomy vi. 4, 5; Leviticus xix. 18.

their spirit, and who in expounding their teachings uses words as burning as theirs, that man is George Adam Smith, who by the accident of residence belongs to Scotland, but who, by the evangelical soundness and the catholicity of his spirit and the extent of the field of his service, belongs to universal Christendom.

The most striking example of this special legislation is that which has for its object the protection of the poor in their rights in the land. "One of the highest and most difficult problems of statesmanship is to provide for and secure the equable distribution and ownership of the land. The ownership of the land is the fundamental economic fact in all communities. Unequal distribution of the land has always been accompanied by a hereditary landed aristocracy. Approximately equal distribution of the land is the necessary basis for a real and permanent democracy, both political and social." If the land is owned by the men who till it, there is social soundness, health, equality, prosperity, happiness. If it is owned by wealthy families and tilled by landless, homeless laborers, the situation is radically wrong; there will be inevitable injustice and oppression on the one side, and privation, suffering, humiliation, discontent, bitterness on the other, unless the people have become so low, so dull, so debased, so abject, as to be no longer capable of pride, self-respect, or discontent—like dumb, driven cattle.

Now the law of the Old Testament shows a really astonishing breadth of view and depth of insight on this fundamental but difficult subject, distinctly in advance of the wisdom, the laws, the customs of our day. What statesman or economist has arisen in our day who has been equal to originating and formulating a plan that would make it forever impossible for cunning and greedy land-grabbers and fortune-builders to get and hold possession of miles and leagues of land, while millions of the poor are living as dependent tenants and barely existing on the crumbs that fall from their masters' tables? I know of but one, but I know of one.

The Hebrew law, however, did make provision to guard against the accumulation of the land by a few of the wealthy and powerful. "The manhood of the poor was more sacred to it than the property of the rich." It made these provisions:

1. The land could not be permanently alienated from the original owner or his family. If a man "waxed poor" and had to sell

his land for immediate necessities, then his next of kin had to redeem it for him; or in case there was none to do it, at the year of Jubilee, no matter how near it might be, the land reverted to the original owner, and "he returned unto his possession." (Lev. xxv. 10, 13, 23.)

2. Every seventh year all the land of all owners was to remain untilled, and what it brought forth of itself was common property.

3. Owners were not to glean after the reapers, but to leave the gleanings for the poor and the sojourner. You will recall the romantic and charming idyl of Ruth the fair Moabitess who gleaned in the fields of Boaz. (Ruth ii. 2, 3.)

4. The laborer was to be paid at the end of each day. (Lev. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15.)

Now, while these laws are not ideal, and some of them suited only to such conditions as then and there obtained, they show that the Hebrew lawgivers *did have a plan* for maintaining an equable distribution of the land and its products. That is more than can be said of the lawgivers and economists of this day. And these land laws were enforced. When the king himself, through the scheme of his astute queen, the resourceful Jezebel, undertook to set them aside, he found that he "had collided with the primitive land system of Israel," and it cost him and his family the throne, and Jezebel her life.

The Prophets.

Whether the law preceded the rise and ministry of the prophets and was the inspiration of them, according to the common view, or whether the major part of the law was given during and after the Exile as an outgrowth and a sort of codification of the great principles which the prophets had proclaimed and taught, cannot be discussed here.

At all events, they are quite at one in their great underlying principles and in spirit. Both are illustrated in such splendid passages as these: "And Samuel said, Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." (1 Sam. xv. 22.) "For I desire goodness, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than

burnt-offerings." (Hosea vi. 6.) "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow." (Isa. i. 16, 17.) "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Micah vi. 8.) It was not oblations but obedience, not ceremonies but service, not ritual but righteousness, not sacrifices but the spirit of love, that God required.

The aim of the prophets was: (1) The dissipation of the delusion, so current and so stubborn, that if men gave due attention to the ceremonial of worship, they could live as they listed and lusted. The service that God demanded was not that of ritual performances, but through and through, ethical—that of righteousness and justice and love and helpfulness. (2) The righting of social wrongs, such as the oppression of the poor and dependent by the rich and powerful. And their messages were not restricted to private and personal religion and morality, they dealt largely with the social and political life of the nation. This was so in the nature of the case because of the solidarity of the nation and their relation to it as a nation. Israel *as a people* was the chosen people of God. His theocracy resided in them as a people. The prophets were preachers, to be sure. They themselves had come in personal and immediate contact with God, had had experience of the power and inworking of God, had communion with God, and through these experiences had come to know who God was and what he was, to understand his nature, his holiness, his will. We get glimpses of these experiences in the writings of some of them, as in Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and fuller disclosures in those searching confessionals which we find in the Psalms, where the very inmost soul is laid bare and all its secrets rendered up in the presence and under the eye of God, the consciousness of forgiveness is testified to, the soul is filled and satisfied with peace and exultation, and the lips break forth in songs of deliverance and praise. Such men as these became witnesses for God, interpreters of God to others, and proclaimers of his will. That is, they became preachers. In the Psalms we see and hear them in the secret place of prayer; in the books of their prophecies we hear them thundering from their pulpits.

But they were other and more than preachers who declared the relations and duties of the individual to God. They were also, because in their situation they had to be, statesmen. Since Israel was God's theocracy, and those who, by the mere accident of birth, became its earthly human kings, could not be depended on to follow or even to know God's will and plans, these men who *were* acquainted with God and his ways, were commissioned and sent as the interpreters and spokesmen of God to be the advisers of both king and people in matters of public, social, and political concern. The position of these prophets was roughly similar to that of prime minister in a limited monarchy, like Great Britain, only they were not selected by the king or elected by the people, but were "found" and chosen and commissioned by God himself. If it had been left to the king or the people to choose them, they would have chosen men of their own sort. They had to trust to the character of their message, their own personal character, their own insight and foresight, their divine unction, and other "signs accompanying," as the credentials of their call and commission. As to the king, they pointed out his errors, warned him of perils, dictated the right course to pursue, and, when necessary, rebuked his sins, as Samuel did Saul's; Nathan, David's; and Elijah, Ahab's. As to the people, they advised, exhorted, reproved, warned, or threatened them, as the need might be.

These facts make it clear why the messages of the prophets, as we find them in the histories or read them in their extant writings, were in such large measure of a general and public character, and had to do with social and political affairs. But every now and then we meet with passages even in their public messages which focus on the individual. These are those passages which condense a comprehensive and all-inclusive statement of God and the essentials of true righteousness in a single pregnant sentence, such as we find in Micah vi. 8: "He hath showed *thee,* O man, what is good; and what doth Jehovah require of *thee* but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with *thy* God?" When the nation as such fell into disintegration and decay and was finally destroyed by foreign conquerors, the character of the messages of the prophets changes. They were henceforth not so much political and social as formerly, but now began to be directed

more and more toward individual righteousness. This begins with Jeremiah and grows more pronounced in Ezekiel.

John the Baptist really belongs to the order of the prophets, though in a sense he was more than a prophet, as Jesus said of him. He had thus a message for the individual; and he had messages also for different classes, as the Pharisees and Sadducees, the publicans, the soldiers—for everybody. As with the lawgivers of Israel and the prophets, what struck John was the distressing inequality in the conditions of men: some had plenty, others had nothing. He demanded that those who had should share with those who had not (Luke iii. 11)—an elementary part of repentance which is conspicuously absent from the lives of many of those who call themselves Christians to-day.[2]

Nashville, Tenn.

---

[2]This paper contains the substance of the address which the Editor delivered at the recent Ecumenical Conference at Toronto.

MODERN THEOLOGY AND THE PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, PH.D., D.D.

ONE of the writer's friends, who by a happy gift of fortune combines in his own person the taste of the artist and the subtlety of the physchologist, has written a book on *The Psychology of Art*. In it he calls attention to the difference which is made in our attitude to a work of art by the angle from which we approach it. The artist, the critic, the observer, each has his own point of view; and the standard by which each judges varies correspondingly. The first requisite, therefore, for an intelligent appreciation of the beautiful is to determine which of these three kinds of art-lovers we propose to be.

A similar observation may be made in theology. Here, too, we must distinguish between the attitude of the creator and that of the consumer; or, if you prefer, between that of the professional and that of the amateur. The professional theologian, like all specialists, is interested in the technique of his profession. He advances new theories, demolishes old ones, writes lengthy articles about the meaning of a single word, and bewilders the uninstructed reader by a multitude of apparently irrelevant and unimportant details. When the ordinary Christian hears him talking, he wonders what it is all about. He cannot see the forest for the multitude of trees. But it is the forest in which alone most men are interested. They do not care who wrote this verse or that; whether there was one Isaiah or two; whether such and such a proper name is derived from the Arabic or the Assyrian. They want to know what is the permanent outcome of this whole process of criticism and reconstruction; whether we still have a Bible to which we can turn for the food our souls need; whether Jesus Christ is still what Christians have always believed him to be, the Lord of life, and the Saviour of the world; whether faith in God and immortality and judgment to come is still a reasonable faith. But on these great questions of the soul they find it often difficult to know what the theologian really believes, or indeed whether he believes anything.

Theologians are not the only persons who are guilty of this confusion of tongues. Every profession has its specialists interested in their own peculiar problems, and talking a language of their own which no one else can understand. But in the case of theology the consequences of misunderstanding are more serious than in the case of medicine or law, because of the nature of the subject-matter with which it deals. For theology has to do with religion, and religion is the supreme concern of the human soul. Moreover, religion is the one business which cannot be done by proxy. Salvation, however far-reaching may be its social consequences, is, in its beginning, a matter of strictly individual concern. No man can commune with God vicariously. Each of us must do his own repenting, his own praying, his own believing.

Such, at least, is our Protestant conviction. Protestantism is democracy in religion. It is born of faith in the inherent relationship between the soul and God, in the inalienable right of each individual to approach God for himself, in the adaptation of truth to conscience and of conscience to truth, in the efficacy and sufficiency of the Christian gospel, for all that man needs for his salvation, faith, and life.

For Protestants, therefore, it is a serious matter to introduce confusion into the realm of religion. If the gospel is obscured and its authority weakened, harm is done to more than the mind. The whole nature is affected, the springs of action are weakened, the heart is robbed of its accustomed outlet, and the result is spiritual poverty, anxiety, and ultimate despair.

I believe that it is the fear of some such result as this which accounts for the widespread distrust of the new theology. Those who look askance at the claims which have been made in its behalf are not necessarily narrow or unreasonable. They are, many of them, sincere and open-minded men, lovers of light and of progress, ready to accept whatever advances human knowledge and promotes human welfare. But they are sensible men, wishing to look before they leap. They know that a thing is not necessarily good because it is new. In their own souls they have put Christianity to the proof, and have found it what Paul found it—the power of God unto salvation. They regard the gospel as God's best gift to man, and are jealous of any movement, no

matter how plausibly commended, which robs it of its life-giving power. They know that criticism is no substitute for testimony, theory no substitute for experience, speculation no substitute for revelation. They are sure that the gospel which is to meet the needs of humanity must be definite, practical, authoritative; a message direct from the heart of God to the soul of man, and they cannot see why the statement which sufficed for one generation should not be equally valid for another.

I do not believe that this attitude is justified, and yet it is easy to understand how it has come about; indeed, it is difficult to see how the result could have been otherwise, in view of the facts as I have stated them. We have here another instance of the failure to distinguish between different points of view. It is a case of two men equally sincere, equally earnest, misunderstanding each other because they are talking different languages and trying to attain different ends.

But, natural as the misunderstanding is, it is unfortunate, for it not only leads to division between men who, if only they really knew each other's purpose, would be standing shoulder to shoulder; but what is still more serious, it prevents the preacher from gaining the practical help which modern theology has to give him in the great work to which his life is given.

For, consider what the new theology really is. It is simply the effort to apply to the sphere of religious knowledge certain principles which have been found useful in other departments of life; such principles, for example, as thoroughness, system, open-mindedness, and faith. It means that you are not content to base your judgment upon part of the facts, but that you insist upon having all before you, or, at least, all that is possible for you to gather. It means, further, that you group the facts in an orderly manner, putting like with like, and noting the smallest difference in form or structure. It means that you approach each new question with an open mind, ready to discard the conclusions of the past, if good reason appears for so doing, or modify them in any particular in which the evidence shall seem to require it. It means, finally, that you have an undying faith that knowledge is possible, that this world is a reasonable world, and that loving, persistent, patient devotion to the cause of truth will be rewarded in the end by success. Surely, there is nothing in all this to be

afraid of. It is simply, I repeat, the consistent application, on a large scale and over wide areas, of the principles which as individuals we have all found practically useful in the conduct of our daily living.

Why, then, should religious people be suspicious of the new theology? I believe that the suspicion is caused by failure to make a very simple distinction—the distinction, namely, between the subject-matter of theology and its method. We think of theology as offering us a new religion, and very naturally we distrust it, for we have tried the old religion and have found it adequate to our needs.

But nothing is farther from the theologian's mind than to offer us a new religion. He knows very well that he cannot if he would. Religion is the theologian's datum. It is the raw material with which he deals. It is a final fact, back of which he canot go. You might as well expect the physician to invent a new body, or the psychologist a new mind, or the geologist a new earth, or the astronomer a new heaven. All that the astronomer can hope to do is to make us better acquainted with the heaven we have, to open new doors of observation, to discover unsuspected secrets, to penetrate into privacies hitherto uninvaded; in a word, to make us better acquainted with the world in which we have been living all the time, if we had only known it.

Precisely this is the service which the theologian seeks to render to religion. It is not his desire to give us a new religion, but only to make us realize more fully the undiscovered possibilities of the old. Wonderful as our religion is, we have not yet exhausted its possibilities of wonder. Satisfying as is the Christian gospel, we have only begun to realize the extent of the satisfactions which it has still in store. In every generation Christians have been discovering new things about Christianity. Modern theology says to us, Let us search still more systematically, and see if there is not still more to find.

It is, then, I repeat, no new religion which is offered us, but only a better understanding of the old. And yet, this is not quite all the truth. You cannot know anything better without a corresponding change in yourself. Reality is not something that exists in its completeness outside of us. Reality is active, alive, touching us at every angle, pressing in upon us at every

pore. Every increase of knowledge is at the same time an invitation to new experience; and the world which includes the steam engine, the dynamo, the dirigible, and the aëroplane, is in a true sense a new world.

It is just so with religion. Here even more we have to do with a reality which is only in part without. Religion is the life of God in the soul. The better we know God, the richer and the more many-sided our own life will be. Here, again, increase of knowledge means enrichment and enlargement of experience.

That is why it is so important for the preacher to know theology. It puts tools into his hands that he cannot afford to neglect. It furnishes him with a new method of approach; it makes his gospel more definite, more practical, more authoritative, and so more satisfying.

What are some of the new tools that modern theology puts into the hands of the preacher? First of all, the discovery that religion is one of the ultimate facts of life. It is not something outside of man which he can take or leave as he chooses. It is inwrought into his nature, a part of the very structure of his being, which he cannot maim or stifle without at the same time injuring himself.

This is, to be sure, no new discovery. Theologians have long asserted that man was naturally religious. Tertullian went even farther, and declared that the soul was by nature Christian. But it is one thing to assert, and another to realize. Modern theology has furnished us with new evidence of the old fact, and so given it new freshness and vividness.

It has done this in various ways. The study of history is one way. However far we go back in time, we find man looking up in adoration and worship to a being beyond himself. The study of comparative religion is another way. For three generations we have been observing the great civilizations of the East, and we find that they are religious through and through. Most effective and convincing (because nearest at hand) is the way of life itself. Psychology has taught us that the fundamental religious feelings—reverence, aspiration, dependence, submission, awe—are rooted in the nature of man; that they are as much a part of ourselves as the craving for food and the love of kind;

that the desire for worship is as insistent in its demand for satisfaction as the desire for activity when one awakes in the morning, or of rest when one returns home at night; that it is not a question, in short, whether or no one will be religious, but only what kind of religion one will have.

This being the case, we have a new point of view for judging some contemporary phenomena which without this key would be perplexing, if not alarming. Take, for example, such a movement as modern Socialism. Here is a creed which, in the person of many of its adherents, dispenses with what most of us have been brought up to consider the essentials of religion. It has no God; it leaves immortality an open question; yet it calls forth the passionate loyalty of tens of thousands of earnest men and women. How will you account for this fact? It is the religious nature which, having lost its old object, seeks a new outlet for its fervor and, in devotion to humanity, expends the store of consecration and of enthusiasm which former generations gave to God. Or, take Christian Science—the most singular of modern religions. What more pathetic witness could be found to the hunger of the soul for the divine than the quick response with which Mrs. Eddy's appeal has met, in spite of what seem to many of us its manifest contradictions and absurdities? Take our social settlements, and our societies of ethical culture. Take any one of the countless movements which are springing up outside the Church, with their programmes of social reform or of spiritual culture. These are not causes of discouragement, but of hope. They are witnesses to the deathless ideal which sleeps in every man. They are a challenge to our effort, an incentive to our faith. If we have not been able to win the men and women connected with these movements to our gospel, it is not because they are not open to it, but because we have not yet learned how to preach it as we should.

For it is not enough to be religious. The important thing is, to be religious in the right way. And this brings me to the second contribution of modern theology to the preacher's equipment—namely, the discovery that while religion is universal, not all religion is equally valuable or equally satisfying. Religions differ in kind, and difference in kind means difference in worth.

This, again, is no new discovery. Indeed, I fear that my read-

ers may feel that it is the veriest commonplace. For generations the assertion of the supreme value of the Christian religion, in comparison with all others, has been the stock in trade of the preacher. But here, again, it is one thing to assert, and another to realize. The difficulty has been that when we have questioned those who have offered us so ready a solution of our quest for the best religion, they have not all answered in the same way. The Catholic has pointed to Catholicism, and the Protestant to Protestantism; and within Protestantism each denomination has offered its own particular kind of Christianity as the truth of God, while outside we have seen the Jew claiming divine authority for Judaism, the Mohammedan for Mohammedanism, the Buddhist for Buddhism, and so on all along the line. If we are content to follow Mephistopheles's advice in *Faust,* and accept unquestioningly the teaching of our own denomination or Church, we shall feel no difficulty; but if our minds are open, and we wish a reason for the faith that is in us, the situation is, to say the least, perplexing.

Here modern theology has a distinct contribution to make. It has been studying the religions of the world scientifically—that is to say, in a systematic and orderly way; and it finds that, like all other objects of human knowledge when studied in this way, they fall into groups which differ from one another in interesting and instructive ways.

To one who is not a specialist the subject of classification presents the most mysterious and perplexing problems. You enter a room filled with musical instruments, and you see side by side what to all outward appearance are two pianos, but your friend who has made a specialty of music will tell you that one of them is not a piano at all, but a harpsichord. A piano is played by striking with a hammer, but on a harpsichord the string is plucked with a quill. A harpsichord is simply a glorified mandolin with a mechanism enabling you to reach more strings than your fingers could otherwise reach. If you are to place it where it belongs scientifically, you must take it away from the piano case and put it with the guitars, the banjos, and the mandolins.

But, you say, what is the use of doing this? What difference does it make where you put it? Why not leave it with the pianos where you found it? I answer, to you who are content to look

at the outside of the case, it makes no difference, but to the professional musician it makes all the difference in the world. He wants to use his instrument as well as to look at it. To do this intelligently, he must know how it is played and what it can do.

Scientific classification, then, is simply the attempt in our estimate of things in general to substitute the inside view for the outside, to see things not as they seem, but as they are, in order that we may be able to use them more effectively.

When we apply these principles to our matter of religion, we reach some very interesting results. Seen from the outside, the religions of the world look very much like a collection of musical instruments before they have been classified. The eye is met by the most extraordinary variety of shapes and forms of which you can conceive. Superstitions of the most diverse kind, customs the most barbarous, torture, self-mutilation, human sacrifice, all masquerade as religion; and a complete collection must take these in as truly as the rattles of the North American Indians or the whale-skin drums of the Eskimos. But, as you study more carefully, you find it necessary to revise your earlier estimate. Differences there are, to be sure, important and far-reaching, but they are less in number than they seem; and what is more significant, they are none of them meaningless. The religions of the world fall into groups which differ from one another by various definite and comparatively simple marks. There is the mystic group, which is introspective and contemplative, seeking salvation in immediate communion with God and content to let this world go on its way to destruction without let or hindrance. There is the ethical group, with its keen social interest, concerned for justice and mercy, with a divine sanction for human conduct, and a divine judgment for human sin. There are the nature religions, peopling the world with gods, but not yet having learned to differentiate the divine from the hills and the streams and the woods which are its abiding place. There are the religions of authority, with their insistence upon absolute and unqualified submission. And there are the religions of freedom, the Protestantisms of humanity, with their confidence in the individual and their recognition of the supremacy of conscience as the court of final appeal. These types recur again and again in the history of mankind. They not only characterize

single religions; they reappear within each of the greater religions as the mark of smaller groups. They combine one with another in singular and unexpected ways. Their action and reaction explain the constant changes in the history of religion, and give the study of it its ceaseless fascination.

But theology not only shows us the fact of difference. It helps us to estimate its significance. It shows us the consequences which follow from the adoption of one or the other of these forms of religion, and we find that they are of momentous importance. If your religion is of the mystic type, introspective and self-centered, you will enter a monastery, or make your cell in a desert, or perhaps climb on a pillar like Simeon the Stylite, and the crying wrongs of the weak and the oppressed will remain unredressed. If your religion is one of pure authority, whether you call your master pope or caliph, you will shut your eyes to the plain teachings of reason and blindly support your Church in whatever it asks you to do or think. If your religion be a nature religion, you will magnify the physical, and it may be will give free rein to passions which a more enlightened conscience will tell you should be held constantly in check. If your religion be ethical, you will adopt the Apostle James's definition as your own, and realize that in ministering to the orphan and in succoring the widow you are doing the will of God.

Of all the pages of human history, there is none more tragic, but at the same time none more instructive, than that which tells the story of religion. As we read it, we are impressed with the incalculable harm which may be wrought either in the life of an individual or of a society by a bad religion—a religion, that is to say, which tries to suppress some essential need of human nature or, on the other hand, which panders to its infirmities or superstitions. We realize with new force the truth, which we have so often dismissed as a mere platitude, that it is not enough to be religious. One must be religious in the right way, and we ask ourselves what reason we have for believing that the religion we profess is really of this kind.

Here, too, modern theology has help to give. It tells us not only of the necessity of religion, and of its differences; it gives us a standard for judging between them. It assures us that if there is to be a universal religion at all, it must be Christianity;

and this for the simple reason that no other religion meets so completely and in so plain and satisfying a way the permanent religious needs of mankind. Let me illustrate, if I can, what I mean.

I have spoken of the different types which are revealed by the study of comparative religion. But when we examine them more closely, we find that for our present purpose they may all be reduced to two. The nature religions represent a stage through which man passes in his religious development, which is destined sooner or later to be outgrown, and which, as a matter of fact, has been outgrown—at least, in principle—in all the greater religions. The religion of authority is the expression of a permanent instinct present in every age as the necessary corrective of an exaggerated individualism. It is the form in which the social acquisitions of the past are conserved and handed down to future generations. There remain two great types which in every age have confronted one another as rivals for the allegiance of the religious man—the mystic type, and the ethical type: the religion which seeks contact with God in the immediate experience of the soul, and the religion which finds in the service of humanity the highest expression of worship. Each has its roots deep in the subsoil of human nature. Neither has been able to displace the other. The religion which is to win universal acceptance must make place for both.

I say it must make place for both, but it must do it in a consistent and satisfying way. It is not enough to place the two side by side and let them live their lives as best they can without inner understanding or harmony. Such an outward juxtaposition of competing and inconsistent types has taken place again and again in religious history, and no one religion has the monopoly of it. Every great religion has its mystics and its moralists, its recluses and its agitators. But this of itself does not qualify it for world supremacy.

What I have in mind is something much more fundamental. I have in mind an inner harmony, a type of religion which satisfies the mystic's hunger for God and the moralist's passion for man, in one and the same experience; a religion which is so conscious of the immanence of God that it feels him as the very life of the soul, and yet which knows that the God whom it worships

is a personal God, the Father of many children, the ruler of society, as well as of the individual; the mind that plans and the will that decrees, as well as the spirit that inbreathes. Only a religion which possesses such a God as this can hope for world supremacy.

Such a religion is Christianity, and there is no other. Here alone you find the synthesis for which the whole history of religion is striving, the goal to which in every age it has been unconsciously pointing. This insight, painfully won as the result of an infinity of patient labor, is the third great contribution of modern theology to the preacher's equipment.

It is not easy to exaggerate its importance. For it gives us a vantage ground in our appeal to men of other faiths which we could not gain in any other way. We do not come to them as if they were destitute of religion, but as the interpreter and completer of the religion they have. Is the man we are seeking one of the mystic type, forgetful in his joy of the realized presence of God, of the claim of the neighbor who lies at his door? We have our word for him. We do not have to ask him to deny the reality of his experience, or question the fact of the omnipresence of the immanent God. We bring to him a completer revelation of the nature of the God he worships, and bid him see his character revealed in the face of that Jesus who went about doing good.

Is it a case, on the other hand, of some zealous social reformer so intent on his effort to secure more tolerable conditions of living and a more just scale of remuneration that he has no room in his scheme of life for prayer? For him, too, we have our message. We do not want him to value man less, but more. We want to enlarge his estimate of the capacity of humanity till it is broad enough to include fellowship with the God of all the earth. We point him to Jesus, the great servant, as in the silence of the mountain, in solitary communion with the Father, he gains strength for the next day's ministry. So, by its inner adaptation to needs yet unrealized, we commend the religion of Christ as the one religion perfectly adapted to satisfy the world's search for God.

I say, we commend the religion of Christ; and this brings me to the last of the contributions of modern theology to practical religion, of which I shall have time to speak—namely, its re-

newed emphasis upon Christ as the center and norm of Christianity.

I have spoken of the appeal of Christianity to men of other faiths. It is an appeal which was never more widespread and never more effective than in our day. But there is one obstacle which hampers their efficiency, and that is the divisions which still exist among Christians themselves. We speak of Christianity as if it were something which everybody understood, and as to whose nature there could be no doubt. Yet, as a matter of fact, there are almost as many different kinds of Christianity as there are men. All the great types which we have distinguished in other religions reappear here. By what right, then, do we differentiate Christianity from other religions? Wherein does its superiority consist?

Here modern theology gives us a perfectly definite answer. The distinctive thing about Christianity is Christ. He is its new contribution to the cause of religion. The differences of which we have spoken are only the persistence on new soil of the old types whose roots lie deep in the past. They are not Christianity. They are only the raw material out of which Christianity is made. Christianity is the effect which has been produced upon these old types by the new spirit which Jesus has introduced. Christianity is Christ, so far as his Spirit has yet become controlling in humanity.

We have here just what we need, an explanation and an incentive. We have an explanation of the difference which exists between Christians. They are the survival of the pre-Christian in Christianity. We have a standard by means of which we can adjust them. The Christ whom we offer to the men of other religions is the test by which we must purify our own.

This does not mean that we are to admit nothing into Christianity which we cannot prove to have been historically derived from Jesus. Christianity is not simply the reproduction of Jesus' teaching; it is something much grander and more wonderful. It is the expression of his life. All that is alive grows—that is to say, it changes. It is always taking up into itself new materials and fashioning for itself new forms, but it is change according to a plan. The spirit within sets bounds to the life in its outward reach, and directs it to a goal as yet unseen. It is so

in the Christian religion. The Spirit of Jesus is the test of Christianity, and the justification of creed and doctrine and institution alike must be found in the extent to which they make more real to the imagination of men, and more controlling over the will, the unseen Father whom he came to reveal.

And so the last word of the new theology is the first word of the old evangelism: *Come to Jesus.* Test your life by him; make him Lord of your thought, King of your purposes, Saviour and Friend of your soul. Lift up your eyes upon the world in which you live, this changeful, baffling world, where so much is fascinating and so much heart-breaking, and see him slowly molding it by his spirit after the pattern his Father has set. Dare to believe that he will have his way in the end.

It is no new gospel, then, that the new theology brings to us, only the old gospel set in a new light; and yet in a very true sense it is a new gospel. It is new in the freshness of its appeal, since it comes to us by another channel and seeks its evidence in unfamiliar quarters. It is new in the breadth of its foundation, since it is based upon an induction of all available facts and can face the last word of modern discovery with an even mind, sure that it will bring nothing to be feared. It is new, as every fresh experience of an old fact is new to the man who has lived it over again with that openness of mind, that attention of the will, and that large faith in the overshadowing presence of a God of wisdom and of truth, which is the spirit of science at its best. The preacher who has put this to the proof of his own experience will no longer be afraid of the new theology. On the contrary, he will welcome it as an indispensable ally in the supreme task to which his life is given—the preaching of the gospel of that living Christ who is the spring of all progress and the goal of all endeavor, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

MR. WESLEY'S RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL STANDARDS.

BY CHANCELLOR BURWASH, S.T.D., LL.D.

It is generally taken for granted that the demand of Modern Science for perfect freedom of thought and investigation, and for perfect intellectual honesty in arriving at conclusions and accepting them as truth, is the outcome of the scientific development of our own age. Not only has this claim been made for science, but it has also been claimed that religion is opposed to this important ethical principle, and on this account has proved one of the main hindrances to the discovery and acceptance of scientific truth. Hence the cry against creeds and the imposition of dogmatic standards of any kind as preventing the honest search for, and attainment of, truth.

That this has been the case with perverted forms of religion, in many instances, is undeniable. But it is also certain that such a spirit has been quite as fatal to true religion as to honest science. And further, we think that a candid investigation of at least one instance of the formation of Doctrinal Standards in religion will show that the true religious spirit is as sensitive to the ethical claims of the intellect, and as conscientiously honest in seeking truth in all things, as science could possibly be.

Mr. Wesley grew up with as strong predilections, or prejudices if you will, in favor of a rigid dogmatism as could be found anywhere. The training of his childhood and youth was on lines of strict authority, and his university was then, and still is, strongly conservative. And in religion, until thirty-five years of age, he followed the teachings, not of a liberal Protestantism, but of a mediæval and Catholic type of Anglicanism. Mystic he certainly was, but with the mysticism of á Kempis, Tauler, Jeremy Taylor, and Law. His favorite text-book, "The Whole Duty of Man," was a book of formal authority. We need not repeat the well-known story of his conversion from this religion of authority to that of a personal, inward assurance of acceptance with God through faith in Christ. This change was to him, as to so many others, the awakening of a new life—a life no longer based

on authority, but upon an inner certainty, a personal conviction of truth, which is the basis of all true spiritual life, whether that life be intellectual, moral, or religious. This by no means meant that he cut loose from *all* his old dogmatic beliefs. But it meant that henceforth he "proved all things," and he found that much of the old proved good, and its truth all the more manifest in the new light of faith and the Spirit. This inner certainty he believed to be divine, the God-given seal of truth, the witness of the Holy Spirit, hence something not to be violated, either in his own spirit or in that of others. But at the same time he did not hold it as an irrational thing. It was capable of verification; it could stand testing, and if, when tested, it was found wanting, it might be the delusion of the devil or the presumption of the natural man. It is thus apparent that Mr. Wesley's jealous guarding of this sacred inner conviction of truth sprang directly from the religious spirit, and this religious spirit thus anticipated the ethical basis of modern science and gave it a far wider application.

A notable instance of its application immediately appears in Mr. Wesley's own life. He at once began to preach the new gospel which had wrought such wonders in his own experience, and at the end of six years had associated with him a band of fellow-workers who were not ashamed with him to be called Methodists. Five of these, all clergymen, met him in London on the 25th of June, 1744, "to consider, (1) What to teach; (2) How to teach; (3) What to do;—*i. e.*, to regulate our doctrine, discipline, and practice."

The principles laid down by Mr. Wesley to guide them in this "consideration" are most remarkable. He desired "that all things be considered as in the immediate presence of God; that we may meet with a single eye, and as little children who have everything to learn; that every point which is proposed may be examined to the foundation; that every person may speak freely whatever is in his heart; and that every question which may arise should be thoroughly debated and settled."

Ques. "Need we be fearful of doing this? What are we afraid of? Of our overturning our first principles?"

Ans. "If they are false, the sooner they are overturned the better. If they are true, they will bear the strictest examination. Let us all pray for a willingness to receive light, to know of every

doctrine, whether it be of God." After an admonition to prayer, he then proceeds:

Ques. "How far does each of us agree to submit to the judgment of the majority?"

Ans. "In speculative things each can only submit so far as his judgment shall be convinced. In every practical point each will submit so far as he can without wounding his conscience."

Ques. "Can a Christian submit any further than this to any man or number of men on earth?"

Ans. "It is undeniable he cannot; either council, bishop, or convocation. And this is that grand principle of private judgment on which all the Reformers proceeded. 'Every man must judge for himself; because every man must give an account of himself to God.'"

The strictest scientific method could demand no more explicit statement of intellectual liberty and of ethical, scientific procedure than is here set forth, and yet from beginning to end it is permeated by the religious spirit.

In perfect harmony with these principles were the rules of Society set forth by Mr. Wesley a few years before this Conference. "There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these Societies, 'a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins.' But wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits." Then follow the rules, all dealing with moral and religious duty, and founded, in the last paragraph, upon the authority of the "Written Word" and the work of the Spirit in "truly awakened hearts." To secure a true moral and religious result, the "only and sufficient rule" is applied in individual conviction of the awakened heart by the Holy Spirit.

For three years these Conferences proceeded, and we note that the doctrinal subjects discussed during these three years were the essentials of Salvation, Justification, Justifying Faith, Assurance or the Witness of the Spirit—Repentence, as preceding, and Holiness, as springing from, these. Along with these, important discussions took place on discipline, the rules by which helpers should regulate their work and practice, the means by which they should seek to maintain their own spiritual life. Another point was the testing of "those who think they are moved by the Holy Ghost

and called of God to preach." The three tests which Methodists should ever maintain are propounded at this early period.

1. "Do they *know God as a pardoning God?* Have they the love of God abiding in them? Do they desire and seek nothing but God? Are they holy in all manner of conversation?"

2. "Have they gifts as well as grace for the work? Have they in some tolerable degree a clear, sound understanding? Have they a right judgment in things of God? Have they a just conception of salvation by faith? And has God given them any degree of utterance? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly?"

3. "Have they fruits? Are any truly convinced of sin and converted to God by their preaching?"

"As long as these three marks concur in any, we believe he is called of God to preach. These we receive as sufficient proof that he is moved therein by the Holy Ghost."

Then follow specific directions as to the first testing and subsequent probation of the candidate, including the placing of the Minutes in his hands, that he may "read and carefully weigh what is contained therein and see whether he can agree to it or not." "If he can, he may be received into full connection with us by giving him the Minutes inscribed thus: 'So long as you freely consent to, and earnestly endeavor to walk by, these rules, we shall rejoice to acknowledge you as a fellow-laborer.' "

This was Mr. Wesley's first approach to the establishment of Doctrinal Standards, and the steps which led up to it make us acquainted with the conditions under which he organized his Societies and his body of helpers in the work of evangelism.

From this history we may draw the following conclusions:

1. That the one object strictly and consistently kept in view by Mr. Wesley in these proceedings was the conviction and conversion of sinners, and their building up in holiness of heart and life.

2. That for this purpose he and his "helpers" agreed as to the truths of the gospel essential to this work.

3. That this agreement was free and cordial, founded on their unity in spiritual life and experience of the saving grace of God.

4. That up to this point at least Mr. Wesley made no attempt to extend the covenant of this agreement to other and speculative matters in religion, even though they might seem to be of some

importance, and that in all speculative matters he respected the personal convictions of his brethren.

It was in this year (1746) that Mr. Wesley published his first volume of sermons, consisting of twelve sermons. His object in this publication seems to be twofold: first, the instruction of his people in the fundamental truths of salvation; secondly, to set forth distinctly to the world the gospel preached by himself and his helpers. The preface to the first volume published in 1746 (though in 1745 three volumes were projected to be printed by subscription) states this very clearly:

"The following sermons contain the substance of what I have been preaching for between eight and nine years past. During that time I have frequently spoken in public on every subject in the ensuing collection; and I am not conscious that there is one point of doctrine on which I am accustomed to speak in public which is not here, incidentally if not professedly, laid before every Christian reader. Every serious man who peruses these will, therefore, see in the clearest manner what these doctrines are which I embrace and teach *as the essentials of true religion.*"

Again: "I want to know one thing, the way to heaven; how to land safe on that happy shore." "I have, accordingly, set down in the following sermons *what I find in the Bible concerning the way to heaven, with a view to distinguish this way of God from all those which are the inventions of men.* I have endeavored to describe the true, the scriptural, experimental religion, so as to omit nothing which is a real part thereof and to add nothing thereto which is not. And herein it is more especially my desire, first, to guard those who are just setting their faces toward heaven (and who, having little acquaintance with the things of God, are the more liable to be turned out of the way) from formality, from mere outside religion, which has almost driven heart religion out of the world; and secondly, to warn those who know the religion of the heart, the faith which worketh by love, lest at any time they make void the law through faith, and so fall back into the snare of the devil."

The second volume followed in 1748, consisting of twelve additional sermons, including eight on our Lord's Sermon on the Mount. Volume three, with twelve additional sermons, appeared in 1750. This contained seven sermons and five tracts, all dealing

with the practical duties of Christianity, one of these being "Thoughts on Christian Perfection."

It will thus appear that Mr. Wesley's sole object in the issue of these sermons from the press was practical and experimental. He desired to point out the way to a personal experience of heart-religion, and to teach men the way of a holy life. And it is further clear, to any who study these sermons carefully, that the subjects there treated are largely identical with those discussed in the Minutes, whether doctrinal, disciplinary, or practical. He was not concerned so much with speculative opinions as with the true way of salvation, and with this he regarded speculative opinions as having very little to do. The errors which he would guard against were chiefly formality and Antinomianism, and the speculative doctrines which he decidedly opposed were those which led to these false ways of religion. The doctrinal pledge which he exacted from his preachers was a pledge to set forth this way of salvation.

In the year 1763 Mr. Wesley took a further step in the direction of Doctrinal Standards in the preparation of a form of deed for the settlement of all chapels on trustees. The trusts in this deed required two things which implied a definite form of doctrine; first, that the trustees "shall permit John Wesley and such persons as he shall from time to time appoint, and at all times during his natural life, and *no other persons,* to have and enjoy the free use and benefit of the said premises, and the said John Wesley and such other persons as he appoints may therein preach and expound God's holy Word." Again: "Provided always, that the said persons preach no other doctrine than is contained in Mr. Wesley's Notes upon the New Testament, and four volumes of Sermons."

At the same time, the most important parts of the Minutes were extracted and published, and formed a basis of doctrine and discipline for the future. These facts still make prominent the central thought of Mr. Wesley in establishing a Standard of Doctrine for his preachers. It was not to control their personal opinions in speculative matters, but to secure the preaching of a free, full, and present salvation, received through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, witnessed by the Holy Spirit to the individual consciousness, leading to all holy life and motive, and consummated

in Christian perfection. His standards called for a type of evangelical teaching and preaching leading to an individual experience and life opposed to mere formal religion and to Antinomianism. His standards were standards of gospel *preaching,* destined indeed to work out a theology, but by no means anticipating the construction of a theological system or enforcing that system when in course of time it might be developed.

It does not follow that he was indifferent to all other elements of Christian doctrine. Some doctrines, such as the provision in the atoning work of Christ for the possible salvation of all men, he believed to be essential to the fullness of evangelical preaching. Others, as the doctrine of predestination, he regarded as obstacles to the full and effective preaching of evangelical holiness. They stand in the Notes just as they stand in the New Testament, neither more nor less. He wrote controversial pamphlets, but he did not include them in his Standards, except so far as they entered into the experience of the Christian. He left them to do their work in the minds of his preachers by honest conviction of truth, rather than by authoritative enforcements; and no part of the Church in any age has had less trouble with heterodoxy in its ministry than had Mr. Wesley with his preachers. In this practical way, in the first twenty-five years of his evangelical work, Mr. Wesley had evolved for his Societies in Great Britain and Ireland a *type, standard,* and *content* of evangelical preaching—outlined in the "Minutes," expanded in "the Sermons," and related to Scripture in "the Notes." There was a theology in it, a theology which must grow out of it, in due time; but he was not so anxious about that theology as he was about the preaching and its result in the salvation of men. He left his Standards in this simple and effective form for his Societies in Great Britain and Ireland, only anxious that the work which God had called him to begin should continue as it had commenced. The foundation upon which he built was Scripture. The instrument of his interpretation was the light of the Spirit in experience. And we do not think that his confidence in such a foundation for the doctrine of a Church was misplaced. What he further did when he came to deal with the situation in America, we must leave for further study.

Victoria University, Toronto, Canada.

CHARLES DICKENS AFTER A HUNDRED YEARS.

BY GEORGE HERBERT CLARKE.

It is difficult to think of a modern Anglo-Saxon civilization without its *Pickwick Papers,* and *David Copperfield,* and *Our Mutual Friend.* And yet Dickens is only a hundred years old. He was unknown to the England of Walpole or of Clive, to the America of Franklin or of John Adams.

Was he unknown? Every man is a unit, it is true; but every man is also a link. If the philosophy of literature teaches us always to reckon with the continuity of literature, then we must come to see that Dickens did not, after all, inaugurate Dickens, but, so to speak, inherited himself out of the spirits of Ben Jonson and Tobias Smollett. It is always so. Burns blazed the way for Wordsworth; Blake made Coleridge possible; Byron and Pope created Tennyson; Shelley discovered Browning to himself; Fielding impelled Thackeray; just as Meredith and Dickens himself have, in the day of this writing, breathed upon the spirit of William De Morgan. The mantle, the torch descend; not until the prophecy be completely uttered and understood (and that will never be) will the light flicker and cease.

I.

It will, perhaps, surprise some of my readers to learn that the novelist was christened Charles John Huffam Dickens. Of course, the kindly suggestions of his own genius would have sufficed, had there been no other influences, to lead him to slough off half of this label. One recalls how Stevenson came to drop the "Balfour" and Sidney Lanier the "Clopton."

Dickens was born February 7, 1812, at Landport (Portsea), England. His father, John Dickens, was a small-salaried clerk in the Navy Pay Office, who had married, in 1809, Elizabeth Barrow. She became the mother of eight children, Charles being the second.

Although the family lived from time to time in London, Charles's early childhood was spent in Kent, one of the garden spots of a country itself a garden, and the literary home of not

a few great Englishmen. Fortunately for Charles, his father's more serious difficulties antedated his son's early boyhood. Charles was made much of at home; was given the freedom of a small library, including sundry works of Smollett, De Foe, Fielding, Goldsmith, Cervantes, and Le Sage; and between the ages of seven and nine was in attendance at William Giles's school in Clover Lane, Chatham.

But ill winds were beginning to blow the way of Dickens père. He was chronically unfit to care for his own affairs, let alone those of others. It was not that he lacked in industry or integrity, but rather that he had no sense of proportion in money matters. He lived in an atmosphere of financial sixes and sevens, and overcame his own uncomfortableness by means of the Micawber-like antidote of excessively sanguine expectations. Indeed, John Dickens and Wilkins Micawber are one, as are Elizaboth Dickens and Mrs. Nickleby, and Charles Dickens and David Copperfield. The painful result was that the father found himself at last in the Marshalsea Prison for Debtors, whither his family, after a futile attempt of Mrs. Dickens to establish a small school,[1] shortly afterwards followed as boarders, while little Charles was required to take an underling's place in the blacking business of one James Lamert, where he tied and labeled pots of blacking *ad nauseam,* at six shillings a week, among rough, uncouth, though usually good-humored mates. He lodged at this time in the home of Mrs. Roylance (the original of the Mrs. Pipchin of *Dombey and Son*), and later in a back attic nearer the prison. The memory of these two years of menial service long rankled in the breast of Dickens, yet there can be no question that the impressions then made upon his memory and imagination were of almost indispensable value to his life work.

As were the experiences immediately succeeding. Owing to new legislation and a timely bequest, Mr. Dickens's imprisonment came to an end; and the family fortunes having slightly improved, Charles was sent to school for two years, at Welling-

[1] "I never found," says Dickens, "that any young lady had ever been to school there; or that any young lady ever came, or professed to come; or that the least preparation was ever made to receive any young lady. The only visitors I ever saw or heard of were creditors. *They* used to come at all hours, and some of them were quite ferocious."

ton House Academy, and, somewhat later, to another establishment near Brunswick Square. Neither of these schools appears to have done much, or to have been equipped to do much, for the intellectual nurture of the boy, who nevertheless entered with zest into school life, and remembered to excellent advantage the human types that there presented themselves. There must have been in William Jones, the not overscrupulous master of Wellington House, something of Creakle and of Wackford Squeers, Esq. Certainly, he was both ignorant and cunning, and cruel into the bargain. Yet he employed informed if slavish teachers, and it has very recently come to light that Charles absorbed enough Latin to capture a first prize. He also learned a little dancing, a good deal of boyish mischief, and something of the sting of the cane. At fifteen, he became a lawyer's clerk, but, after eighteen months' experience, transferred himself to journalism, mastering the art of shorthand with almost dogged perseverance. He served as reporter on *The True Sun, The Mirror of Parliament,* and *The Morning Chronicle,* and began also outside, though as yet unpaid, magazine work.

In the offices of *The Chronicle* Dickens's fidelity and enthusiasm as a reporter, and his cleverness as a special writer, won him fair wages. George Hogarth, *The Chronicle's* musical and dramatic critic, was much interested in the young man, and Dickens reciprocated by showing interest in Hogarth's family, in which the eight daughters were a majority. Three of these girls, especially, touched the life of Dickens,—the eldest, Catherine, a fellow-journalist, whom he married in 1836; Mary, who is the original of "Little Nell," and who died at seventeen; and Georgina, to whom many of his last letters are addressed. Of all three more will be said. It will not be out of place here to state that there was a "Dora" in his early boyish life, but that their love came to what the world calls "nothing."

II.

The "human-interest" stories which Dickens wrote for *The Chronicle* were afterwards, on account of their popularity, gathered together as *Sketches by Boz;* but the first work which really introduced him to England—*Pickwick Papers*—was contracted for from the start. There was much contemporary liking for

books made up of humorous or sporting pictures, with light, descriptive story-comment written to fit. Messrs. Chapman and Hall, casting about for a man to fictionize (if I may coin a useful word) a set of plates of this character, hit upon Dickens, and proposed that he should furnish the letterpress to accompany Seymour's drawings. They agreed, however, after a conference, that Dickens should have more independence than was usually granted the author in enterprises of the kind, and the result was that the words almost from the beginning exceeded the pictures in attractiveness and appeal, and the work shortly shaped itself anew in the mind of Dickens. He was left the freer, indeed, through the unfortunate death of Seymour, soon after the first publications. H. K. Browne followed as illustrator, and with him Dickens worked in perfect harmony. From the casual adventures of a group of "characters," *Pickwick,* though always loose in form, came to take on the aspect of a series of well-considered, finely human, serio-comic interpretations of life. There are mirth and mischief in them of an irresistibly droll and entertaining nature, but there are also intimations of character and conduct that touch, though nowhere profoundly, the core of life. There is a world of inference in the simple statement that only four hundred copies of the first part were ordered bound, but that by the time Part XV. was reached, the order required forty thousand. England was laughing affectionately at Mr. Pickwick and the Pickwickians, and Dickens had become famous. His genial if too exuberant humor; his friendliness; his sentiment; his folk-kinship; his mischievous "Nay-then-I-have-an-eye-of-you" attitude; his pleasant assurance that life and destiny mean well by men; his sheer good-naturedness, Falstaffian in its essence; and, not least, his very positive Englishness;—all this had won for him an eager and steadily growing audience.

Like his own Oliver Twist, the hero of his next story, his followers, their appetite once whetted, could not easily be satisfied. The man who had made Mr. Pickwick, Mr. Tupman, Mr. Winkle, Mr. Snodgrass, Mr. Jingle, Bob Sawyer, and the imperishable Wellers, could not be allowed to shirk further creativeness. Nor did he desire to shirk it. Dickens was one of the busiest of hard-working writers. "The mere consciousness of an engagement," he writes to a friend, "will sometimes worry a

whole day. . . . Whoever is devoted to an art must be content to deliver himself wholly up to it, and to find his recompense in it." And in another letter he reveals something of his arduous if well-loved task in declaring that

> When one is compelled to write this or that, one has still to consider, "How much of this will tell for what I mean? How much of it is my own wild emotion and superfluous energy—how much remains that is truly belonging to this ideal character and these ideal circumstances?" It is in the laborious struggle to make this distinction, and in the determination to try for it, that the road to the correction of faults lies. (Perhaps I may remark, in support of the sincerity with which I write this, that I am an impatient and impulsive person myself, but that it has been for many years the constant effort of my life to practice at my desk what I preach to you.)

During the six years following *Pickwick,* Dickens produced, besides much editorial work, his *Oliver Twist, Nicholas Nickleby, Old Curiosity Shop,* and *Barnaby Rudge.* The second of these is the weakest; the third, perhaps, the best, of the group. All four show a progressive tendency to elaborateness and complexity of plot, and all four show also a turn for the theatrically sinister, an inheritance from the gothic eighteenth-century type; yet in general, there is a reversion to realism of a wholesome and refreshing kind, a realism that does not, like Zola and the Decadents, see all the world red or black, but preserves the proportions of the spectrum, and maintains health of soul.

The rapid publication of these books greatly improved Dickens's financial position, and brought him not only added fame, but, what was humanly worth more to him, a group of devoted personal friends, that enlarged itself again and again, until we find in his letters intimate communications with such people as Thackeray, Browning, Mrs. Gaskell, Serjeant Talfourd, Bulwer-Lytton, Wilkie Collins, Charles Reade, Douglas Jerrold, his biographer John Forster, Washington Irving, Hood, Macready, Landor, Harrison Ainsworth, and others. The correspondence of Dickens between 1833 and 1870 makes a portly volume, and rivals his stories in humor, middle-of-the-road wisdom, and lure of manner.

III.

From this time on until the year of his death, 1870, his unresting pen constantly gleaned his teeming brain, the most important of his remaining works, chronologically named, being

American Notes, The Christmas Carol, Martin Chuzzlewit, The Chimes, The Cricket on the Hearth, Pictures from Italy, Dombey and Son, David Copperfield, A Child's History of England, Bleak House, Hard Times, Little Dorrit, A Tale of Two Cities, Great Expectations, The Uncommercial Traveler, Our Mutual Friend, and the unfinished *Mystery of Edwin Drood.*

Among this copious output, Americans, as Americans, are, of course, especially interested in the first and the third. The travel-fever, prior to 1842, had taken Dickens pretty well over England, but not abroad. It seized him strongly, however, in that year, in 1844-45, and again in 1867. America was his objective during the first and last of these years, and Italy in 1844-45. Besides these visits, he journeyed also to Paris and Switzerland. The impressions and results of his first American tour are sketched in *American Notes* and *Martin Chuzzlewit,* and the same is done for Italy in *Pictures from Italy.*

On his first visit to America, he was so boisterously welcomed as a writer of democratic spirit that he suffered reaction, and honestly felt—and wrote—some very uncomplimentary things about the uncouth and raucous vulgarity of the United States of that day. The advice he gave his friend, the great actor Macready, who was traveling in America in 1844, against taking the lecture platform, is tinged with unhappy memories.

> To us [he writes] who know the Boston names and honor them, and who know Boston and like it (Boston is what I would have the whole United States to be), the Boston requisition would be a valuable document, of which you and your friends might be proud. But those names are perfectly unknown to the public here, and would produce not the least effect. The only thing known to the public here is, that they ask (when I say "they" I mean the people) everybody to lecture. It is one of the things I have ridiculed in *Chuzzlewit.* . . . "Puff-ridden!" Why to be sure they are. The nation is a miserable Sindbad, and its boasted press the loathsome, foul, old man upon his back, and yet they will tell you, and proclaim to the four winds for repetition here, that they don't need their ignorant and brutal papers, as if the papers could exist if they didn't need them! Let any two of these vagabonds, in any town you go to, take it into their heads to make you an object of attack, or to direct the general attention elsewhere, and what avail those wonderful images of passion which you have been all your life perfecting!

The truth is, that Dickens, despite his comparatively obscure origin, never was a shirt-sleeve democrat. He believed in democracy very earnestly, but in the Emerson type of it rather than

the Walt Whitman. It was not a fatuous *camaraderie* that he desired, but *opportunity,*—opportunity for merit to express itself, for virtue to live and for vice to die. There came a time, indeed, when he seriously doubted whether representative government could be regarded as a success in either England or America, without a great advance in popular education. Like Shakespeare, he loved to feel the pulses of the mob; and yet, like Shakespeare, he seems to have had slight faith in the mob's collective wisdom. He thought that there was no such thing as a middle class in England, "for though we are perpetually bragging of it as our safety, it is nothing but a poor fringe on the mantle of the upper." And yet it was only his mind that was truculent and impatient about the unintelligence and bad manners of the crowd. In his heart Dickens loved humanity, and humanity knows it. It is unfortunate that he had not the clearer vision of Maurice Maeterlinck, when the Belgian wrote in *The Double Garden:*

> In those problems in which all life's enigmas converge, the crowd which is wrong is almost always justified as against the wise man who is right. It refuses to believe him on his word. It feels dimly that behind the most evident abstract truths there are numberless living truths which no brain can foresee, for they need time, reality, and men's passions to develop their work. That is why, whatever warning we may give it, the crowd insists before all that the experiment shall be tried. Can we say that, in cases where the crowd has obtained the experiment, it was wrong to insist upon it?

Natural, then, and even pardonable as Dickens's early ideas of America may have been, they were nevertheless one-sided, and untrue to the best in his nature. He did not see that the two concepts of democracy suggested above were struggling with each other to achieve recognition as the true American idea. They are still struggling, but a right victory is now predetermined. On his second visit Dickens was far more considerately treated, and was able to say, publicly:

> Nor am I, believe me, so arrogant as to suppose that in five-and-twenty years there have been no changes in me, and that I had nothing to learn, and no extreme impressions to correct when I was here first.

IV.

In *Oliver Twist, Dombey and Son, Old Curiosity Shop, David Copperfield, Bleak House,* and *Great Expectations,* Dickens's loving sympathy with the child-consciousness is especially manifest.

In this he is at one with a movement inaugurated by the English Romanticists, that has gone on steadily since the days of Blake's *Songs of Innocence* and Wordsworth's great *Ode on the Intimations of Immortality*. Child-study is the pedagogical offshoot of this spirit. In literature I have only to mention the names of Charles Kingsley, Lewis Carroll, Robert Browning, Thomas Hughes, Rudyard Kipling, Eden Phillpotts, Kenneth Grahame, J. M. Barrie, and Maurice Maeterlinck, to bring to mind many illustrations of this prevailing interest in child life. Dickens would be immortal as the creator of David Copperfield and Paul Dombey alone,—to me the truest of his children. There seems to be something too much or too little—a touch of the adult and alien—in the others, save Tiny Tim, but *these* ring true.

Dickens himself, it happens, preferred Little Nell. The writer's mother used to tell him how much Dickens liked to read aloud the scene of Little Nell's death, and how well he did it, in her hearing. She would speak of the marked histrionic talent he showed on such occasions:

> I have heard a great many eloquent men, but few to compare with Dickens. He held his audience spellbound, now overcome with uncontrollable laughter and now in tears. He seemed to me a great actor, transforming his hearers to other scenes, almost hypnotizing them. The power of the man was unquestionable.

Macaulay cried over Florence Dombey, but little Nell won the suffrages of the great arbiter, Jeffrey, and of his following.

> Since the divine Nelly was found dead on her humble couch [Jeffrey declared], beneath the snow and the ivy, there has been nothing like the actual dying of that sweet Paul, in the summer sunshine of that lofty room.

And Jeffrey shared with Landor the opinion that the portraiture of Little Nell was even comparable to that of Shakespeare's Cordelia. Thackeray, too, strange to say, was "taken in" by Nell's death-scene; but Ruskin bluntly said that "Nell was simply killed for the market as a butcher kills a lamb." And that is a just criticism, if too harshly phrased. Though with deference, I must express the belief that the character of Little Nell is out of drawing; that she is a Juvenile Virtue, but not a juvenile; and that the scenes in which she figures are usually "obvious," melodramatic and plausibly sentimental. The death-situation suggests the spot-light, and a slow orchestral accompaniment. One can

say this and still admire the Little Nell *idea.* But how real are the boyish bewilderments and gentle pride of Paul Dombey, how very human the experiences of Master Copperfield! I have watched a moving-picture audience as *they* watched David's boyhood adventures, skillfully reproduced. There was the tribute of a hushed silence and quiet tears. That Dickens understood and loved the innocence and idealism of little children is a guarantee of his insight into the lives of adults also. One of his tenderest letters is to a mother who had lost her infant daughter.

It is to the *Letters,* indeed, that one must go in order to round out Dickens's interpretations of the child-life. Though his masterpieces touch children so often, and though their naïve laughablenesses are not ignored, yet over those children hangs, in almost every instance, the shadow of another's crime or misery. In the *Letters,* on the contrary, we get *Christmas Carol* humor. When Dickens was in Dublin in 1858, he wrote down in this happy fashion a dialogue that took place between himself and the innkeeper's little boy, who had sidled up to the busy author:

Inimitable. "Halloa, old chap."

Young Ireland. "Hal-loo!"

Inimitable (in his delightful way). "What a nice old fellow you are. I am very fond of little boys."

Young Ireland. "Air yer? Ye'r right."

Inimitable. "What do you learn, old fellow?"

Young Ireland (very intent on *Inimitable,* and always childish, except in his brogue). "I lairn wureds of three sillibils, and wureds of two sillibils, and wureds of one sillibil."

Inimitable (gaily). "Get out, you humbug! You learn only words of one syllable."

Young Ireland (laughs heartily). "You may say that it is mostly wureds of one sillibil."

And so the conversation proceeds. Many readers will recall also the diverting account of the infant school at the Exhibition, in a letter to Mrs. Richard Watson, of Rockingham Castle, to whom, with her husband, he dedicated the work of which he thought most—*David Copperfield.*

There can be no doubt that this is the most popular of Dickens's books to-day, and perhaps justly so. Although there are evidences here—where, indeed, in his works are there not?—of theatrical device and plausibly decorated interstices in the story, yet it is sound at core, and the earlier parts are especially human

and convincing. Dickens the man sees Dickens the boy, and honors him, not because he has the conceit to suppose that his boyhood was "different," but because he is grateful to the child that made the man possible, grateful in a genuine, tender, elder-brother-like way that evokes the human out of the past and constrains it to live again in the unshrinkable dimensions of art. It has been happily suggested by Professor Thomas Seccombe that "in some respects it [*David Copperfield*] stands to Dickens in something of the same relation in which the contemporary *Pendennis* stands to Thackeray." In this riper work, *Copperfield,* the humor is far more satisfactory than in the first products of Dickens's pen.

Indeed, as Dickens's outlook upon life became clearer and wider, his insight into the springs of humor seems to have deepened. Much of his earlier humor is, however entertaining for the moment, yet exaggerated and alien to the spirit of good art. This criticism is equally applicable to his pathos. Dickens had to learn to discipline his comicalities, to lean toward Lamb (who far excels him as a master of pure humor) rather than the more rollicking Smollett. Initially, his humor is localized and jocular rather than catholically appealing and holding. Walter Pater identifies the highest type of humor with "the laughter which blends with tears and even with the sublimities of the imagination, and which, in its most exquisite moments, is one with pity." It seems to me to be the function of humor to interpret the deeper problems of life by giving them a truer, better-proportioned focus. Humor that laughs at itself, and admires its own cleverness, is spurious as humor, whatever be its value as relief and diversion. Perhaps we shall find here at least one cause of the fatal weakness of the great bulk of the popular American fiction of the day. It is more willing to rely upon sharp, staccato vaudevilleisms, so to speak, than to breathe the gracious, urbane, almost tender atmosphere in which true humor lives and has its being. One has only to look ruefully at *Puck* and *Judge*—to say nothing of *Life*—to realize this truth; and though their European contemporaries, even *Punch* (to which both Dickens and Thackeray were contributors), are not models of excellence—as indeed, how should be any *regularly* appearing journal of humor, *irregular,* involuntary, and self-surprising as that rare quality must be?—yet they

would often shame us, if we read them, by their superiority in point of gentleness of treatment and wealth of literary tradition.

V.

The best human gift Dickens missed,—a happy marriage, based on an understanding and enduring love. Mrs. Dickens is not in his novels. Mary Hogarth is there, in Little Nell; and Georgina, in Agnes; but concerning his wife Dickens seems for many years to have had little to say, until, after their separation in 1858, he unfortunately allowed himself to publish a defense of his course, and to write to his secretary a letter which the newspapers somehow obtained. Although he allowed Mrs. Dickens thereafter £600 a year, he left her absolutely nothing in his will, bequeathing to her sister Georgina, who took control of the household upon Catherine's departure, a sum of money and all his personal belongings and papers, and making her, with John Forster, co-executor of the will. He also adjured his children to remember always "how much they owe to said Georgina Hogarth, and never be wanting in grateful and affectionate attachment to her, for they know well that she has been through all the stages of their growth and progress their ever-useful, self-denying, and devoted friend."

In the same year he wrote of Mary Hogarth, long since dead, that "she is so much in my thoughts at all times, especially when I am successful, that the recollection of her is an essential part of my being, and is as inseparable from my existence as the beating of my heart is."

It is probable that both in the memory of Mary, innocent, amiable, and affectionate, and in the practical everyday, capable ministrations of the unselfish Georgina, Dickens caught what vision he had of the real significance of romantic love; it is more than probable that he first invested Catherine Hogarth with a halo on account of her sisters. It is often carelessly said that Dickens as a young man loved the whole Hogarth family, and would have been willing to make any one of the eligible girls his wife, but it is difficult to account for the fact of his actual choice on that basis alone. It is as loosely said that his conduct in permitting, indeed contributing to, the publicity which attended the separation, is strong evidence against his right to be considered a gentleman.

When we say that a man is "not a gentleman," we mean one thing. When we say that he is "no gentleman," we mean quite another thing. "A single bad act," Fielding reminds us, "no more constitutes a villain in life, than a single bad part on the stage." It is far from the mark to contend that Dickens was "no gentleman," not a man of normally fine and generous impulses, whatever may be admitted touching his early environment and his sometimes less than refined taste in personal dress and social and fictional manner. There is evidently a chapter in the history of his own heart that he never found it possible to understand, perhaps quite to *read,* himself. Whatever unhappy mistakes may have been made through that inability, let his right fame cover!

VI.

Dickens's last illness came upon him, after several years of indifferent health, courageously faced, on June 8, 1870, a perfect midsummer day. Following an hour's uneasiness, of which he said nothing at the time, he was suddenly stricken at the dinner-table at Gadshill, his last earthly home. Only his sister-in-law, Georgina, was at home at the time. Alarmed at the change in his appearance, she begged him to lie down. "Yes," he answered, slowly, "yes, on the ground." These were his last words.

The tired-out body soon relapsed into unconsciousness, and shortly before sunset on the following day Dickens passed away. He had desired burial in a quiet churchyard that he loved, but his family bowed to the will of the nation that Westminster Abbey should fitly hold his remains, cherished among her silent company of England's illustrious dead. America thinks of him and honors him as he lies there, and still reads his works with unabating pleasure; France also, which even now is reproducing on the Parisian stage three of his most notable books; all the world of "gentle readers," to whom his life spells a warm, kind human fellowship, and resourceful strength.

VII.

Dickens's first purpose as a writer of fiction is, of course, to interpret human life as he sees it. He was not among the world's great thinkers, but his powers of observation and feeling were strong and ample enough to amount to genius. His more spe-

cific purpose, indicated by his attacks upon all sorts of false prophets and institutions—the Fleet and Marshalsea Prisons, Dotheboys Hall, the Eden of *Martin Chuzzlewit,* the Circumlocution Office, the Chancery Court, etc.—is set forth by himself in a letter to a friend:

> While you teach in your walk of life the lessons of tenderness you have learned in sorrow, trust me that in mine I will pursue cruelty and oppression, the enemies of all God's creatures, of all codes and creeds, so long as I have the energy of thought and the power of giving it utterance.

This pursuit, however, is not a matter of denunciation merely. Dickens is too surely the artist for that. He uses the antithesis of character *versus* cunning and cruelty. As Chaucer's "Povre Persoun" is the best argument against the vices of the representative clergy of the fourteenth century, so the existence of Nicholas is an antidote to Squeers; so Pickwick, and Pip, and the "Cherub," and David, and Mark Tapley, and Esther Summerson (*she* rather too palpably), triumph over that which is evil. So, in that strong, tragic, gripping story, *A Tale of Two Cities,* perhaps nowhere else in Dickens so successfully, we find the supreme virtue of self-sacrifice revealed as humanly possible, as divinely imperishable.

Add to this Dickens's great liberality of judgment; the never-failing sweetness and cheerfulness of his humor, progressively refined; his friendliness toward all the world; his love of everything vital and earnest and affectionate in life; and one has a fair idea of the spirit of the man and his work. In politics and religion alike he described himself as a Liberal, but he had a cautious, conservative balance. He thought the New Testament "the best book that ever was or will be known in the world, because it teaches the best lessons by which any human creature who tries to be truthful and faithful to duty can possibly be guided."

University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD-WIDE MOVEMENT FOR THE LIBERATION OF WOMEN.

BY MISS BELLE H. BENNETT.

FROM the time when its divine Founder rebuked in scathing terms the teachings of the scribes, Pharisees, and hypocrites of Judaism, the dominant note of Christianity, even in its lowest forms, has been a note of liberty. A Christian civilization which does not generate and develop a spirit of individual, civil, and religious liberty is impossible. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." The so-called world-wide movement for the liberation and uplift of woman is distinctly and insistently the result of the teachings of Jesus Christ, and the operation of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men.

The most casual student of Church history must, perforce, see that every real advance of the Church of God, since the time of the Apostles, has been marked by a corresponding advance in the social, economic, and educational status of women. In non-Christian lands, where men and women of alien races with passionate devotion proclaim and teach the gospel of Jesus Christ, which is the most dynamic and revolutionary social, moral, and political force the world has ever known, we call it "Missionary Work." In other lands, where the same great power operates to change and ameliorate the unjust, hard, and often cruel conditions under which one-half of the people live, we call it "Woman's Rights."

Every great reform movement, notably those immediately affecting social and domestic life, has had to break "with strong crying and tears" the bondage of century-old customs, honored and honest conservatism, biased interpretation of Scriptures, commercial greed, ignorant prejudice, tender sentiment, and the natural fear of every normal mind and heart of the painful changes and wrenching readjustments attendant upon new and untried conditions.

In primitive ages and all down the centuries, "woman's sphere" has been one of dependence and subjection, varying in degree as man's estimate of her varies according to his tribal ideas and his

religious cult. Among the lower races, and in lands where "might is right," the woman is literally a beast of burden, doing all the heavy work, and as completely the property of her owner as his dog. Where a higher form of life obtains, and woman is relieved of the heavier, harder kinds of physical labor, her "sphere" assumes a different aspect, though her personal value and self-respect as a human being may be lessened rather than increased. Professor Westermarck, in his book on *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas,* says in a chapter devoted to "The Subjection of Wives":

The status of wives is in various respects connected with the ideas held about the female sex in general. Woman is commonly looked upon as a slight, dainty, and relatively feeble creature, destitute of all nobler qualities. Especially among nations more advanced in culture, she is regarded as intellectually and morally inferior to man. In Greece, in the historic ages, man recognized in her no other end than to minister to his pleasure or to become the mother of his children. There was also a general notion that she was more vicious, more addicted to envy, discontent, evil-speaking, and wantonness, than man. Plato classes women with children and servants, and states generally that in all pursuits of mankind the female sex is inferior to the male. To the Buddhist, women are, of all the snares which the tempter has spread for men, the most dangerous; in women are embodied all the powers of infatuation which bind the world. Islam pronounces the general depravity of women to be much greater than that of men. According to Mohammedan tradition, the Prophet said, "I have not left any calamity more hurtful to man than woman." The Hebrew represented that through the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we will die. This notion passed into Christianity. Tertullian maintains that a woman should go about in humble garb, mourning and repentant, in order to expiate that which she derives from Eve, the ignominy of the first sin, and the odium attaching to her as the cause of human perdition. "Do you not know," he exclaims, "that you are each an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age; the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the first deserters of the divine law; you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God's image—man." Progress in civilization has exercised an unfavorable influence on the position of women by widening the gulf between the sexes, as the higher culture was almost exclusively the prerogative of the men. Moreover, religion, and especially the great religions of the world, have contributed to the degradation of the female sex by regarding woman as unclean. In the Society Islands a woman was forbidden to touch whatever was presented as an offering to the gods, so as not to pollute it.

Among the Ainos of Japan, though a woman may prepare a divine offering, she may not offer it. In China women are not allowed to go and worship in the temples. According to the sacred books of India, women are considered to have no business with the sacred texts; and, being destitute of the Vedic texts, they are as impure as falsehood itself; that is a fixed rule.

Islam is chiefly a religion for men, though Mohammed did not forbid women to attend public prayers in a mosque.

Whatever "woman's sphere" may have been in heathen thought at any period of the world, or whatever it may be now, the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures have for six thousand years taught the essential equality of man and woman. Both were created in the image of God. To both he gave dominion over the things of the earth; both sinned and have reaped the punishment of sin; and to both God came in the flesh as Jesus Christ, whose declared mission was to destroy the works of the devil and to save to the uttermost.

The modern woman's movement in Christian lands, which has manifested itself in three sharply defined phases—(1) a demand for higher education, (2) for legal protection of property and personal rights, (3) and for equal political recognition by governments—parallels in time and importance the modern foreign missionary movement for the evangelization of non-Christian lands; and both are logical results of the progress of Christianity through the Protestant Reformation, which gave to the world the open Bible and freedom of thought.

Woman's right to give birth to the race, to labor for it, and in some measure to shape its development, has so far seemed to her an inalienable right; and to maintain that right in its entirety, preparing herself, mind, soul, and body, for the high and holy calling, is the cause for which she is contending before the world.

Educational.

At the beginning of the last century, colleges and high schools for girls were unknown institutions in any Christian country. The governess, the "finishing school," and the convent were the all-sufficient opportunities for "female education." It was not until 1821 that Mrs. Emma Willard established the first girls' high school in this country, in the city of Troy, New York; and fifteen years later, Mary Lyon founded the Mount Holyoke Seminary in South Hadley, Massachusetts. These and like modest efforts provoked a storm of opposition and ridicule, and much talk was made about unsexing women and unfitting them for the duties of motherhood and the care of their families.

At the present time there are more girls than boys in the high

schools of the United States, and about one-third of the graduates from colleges and universities are women. Seventy-three and one-tenth per cent. of the public-school teachers are also women.

In England and continental Europe, poverty and class prejudice have prevented the same widespread effort on the part of women to obtain these broader educational advantages; but many of the great universities are open to them, and hundreds of women matriculate annually. In the "nearer East," Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and Turkey, as well as in India, China, and Japan, Christian missionaries and contact with Western civilization have aroused such a desire for education that even the shut-in women of these lands, the bulwark of opposition to all progress, are feeling the tremor of an impending change, and many of the younger women are seeking opportunities for higher education in mission schools and Christian countries.

Legal Protection of Property and Personal Rights.

American women, privileged and blessed above the women of any country in the world, rejoice to know that no legislature in the United States has thoughtfully and deliberately made laws degrading women, or placing them at a disadvantage with men. American law, except in Florida and Louisiana, where the Code Napoleon was made the basis, was founded on English common law, and English common law was developed and codified in an age when war was the business of nations and physical prowess the ideal of every man. Woman needed protection and support only as the mother of the race, and her value was according to the number of sons she could give to defend the king's honor, or the king's domain. Under English common law, a wife was her husband's chattel. If she had property, it became his as soon as they were married; and he could not even endow her with salable effects, except by the establishment of a trusteeship. Her clothes, her services, her earnings, and her children belonged to him, and it was his right to dispose of them at will. "Moderate correction," or, as Blackstone records it, "reasonable restraint," could be administered by the husband, but he must not use a stick larger than his thumb. For a misdemeanor, theft, or depre-

dation, committed on property by the wife, the husband was responsible; the wife had no existence in the eyes of the law.

That our forefathers, Puritan and Cavalier, should have continued to use these laws, modifying or changing them, as the country and conditions changed, was the natural thing. Many of them, however, remain on the statute books of a few States to the present time, especially the laws concerning the property and personal rights of women. Class legislation must always be partisan; and as long as women have no voice in making the laws under which they live, discrimination against them must continue.

Men and women are not alike; they do not think alike. Man and woman are the complement each of the other in God's creation; and the home, the community, or the nation which excludes from its governing force and the solution of its domestic, municipal, and national problems one-half of the mental and moral power of the human race, is out of harmony with God's plan for the redemption of the world. It cannot be otherwise than a house divided against itself.

In 1848, when a little band of choice spirits called the first convention for the consideration of woman's rights, one of the first efforts at reform was to secure a repeal of the law giving a husband the absolute right to his wife's income, or his wife's wages. The battle was a long and bitter one, but success finally crowned their efforts, and an effectual Married Woman's Property Act was secured. Horace Greeley said of this Act, that giving woman a right to her own earnings meant more to the State of New York than all of the eleemosynary and philanthropic institutions within its borders. More than half a century has passed, and as the Western States have entered the Union, many of them have accepted the New York law as a model.

The victory is not yet won, however Year after year, little groups of women have stood in the lobbies of the legislatures, appealing and protesting, protesting and appealing, and thousands of others have waited at home using all their vaunted store of indirect influence, and there still remain seven States where the law gives the husband entire control of all his wife's income, and where men can and do draw the wages of their wives, leaving these women and their little children to starve, or steal, or suffer and die.

Another law handed down to us from the English common law, and one which worked a great hardship on women and children, was the statute denying married women the right to hold property, and consequently the right to make a will. Fathers whose daughters were married to worthless husbands finally felt the sting of this injustice, as they saw children and grandchildren subjected to mistreatment and poverty. Men who desired to evade the payment of just debts by holding property in their wives' names, and the ever-present group of so-called Equal Rights Women that never failed to appeal and protest, eventually made an impression on the General Assembly of one State after another, until every State in the Union has modified its law; and married women can hold property in some form, and devise the same, or a part of it, as their judgment and hearts dictate.

The still more iniquitous provision which gave the father an absolute and sole right to his children—born in wedlock—has been equalized or changed in only fifteen States. In Kentucky, where a young father under twenty-one years of age could not will his horse or his calf, yet under the statute had a perfect right to dispose of his unborn child, this law was changed as late as 1910.

The *age of protection* for little girls, ranging a few years ago from eight (in Delaware) to twelve (in other States), has been raised, by the importunities of these same women, to an average of fifteen. A few States have made it as high as eighteen and twenty-one years.

Where is there a single commonwealth in the Union in which the law will turn over to a fourteen-year-old child real or personal property that she may have inherited? Yet a single day beyond the years which the law decrees as the age of protection, the most heinous of crimes can be committed against the little body, if consent on the child's part can be proved; and the law declares it to be "no offense." The law places a higher value upon property than it does upon woman's virtue. Everywhere the voice of woman has been raised in protest of this "criminal law" against childhood. Could a woman bearing in her body the marks of motherhood pass such an Act?

To enumerate the State, county, and municipal laws under which women must live and rear their children without effectual means of protest, would be out of place in this article.

In England and some of her colonial possessions, the old common law still obtains; and where this is in force, the women appeal, protest, and endure, as they do in the United States. Among the favored classes where the law of entail holds, women inherit property with men, can sue and be sued, execute contracts, and legally dispose of property by gift or will.

For three-quarters of a century the struggle for the educational, financial, and personal liberation of women has gone bravely on throughout Europe. The pathway has all too often been wet with blood and tears, as in the Russian house of bondage to-day; but deep down in the heart of these struggling women, of all humanity, lies embedded that fundamental truth that sustains and quickens the faith of every reformer, *Without suffering, there is no remission of sin.* For unmarried women, the laws governing property rights in most Christian countries have been fairly liberal; the widow and spinster have a legal personality.

In Oriental lands, it is only the exceptional case or a special class of women that can hold property, or that have any personal liberty; the masses are slaves.

Women in Industry.

The most important fact of modern civilization is the great industrial revolution of the last century. The abolition of slavery in the slaveholding countries of Christendom, the discoveries of science, the inventions of machinery, and the application of motor power to industry and travel, came like the breath of God upon his people, and with a touch of his hand he released power that in two generations has transformed the world. Continents became neighborhoods, nations cities, and communities families. Men and women stood bewildered, while the mental process of readjustment slowly conformed itself to the new order of things. Wealth increased by leaps and bounds; the rich became richer, but poverty increased also, and multitudes of men, women, and children filled almshouses and prisons and went hungry to bed. Woman's work was taken out of the home, and she was thrust forth, by thousands, to follow it into the factories, shops, mills, and mines, with little children clinging to her skirts.

The revolution began in England, but spread quickly to other

countries. The labor-saving machinery transformed the textile industries, and great factory towns sprang up. England grew ambitious to supply the markets of the world, and sharp competition became a feature of trade. Women who had once done the spinning and weaving in their own homes were forced out into the factories to help make the money to buy clothing which they had once made at their own firesides from the raw wool and baled cotton. Sullenly and with rebellious hearts men followed, as the "power loom" came into use, ashamed to be doing "woman's work," but unable to support their families without her assistance. Free-trader and protectionist talked in the highways and byways, from platform and pulpit, of the providential opening for "women and children, many of whom will be otherwise useless to society."

After the War of 1812, manufacturers in this country petitioned Congress to protect our "infant industries," pointing out that their establishment had afforded "the means of employment to thousands of poor women and children," who without this protection would be thrown back on the community for support—"doomed to idleness and its inseparable attendants, vice and guilt." Boot and shoe factories followed the textile mills, and in these that which had formerly been a man's work became a "woman's industry." The laundry and the bakery took bread-making and household washing out of the home, and woman's work again became man's work. Men's and women's "ready-made" clothing drew on the resources of the home for a still larger contingent, and the "sweat shop" with its horrors accompanied this departure. In the first quarter of the nineteenth century more than one hundred new industries were opened to women. In 1900 the census reported three hundred and three separate employments, in two hundred and ninety-five of which six million women were engaged,[1] three million of these under twenty-one years of age, and the annual increase more rapid than the increase of the country's population.

Up to the close of the Civil War, a majority of the white women in our Southern States had been supported and protected in their

[1]The census of 1900 gave 6,000,000 in the industries; figures for 1910 not yet compiled.

own homes and "waited on" by the negroes. Slavery had degraded labor, and fathers felt it a reflection on themselves to have their girls or women go out from home to work for money. The slaveholding women of the South were not idle, however. They were mistresses, mothers, physicians, nurses, and "captains of industry." To quote a daughter's remark about her own mother, who was the mistress of a large number of women slaves: "She was a greater general than Grant or Robert E. Lee, and nobody slept on or off arms in this house."

The reconstruction period ushered in a new era for both men and women. Poverty and want aroused a sleeping spirit that woke to meet the occasion. Thousands of women and girls prepared themselves for teaching, and gladly accepted the humblest places in their profession. Thousands later became stenographers, typewriters, trained nurses, and shop girls; and with the advent of the cotton mills, tens of thousands of the poorer and poorly educated classes entered this and kindred industries. The constraining force of world-progress had shaken the civilized woman out of the old lines of work and out of the home, and compelled her to enter into the new without preparation or the means to secure it, or the protection she needed and must have as the mother of the race. At a recent hearing before a Congressional committee in Washington, Mrs. Raymond Robins, of Chicago, President of the National Woman's Trades Union, made the following statement:

> When we demanded in Illinois the limiting of the working hours for women to ten hours a day, many of our women physicians brought forward facts of very great value showing the tremendous physical danger to girls. These facts are growing to be of national importance, and we women who are working for the ballot believe that the ballot is our only hope for protecting the womanhood and motherhood of our seven million workingwomen. We beg that the mother-heart, the home element, the real life of the home, may be expressed in the government, and protected by it. No land or country has escaped this mighty revolution, and these women who labor can but see that the men who work side by side with them demand and secure reasonable hours of labor, reasonable wages, and sanitary conditions under which to work, while they are helpless and compelled to undercut the men they love and honor most, by working longer hours and for smaller wages, under conditions that make life a hard slavery. Why should they not cry out for the protection of the ballot? Somewhere in her conscious or subconscious mind, every woman realizes, "that with each generation the entire race passes through the body of its womanhood, as through a mold, reappearing with the indelible marks of that

mold upon it." Why should she not desire and cry out for all that will help her in mind, body, and soul, and helping her, help those who come after her?

Political Rights.

When the thirteen colonies of this country declared their independence in the memorable words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,"—and that "all just governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed,"—we wonder that to some men the failure to recognize women as a part of the people whose consent should be gained in establishing and perpetuating this new democratic form of government, did not seem an injustice. In Massachusetts women had been voting since 1691 under the old Province Charter for all elective officers, and continued to do so until 1780. For thirty years, three-fourths of the male inhabitants of Massachusetts, one of the three New England colonies requiring church membership in every voter, were excluded from the ballot-box, while women, then as now, constituting a majority of the church, accepted the franchise as a sacred trust. Abigail Smith Adams, wife of the man who was second President of the United States and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was one of the many Revolutionary mothers who from Boston to the "Hornets' Nest of America," Mrs. Brevard's mansion in North Carolina, protested against a new government in which women had no part.

In Virginia and New Jersey this protest against taxation without representation was so strong that the right was accorded them for a quarter of a century.

The Civil War discovered woman to herself in this country, to a still larger degree. While men offered their lives on the battlefield, some for the abolition of slavery, others for property and property rights, woman with aching heart gave hers for home and children, for the old and helpless who could not go to war, for the maimed and dying on the field of blood, and for the sick and wounded in the hospitals and camps. She gave herself without stint, and in giving herself found herself. The Red Cross Society was organized, and skilled nursing became a woman's pro-

fession. Another picture comes to us from one who still watches and waits:

> From my window in Washington, I see day by day a vast army of women marching to and from the War, Navy, State, Treasury, and other departments of the government, filling the numerous ramifications of its intricate work with credit to themselves and honor to their nation. I turn back in thought as I review this transfiguration, and look upon another scene at the door of the Treasury just over the way, where forty-eight years ago a long line of ragged, hungry, homeless women and children were crying for bread and shelter, while across the fair valleys of the Potomac in Virginia there were borne the cruel messages which told of husband, father, son, as sacrificial victims on the altar of relentless war. But out of the revolution initiated by three noble souls, there comes to our vast industrial beehives to-day the consecration of thousands of women in honorable and remunerative employment; for this initial step set wide the gates for limitless expanse of industrial opportunity to woman.

At the close of the war in America, woman had already entered into the literature of the world as a powerful factor. Mary Wollstoncraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* had gained a wide reading in England, and men and women of liberal thought had become her apt pupils. The brilliant Helen Marie Weber, of Leipsic, had written a series of ten tracts on *Woman's Rights and Wrongs,* a book that has scarcely been equaled, in relation to the whole subject, to the present day. Human freedom was being advocated by tongue and pen in all lands.

In the years 1865-70, when the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, giving the franchise to the negro men of the South, were pending and under discussion in both houses of Congress, women in numbers besieged the Capitol, and petitions with tens of thousands of names attached were sent up, pleading for the enfranchisement of women also. The fate of the measure hung on the question of introducing the word "male" into the Fourteenth Amendment. Republicans and Abolitionists who for years had talked and written in glowing language of "human rights," *afraid of jeopardizing suffrage for negro men,* halted and stammered and stultified themselves, promising when this was gained women should "come next." The Democrats treated the petitions with respect, and called attention in every way to the question. The whole South was threatened with disfranchisement, if the negroes were not allowed to vote. "A fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind!"

A great class was in power, and the fate of four million newly freed slaves and *fifteen million white women and girls* hung in the balance. All the world knows the result. Charles Sumner said that "up to that date, more petitions for woman's suffrage had been sent into Congress than on all other subjects combined."

In England, Herbert Spencer had written his *Social Statics,* John Stuart Mill his *Representative Government,* and Richard Cobden made the third of a great trio who advocated the cause of woman. A woman was on the throne, a Jew was Prime Minister; and that Prime Minister, Benjamin Disraeli, while a member of the House of Commons in 1866, made the first recorded speech in that historic chamber in which the right of woman to vote was plainly vindicated, using these words:

> In a country governed by a woman, where you allow woman to form a part of the estate of the realm, peeresses in their own right for example,—where you allow a woman not only to hold land, but to be a lady of the manor and hold legal courts,—where a woman by law may be a church warden and overseer of the poor, I do not see, where she has so much to do with the State and Church, on what reasons, if you come to right, she has not a right to vote.

The same year John Stuart Mill presented to the House of Commons a woman's petition for votes with one thousand four hundred and ninety-nine signatures attached. It was received with laughter; but in 1867, when the "Representation of the Peoples' Bill" came up, he moved to strike out the word "male," making his great speech, so long and so often quoted, and a division showed that he had received seventy-three votes against one hundred and ninety-four. Two years later, the first substantial victory, "municipal suffrage for women," was gained, largely through the efforts of John Stuart Mill and John Bright. In 1870 an Education Act was passed, enabling women not only to vote for school board candidates, but also making them eligible to membership on these boards. The same session witnessed the beginning of that long-continued struggle for parliamentary suffrage, Mr. John Bright introducing "a bill to remove the electoral disabilities of women." In his famous speech advocating franchise for women, Mr. Mill said: "I admit that one practical argument is wanting in the case of women; they do not hold great meetings in Hyde Park, nor demonstrations at Islington." And now, after nearly half a century of praying, pleading, and

petitioning, without getting a third reading for their bill, these English wives and mothers have been driven to both Hyde Park and Islington, and the streets of London never witnessed a pageant representing more heroic and self-sacrificing effort than when, in this good year of 1911, fifty thousand of England's best and most loyal women marched for ten miles through her busy thoroughfares—a living appeal and protest against class legislation.

The twentieth century, however, has ushered in a great harvest-time from the long years of seed-sowing. A new motherhood has brought forth a new manhood, and new conditions are being met by new forces. The oft-repeated argument that women do not want to vote is being answered by a practical denial around the world.

In 1898 the women of Ireland were given the right to vote for all offices except members of Parliament; and the same year West Australia gave full suffrage to the women of that province.

From 1901 to 1906 full national suffrage was granted to the women of federated Australia, and to the women of Finland, while New South Wales, Tasmania, and Queensland give full State suffrage.

In 1907 Norway conferred parliamentary suffrage on the three million women who were already exercising municipal suffrage. Sweden made woman eligible to all municipal offices, and Denmark gave her the right to vote for members of boards of public charities and to serve on such boards. The same year, the six hundred and seventy members of the House of Commons in England, with only fifteen dissenting votes, made women eligible as mayors, aldermen, county and town councilors.

In Scotland and Canada widows and unmarried women have municipal and school suffrage, and in every part of the British Empire some form of political suffrage has been extended to women. In the Isle of Man she has the right to vote for members of Parliament.

In France a committee for the defense of the rights of women was formed in the Chamber of Deputies in 1906, its declared purpose being to secure civil and political rights for women. The fundamental law of Prussia declares the rights of both sexes to be equal, unless exceptions are expressly declared, and a league of Evangelical women, a league of Catholic women, and the

Social Democratic women, supposed to be several millions in number, are making the enfranchisement of women a part of their programme.

In the Netherlands, Austria, and Italy, ever-increasing leagues of women and men are doing systematic aggressive work for woman's suffrage. In 1905 the Woman's Suffrage Association of Rome organized committees in all parts of Italy, and for the first time carried the question to Parliament. They secured a dignified hearing in the Chamber of Deputies, radical and conservative members speaking in favor. "The bill was finally referred to the Minister of the Interior, the most favorable disposition which the regulations allowed."

Russia had no national suffrage even for men until the creation of the Duma in 1905. In local village government women have for generations had certain voting rights, and sometimes held office. Since the war with Japan, all classes of women, especially the peasants, have expressed a strong desire for a voice in their government; and with the exception of the extreme conservatives, woman's suffrage has been placed in the platforms of all the political parties—Constitutional Democrats, Labor, Social Revolutionists, People's Socialists, etc.—and women are members of their executive committees. The proposed constitution for self-government for Poland gives women the right to vote for members of the Zemstvo.

The Turkish government has recently enacted laws giving the right of franchise to citizens paying a certain amount of taxes, including widows and spinsters. In Japan the high-class women are pleading and agitating for larger liberty, greater opportunities, and legal rights. The enlightened, cultured Parsee women in India are demanding the local suffrage possessed by men; and "even in Persia the educated women of Iran are asking a vote for the newly established Representative Assembly."

In the United States, while the women still continue the time-honored custom, now nearly half a century old, of sending committees to Washington City at every regular Congressional meeting to plead for a Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, they are also adopting other measures, and their efforts are meeting with a fair degree of success.

Five of the Western States have granted women full suffrage,

and in doing so have clearly answered the question, "Do women want the ballot?" In each case of these five States, notwithstanding the years of opposition behind them, the ridicule and sarcasm to be met at each initial election, and the mental apathy and physical timidity engendered in many women by long years of unbroken drudgery, the percentage of feminine votes has been quite equal to the percentage of male votes. The awful fear that equal suffrage will destroy the home has also been allayed, since *"it is admittedly the case that in these States it has safeguarded the home by scientific laws, and sweetened and bettered communal conditions directly bearing upon the home."* It has also demonstrated that the act of voting *takes far less of the mother's time from the home than the prayer meeting and the missionary societies.*

Five other States have also, within the past year, by legislative enactment, submitted the question to the voters. The election in one of these States took place in October last, and will be held in others some time in 1912.

In more than one-half of the forty-six States, women have had school suffrage conferred on them, and in as many as six others they have bond or municipal suffrage.

The women of the United States, in their long struggle to secure political liberation, have faced a far more difficult problem than the women of other countries. The central government at Washington, which has exercised an overwhelming influence in every change or extension of suffrage in the country, having persistently refused to entertain the question of a Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, the women have been compelled to deal with the matter as a question of State legislation. This method requires the winning over of every separate State legislature; and that done, the question must then be submitted to the voters of the State, and they, foreign and American born, with all of their illiteracy, sex prejudice, race prejudice, good and bad, must also be won over to the side of justice and righteousness.

Here, and everywhere, the most implacable and relentless foe of woman's suffrage is the organized liquor power. Leavening the thought and influence of Church and State; subsidizing periodicals, newspapers, and the press of the country; employing distinguished lawyers and maintaining a trained lobby at the na-

tional Capitol to protect its interest, it can at a day's notice mass like forces at any legislature or in any State. Always and everywhere its slogan is, *"Defeat woman's suffrage at any cost."*

Another element in this country has made progress difficult. It is said that we have no class distinctions, yet we all know that we have, and that they are strongly marked. The rich and the poor are far apart, the laboring classes and the moneyed aristocracy are divided by an impassable social gulf, and that great middle class, said to be the hope of every country, lies between, eager to get a footing in the Aladdin's palace of wealth and pleasure. These well-to-do, well-bred women, with good homes, husbands, fathers, or brothers, to support them, servants to assist in doing their work and in nursing their children, have in the past given little consideration to the educational, industrial, and political questions affecting the life of the country. Well-bred American women are said to read the daily newspaper less than the same class of women in any other country. To these women, the seven million of women who work ten, twelve, or fourteen hours a day, in shop and mill, office or school, with scant wages or small salaries, living in wretched tenements, poor boarding-houses, or rented homes to be paid for out of their earnings, are an unknown quantity in the country's life. They, in their ease and comfort, can well say: "We have all the rights we want; the ballot would force on us additional responsibilities for which we have neither time nor desire." These women are not heartless, only self-centered, home-centered, afraid of public sentiment—indifferent, because they do not know. Yet they are a type of a like multitude in every land.

Woman in the Church.

The liberation of woman in the Church of God has slowly kept pace with her release in other walks of life. The right of public speech and public prayer, once fiercely resisted, has practically been accorded throughout Protestantism.

In all the Congregational Churches of Protestant Christianity, women vote on a perfect equality with men, in calling pastors, electing church officers, and in assuming financial obligations.

In Churches having an Episcopal form of government, women for the past twenty years have agitated and memorialized their

lawmaking bodies, pleading the justice of an "open door," with some measure of success.

The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, the largest body of that denomination in the world, has admitted women to all the rights of the Church to which laymen are entitled. In the Episcopal Church of America, every separate diocese can grant women the right to membership in the vestries, and elect them delegates to the diocesan councils. In many dioceses they have for years had equal rights in voting on all parish questions. The women of this Church are at the present time agitating for larger reforms and a legal voice in the government of the Church.

Women have always had a controlling voice in the parish business of the Church of England, acted as vestry women, etc.

In the past two years the Wesleyan Church of Great Britain, one of the largest Nonconformist Churches of that country, has conferred on its women the rights of the laity. "At the Wesleyan Methodist Conference recently held at Cardiff, Wales, women were for the first time admitted, and fourteen synods were represented by women delegates."

In Armenia the ancient Oriental Church, occupying a position about halfway between the Greek and the High Episcopal Churches, is almost supreme in government. Last year the Catholicos, its venerable head, issued a proclamation giving the Church a constitution and committing the management of its affairs henceforth to a general assembly of delegates, to be elected by all the members over twenty-one years old. At once the question was asked whether this included women, whereupon he issued a second edict declaring that not only might women vote for these delegates, but they might also be elected themselves. The most influential Armenian paper in Russia, *The Workman,* published at Tiflis, in a column editorial expressed joy over this act and a hope that it would lead to woman's political liberty.

Theological and Bible schools have been opened to women everywhere, and hundreds of young women are engaged in a devout systematic study of the Word of God. Professor Harnack has even dared to suggest that Paul's Letter to the Hebrews *might possibly have been written by Priscilla.* For half a century women have been a growing factor in the missionary life

of the Church, and they have been given large liberty in that field of activity. They have organized and educated great missionary societies, raised and disbursed large sums of money, trained and sent out missionaries into every field the Church has entered, and given the world much of its missionary literature.

In the Roman Catholic Church, the organized and largely independent orders of sisterhoods have been the strong arm of that great communion for centuries. While they were shorn of much of their power in the Middle Ages, they have regained much in the last half century.

In many of the Protestant Churches the office of deaconess has been created, and women specially qualified and trained are set apart to work in coöperation with pastors, churches, and boards, in all of the ordinary activities of each separate denomination.

The New Woman.

In this world-wide movement of women, for women, and by women, the significant fact is the *new* woman. *New,* because schoolroom and college doors have been thrown wide open to her, and she has entered, and come forth a product of the same classroom work and the same faculty which molded her brother or her husband. *New,* because the law has made it possible for her to receive, obtain, and hold property, and to administer it according to her best judgment. *New,* because the world has been opened to her by the printing press, the railroad and steamship, and by the *new man,* who is her comrade and fellow-worker as husband, father, or brother. *New,* because, above all, a trained mind and the open Word of God have made the *Will* of God a real and personal thing to her. Her very newness compels her to claim a larger share in the world's responsibilities and the world's progress. She hears God's voice speaking to her from that great throng of helpless industrial workers, one-half of whom are almost illiterate, as they grope and struggle like another blind giant, turning sightless eyes in mute appeal they know not whither. She feels his constraining hand in the numberless woman's organizations that are cementing bonds of fellowship and sisterhood in every land, as they labor together to right the wrongs of humanity. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union, which has brought forth the Anti-Saloon League, as the

Missionary Societies have called into being the Laymen's Movement, girdles the globe. The multitudes of Woman's Clubs, Trades Unions, Guilds, and Leagues, that honeycomb America, Great Britain, and continental Europe, all look to her for leadership. The International Woman's Suffrage Alliance, which has just held its sixth convention in Stockholm, with twelve hundred delegates, the very flower of the world's new womanhood, was a companion piece to the World's Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910.

Does it seem strange and unwomanly that these women, standing where they do, should believe that the world needs their strength and wisdom, united and combined with the strength and wisdom of its best manhood, to guide and govern Home and Church and State?

New times demand new measures and new men;
The world advances and in time outgrows
The laws that in our fathers' day were best;
And, doubtless, after us some purer scheme
Will be shaped out by wiser men than we,
Made wiser by the steady growth of truth.
The time is ripe, and rotten-ripe, for change;
Then let it come; I have no dread of what
Is called for by the instinct of mankind.
Nor think I that God's world would fall apart
Because we tear a parchment more or less;
Truth is eternal, but her effluence,
With endless change, is fitted to the hour;
Her mirror is turned forward, to reflect
The promise of the future, not the past.

—*James Russell Lowell.*

Richmond, Ky.

THE FIRST LIFE-AND-DEATH STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

THERE were principles of Christianity which, if pressed in a one-sided way, might lead to openings for Gnosticism (*gnosis*, knowledge). The idea of different grades of Christian attainment was at home in Christianity: the mystery or secret which only "the perfect" could know (1 Corinthians ii. 6, 7; iii. 1, 2); the enlightenment which God pours into their minds so that they "know all things" (1 John ii. 20, 21); the special blessing of those deep in the love of God—"unto all riches of the full assurance of understanding" (Colossians ii. 2); and the gracious gift of God,—to one the word of wisdom through the Spirit, and to another the word of knowledge according to the same spirit (1 Corinthians xii. 8). Thus, grades of knowledge were reflected even in the New Testament,—in the simple narratives of the first three Gospels; in the Epistles of Paul, opening here and there vistas into profound truth; and finally in the wonderful Gospel of John, which is like a landscape, now charming in its quiet beauty, and then piercing the sky with its peaks, or revealing unfathomed depths.

Looking beyond Christianity for the working of that strange, multiform, many-colored thing we call Gnosticism, it meets us nearest perhaps in Philo, the philosophic Jew of Alexandria, who was a young man when Christ was born. In him the higher knowledge (*gnosis*) was directed to piercing into the alleged deeper meaning of the history, myths, mysteries, and doctrines of religion. This seemed an innocent proceeding, but it had in it the elements of vast mischief. The same tendency was illustrated in post-apostolic Christian writers,—the uncovering of the deeper sense of Scripture by allegory, "that you might have your knowledge perfect," says Barnabas (§ 1), which he helps forward by a perfectly luxuriant allegorizing of Old Testament laws and facts. Clement of Rome does the same to a less degree to buttress his ideas of Church order (§§ 40, 43, etc.); and Justin Martyr explains the nobler meanings of the commonplace passages of the

Old Testament (Trypho 111-113, etc.). It was the custom—as by the Stoics, Plutarch, etc.—in the Hellenic world to seek under the hull of the myths and mysteries the deeper religious and philosophic meanings. There was also the inclination to discover the same religious ideas in different mythological forms and cults, to adopt or mix the same form with these various sources (syncretism), and especially to study the Oriental cults which seemed to come to them in the light, or with the claim, of original revelation. Thus all these fanatical ideas of the East were brought into the West, and got mixed with the whole movement of Western thought. In this religious ferment Christianity also worked with its doctrine of redemption and of the world; and, though it made the claim of having absolute validity, it yet united to itself the most different religious views, transforming them and being itself transformed. (See Möller-von Schubert, *Church History,* I. 138, for 1912.)

What were some of the elements of this Gnostic ferment? Syrophenician cosmogony and the astrology and magic of the Orient. Man and all the lesser spheres of creation were under the influence of the stars or heavens, which were thought of as higher spirits standing near to God and ruling the world. Redemption was conceived as freeing man from the pressure and power of finiteness, in which these heavenly powers wish to keep fast the soul. There was also the idea of middle beings, angels, etc., as mediating God, behind whom God disappears,—an idea which some think came in from such semi-Jewish sects as the Essenes, Samaritans, etc. Then there were borrowings from the Greek, Pythagorean, Philonic, and Stoic philosophies; and finally Christianity itself, conceived as a religion of world-redemption. There was, of course, a practical side to all this,—a religion of the dedicated, of the perfect, an esoteric society, which looks upon religion as a secret mysterious cult in which the members were the select initiated, with higher knowledge (compare the desire "to know" as a motive in the liturgies of some secret orders), perhaps reminding us of the "knowledge falsely so called" (1 Timothy vi. 20) of those who creep into houses and with specious boasting of superior knowledge lead away silly women and others equally weak-minded (2 Timothy iii. 6).

The success of these apostles of the higher "knowledge" was due in part to the unorganized character of the early Church, its lack of responsible officers and teachers, the freedom of speaking in the congregation, the lack of well-defined boundaries of worship, creed, and structure, and the Church's open and frank attitude toward the Spirit, the giver of new truth,—what Germans call the "enthusiastic" character of early Christianity. There were prophets who spoke under divine afflatus, there were speakers with tongues, healers, and those possessed of other heavenly powers. The Gnostics took hold of these helps to their propaganda, exploited to their own taste both the Old Testament and the literature of the apostles, added to and took away arbitrarily from this literature (Revelation xxii. 18, 19); and in the absence of authoritative norms of doctrine and of fact, the poor believers were the footballs of these "knowing" ones, and were in danger of losing all real hold on their faith. The very historical ground of Christianity was in danger of being dissolved from under the feet of Christians, and they themselves foisted away into a fog of hollow speculation. A crisis indeed had come.

How grave that crisis was may be seen by a little attention to the nature of this so-called Christian "knowledge" of the first second, and third centuries. (1) Christianity, which was originally a practical doctrine of salvation through faith and love, becomes a speculative religious theory or science of the universe, a knowledge of the world-process, which knowledge leads to redemption of the spirit, after the manner of Christian Science. (2) The creator of the world and its lawgiver is separated from the highest God, and various evolutions and emanations go out from the original divine foundation, the highest God being too glorious to mix himself directly with lesser things. The fall of man itself is such a mixing of the spirit with matter worked by lower ungodly powers, who may have had to do with the present appearance and conditions of the earth and world (compare Ephesians vi. 12, R. V.). (3) Redemption, or the freedom of man's spirit, is accomplished by dissolution of the world, by overcoming cosmic powers, and emancipating the spirit from matter. (4) A dualistic trait runs through the whole system, though in various degrees, sometimes going so far as two original principles or Gods, and then fading away into a kind of pantheism.

(5) The purely religious oppositions between the world and the kingdom of God, between flesh and spirit, are enlarged into oppositions of cosmic powers, and thus drawn out of the ethical, where only they have any bearing and sense, into the physical. (6) Christ is placed in the turning point of the religious history of man, who is lifted up also as the turning point of the whole cosmic development. Christ means the coming in and revealing of the divine spiritual principle in the visible world, the revelation of the hitherto concealed God, and with this the outgoing of a new life for all who take hold of this revelation and understand it and subject themselves to the necessary ascetic and secret conditions (compare Christian Science again). (7) A word further as to Christ. As the Godhead unfolds himself in different divine potencies or aeons, so Christianity is thought of as appearing in the world as one of these potencies or shining out from a mixture of them. But Christ as a heavenly and redeeming potency is always to be distinguished from his visible appearance, which latter is to be considered either as a real man who bears for the time the heavenly Christ, or as only a psychical or spiritual (not material) formation or image, or as simply an appearance as in Docetism (compare Christian Science's conception of matter). (8) Who are the saved? Here we must distinguish the pneumatics or spiritual, who are able to receive the divine life and the revelation of the Spirit, and the hylics or material, who are irrecoverably fallen. Some Gnostics define also the psychics, who are incapable of the proper revelation of the Spirit, but who are able by faith to come to a certain knowledge of the divine and to a corresponding blessedness. (9) Over against the realistic view of early Christianity as to the visible return of Christ, the resurrection of the body, and the glorious kingdom of Christ, the Gnostics taught the opposite. The end is the freeing of the spirit from sensuousness and the pain of finiteness (compare Hindooism and Buddhism). (10) Finally, Gnostic ethics, as may be imagined, is purely dualistic. The opposition between matter and spirit is conceived absolutely, not relatively or morally as in Christianity. This opposition receives a metaphysical foundation, and, as in Christian Science, is erected into a fundamental principle. There was a healthy ascetic strain among the first Christians,—a voluntary self-denial under special circum-

stances for a higher good (Matthew xix. 12; 1 Corinthians vii. 7, 8, 26, 29-31; ix. 25-27), illustrated, for instance, in later Church history in the wise resolution of Bishop Asbury to remain single. But this asceticism for moral ends was changed in Gnosticism into an asceticism involved in its basic ideas, metaphysically grounded and driven to its highest point (compare Hindooism and Buddhism again). But another side to this asceticism was moral looseness; for the spirit only being essential, the ordinary external things of life were indifferent, whence libertinism or antinomianism.

From the above statement the reader can see that there is some truth in Harnack's speaking of Gnosticism as the acute secularizing or Hellenizing of Christianity (*History of Dogma,* I. 222, 230, note). It might better be called the Hellenizing of Eastern theosophies, with the transfusion of Christian elements and those elements perverted in the process. Professor W. Walther is right when he says (*Theological Literature,* 1898; Blatt, 228) that Gnosticism is a development on heathen ground, "not a Hellenizing of the gospel, but a stealing of some Christian rags to cover heathen nakedness." Seeberg is better still when he says (*History of Doctrine,* I. 94, 100-1) that Gnosticism "sought to elevate Christianity to the position of the universal religion by combining in it all the tendencies and energies of the ages, and thus adapting it to the comprehension of all and satisfying the needs of all. Thus revelation was to be combined with the wisdom of the world, and Christianity by this means to become a universal religion. It was the first attempt in the history of the Church to bring the world into subjection to the Church by interpreting Christianity in harmony with the wisdom of the world. Under the conditions then existing this attempt appeared to be assured of success, and it seemed to oppose to the gospel of the Church a tremendous combination of forces. Gnosticism is not merely Gentile-Christian in character, but essentially heathen. The fundamental problem to which it addresses itself originates in the religious thought of the heathen world, as well as the means employed in the solution of the problem. Its character is not altered by the fact that it applies the instruments of Christian and Jewish tradition to the problem in hand. It is misleading to speak of it as the acute Hellenizing of Christianity, or to say

with Harnack that "its leaders were the first Christian theologians." Some systems had Hellenistic elements, notably that of Valentine; but "judged as an historical phenomenon, Gnosticism was the attempt to establish the universal religion, in which the religious problems of the educated world in that age should be answered by means of the ancient Oriental mythology and magic," with the addition of Christian ideas. "We may accordingly, instead of a Hellenizing, speak rather of an ethnicizing of the gospel." And ethnicizing here really means heathenizing.

Especially in the system of Marcion (flourished 155) did Gnosticism present itself to the Church in a most fascinating light, as though it would deceive the very elect, reminding us in its subtly dangerous appeal to the susceptibilities of the half-instructed Christians in that day of the modern Marcions—*mutatis mutandis*—the "advanced" theologians of the present. The God of the Old Testament, of the creation and of the law, appeared to him as the hard, passionately angry God, who found pleasure in war, and who was childish in his measures and contradictory in his conclusions, for he feels penitence, and the creator of a by no means perfect world, and also the bringer in of evil ("I am he that created evil," he says himself in the Old Testament). Unless you explain the Old Testament allegorically, there is in it no trace of the God of love. Nevertheless, said Marcion, the God of the Old Testament is not the principle of evil over against the good highest God, but only a lesser, limited god, the world-ruler. But he stands in close relation with the hyle or matter conceived as a principle or personification out of which he built the world. Over both is the highest good God, secret, hidden, resting in everlasting inactivity (compare the religions of India), who has a higher heavenly world around and under him. Suddenly the good God sends his son Christ in a counterfeit or seeming body, who appeared in the time of Pilate in Judea, revealed God, and authenticated himself by miracles. As he did away with the law and prophets and all the works of the world-creator, he was crucified by the princes of this world (1 Corinthians ii. 8), the angel powers of the demiurge or creator—which crucifixion, however, did not harm him, on account of the unreality of his body. He proclaimed the religion of love and of freedom from the law of the creator, though not in a libertine

sense. The faithful to whom the good God is revealed must abstain as far as possible from the pleasures and goods of this world, especially from sexual indulgence and the use of flesh, for the body has no part in salvation. As everything rests upon faith in the divine love, Cain and the evildoers of the Old Testament, as well as all the heathen, are saved by the Redeemer descending to Hades, as they all turn to him with longing; while the pious of the Old Testament have no trust in the proclamation, and remain in Hades.

As all this was contrary to the gospel the Church had received, Marcion had to sift the tradition; and he did this with a vengeance. He claimed that the Judaizers had falsified the gospel from the beginning, the only genuine written remains of which were the ten Epistles of Paul (omitting the Pastoral Epistles) and the Gospel of Luke, but these only in an emended form.

From this the reader will hardly be prepared for Lipsius's favorable description of Marcionism as the Protestantism of the ancient Church, for the reason that Protestantism proclaimed fundamental Christianity, while Marcionism proclaimed fundamental heathenism with Christian elements. But it proclaimed its message with such wise adjustment to the spirit of the times, and with such plausibility to those who were ignorant of the true nature of the Old Testament, that it had a wide vogue. By the time of Epiphanius (close of the fourth century), it had spread from Persia to Italy, from Pontus to Upper Egypt. It came into sympathetic contact with the mighty movement of Manicheism, and according to some formed the basis of the Paulician Church of the seventh century.

How was Gnosticism overcome? (1) By direct refutations by the Church Fathers. It prompted theological defense, and thus gave birth to Christian theology. The Fathers whetted their dialectics on the Gnostic grindstone. Think of the noble vindications of Christian truth by Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, a challenge to the modern minister to a like battle for the faith against present-day errors. (2) The lack of a brief ready confession of the faith made it easy for the Gnostics to win converts from the ignorant. To gather up the apostolic faith in a few short statements, to express the fundamental facts of the life of Christ over against

Gnostic evaporation,—this was a need everywhere felt, and it led consciously or unconsciously to the Rule of Faith, that is, little statements of the main things believed by Christians, which, helped along by baptismal formulas, and by catechetical needs, issued in the later creeds. I do not mean that there were not such statements in some Churches earlier than the Gnostic propaganda, and independent of it; but there can be no doubt that the latter helped along the preparation and use of creeds and their elevation to Rules of Faith. What gave distinct occasion to the Christian society at Rome to make its symbol or creed a rule, says Kattenbusch (*Das Apostolische Symbol,* II. [1900] 82-3), was Gnosticism and Marcionism. "The error of these movements was of course in many points perceived. But they were found chiefly in contradiction with the symbol, the solemn sum of the faith. It was a natural growth when the *sacramentum* of faith became a wall against Gnosis and Marcion." (3) Another weapon was the New Testament rationally interpreted, and especially the fixing of the limits of that Testament over against the swarm of false Gospels, Acts, and Epistles put out by the errorists, and sometimes in fact—truth to tell—exploited by the Church (though this last was not always done deliberately from a book known to be false). One of these was the Gospel of Peter (fragments) found by the French diggers in Akhmin, Upper Egypt, in the winter of 1886-7, and first published in Paris in 1892 by Bouriant, the director of the French Archæological Institute in Cairo, as a part of the ninth volume of the Memoirs of that Institute (editions by various scholars in 1898), and which made such a noise at the time. It is a mild Gnostic Docetic Gospel, written in Syria after the middle of the second century. But to find out for a certainty what the New Testament was, and rightly explain it, was a task thrown upon the Christians by the Gnostics. It is an ill wind that blows nobody good.

Besides all these things, Gnosticism was overcome by absorption; not simply individual Gnostics won back into the Church, but their views, methods, etc., taken up by the Church. Their mystery-cults influenced the Catholic Baptism and Lord's Supper; their philosophy as to the hidden God and the intermediate beings between him and man reacted on the Catholic conception of the awful and infinite One who could better be approached

through saints, angels, and especially the Virgin Mary; their division of men into pneumatic or spiritual, psychic, and hylic, and their call to the former to abstinence and a lofty self-denying holiness, worked on Catholic Christianity with mighty force, and helped to produce Monasticism and many practical phases of the ancient and mediæval Church, and which are still in evidence on every hand. Then there was an approach to the Church on the part of some Gnostics, as for instance Appelles, who said (Eus. H. E., v. 13, 5) that "those who trusted in the Crucified would be saved, if only they were found doing good works," and also that Christ had an actual body and one that could suffer, though a heavenly one. The Docetists described by Hippolytus (*Phil.* viii. 8 ff.) could hardly be distinguished from the Church in several of their teachings. It is remarkable also that Tatian (flourished 160), even after he became a Gnostic (Encratite), enjoyed high honor in the Church. This is shown by the wide acceptance of his Gospel Harmony or Diatessaron, a blending together in a united story (in Syriac) of our four Gospels, beginning with the first verse of John, but omitting the genealogies in Matthew and Luke and every other passage which shows that the Lord sprang according to the flesh from the seed of David, and occasionally incorporating passages not in our Gospels. In the East Syrian Church this Harmony was in favor till the fourth century, and was suppressed first in the fifth. In the former century the great Church doctor Ephraem wrote a commentary on it, and though without mentioning the name of Tatian, copying the most of it in his book. That commentary was translated into Armenian in the next century, and lay in Armenian manuscripts until 1836, when it was published by the Mechitarist Armenian monks of San Lazzaro, Venice. It was translated into Latin by one of them—Father Aucher—in 1841, but not published; and this translation was revised and edited and published at Venice in 1876 by Moesinger, one of the theological professors of the Roman Catholic University at Saltzburg. It is singular that the significance of this unexpected recovery of a Gospel Harmony which reaches back to within less than a lifetime of the death of the Apostle John, escaped the tireless ever-searching eyes of German scholars, the first notice of it being a passing one—line reference of Nestle in the *Theol. Lit.—Zeit.* 1878 (Dec. 7), 607.

An American has the honor of being the first to call the attention of the learned world to this priceless possession,—Professor Ezra Abbot (d. 1884), in his *The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel:* It seems to bring those old Gnostics home to us to have one of them hand us the first Gospel Harmony ever constructed, in which the Gospel of John is used as a book everywhere acknowledged as divine, on a perfect level with Mark and Matthew,—this Gospel which Baur said never existed till after 150.

On the other hand, speaking of the absorption of Gnostic ideas and usages by the Church, we must not lay too much stress there. For instance, Augustine did not get his doctrine of the will and of predestination from the Gnostics or the Manicheans, but from a perverted understanding of Paul. The second and third century Fathers bitterly opposed the Gnostic denial of free will. As Harnack says (*History of Dogma*, I. 260 n.), Gnosticism "was wrecked in the Church on free will, the Old Testament, and eschatology." That man is free and responsible; that the Old Testament is from the supreme God, who is also the Creator; that the body is sacred, and is to be raised at the last day; and that Christ who came in actual flesh once is to come again in power at the end,—these were some of the precious possessions of the early Church which were so firmly a part of her very being that with them she overcame the Gnostic peril. Gnostics used the term, "of the same substance," ὁμοούσιος, of Christ in relation to God, just as the Church came to use it later; and they sometimes seem to have identified Christ with God, but that does not mean, as Harnack thinks it does (I. 259, n.), that the Church "learned very much in Christology" from them, or that they had a "mighty influence on the later Church development of Christology." At the bottom, their doctrine of Christ was at an infinite remove from that of the Church, and their idea of "two natures" had nothing in common with the idea of the Church. The absolutely genuine human nature of Christ, who was linked nevertheless in indissoluble union with the Father,—that was the inexpungable conviction of primitive Christianity; and on that rock the fantastic theories of Gnosticism—however some of them were refined and Christianized by noble and holy men who were "not far from the kingdom"—broke in vain.

Drew Seminary, Madison, N. J.

GEORGE ELIOT AND ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.

BY MRS. GROSS ALEXANDER.

THE literature of the Greeks will stand for all time as the supreme expression of a growth from within—of the multifold and marvelous efflorescence of the genius of a race with no admixture of foreign influence worth mentioning. In this self-taught nation we find all the chief forms of literary composition developed to a state of perfection which must ever remain our despair.

The Roman literature was different, for before the Latin genius had time for self-realization it fell under the spell of the Greek spirit and assimilated what it might of an alien culture. The result was a hybrid literature which represented the expression of two races.

The cosmopolitanism of *our* day is of quite a different nature. The fever and fretfulness of our modern life, the increasing popularity of realism, the permeating spread of agnosticism, together with the contagion of a vicious newspaper press, explain the artificiality and really pernicious nature of much of our modern literature, especially our fiction. It is of the eclectic type, absorbing literature of all lands,—a sort of intellectual free trade, as it were. A certain conservatism, introspection, and exclusiveness are necessary for the development of a nation's highest individuality.

If these observations are true in regard to nations, they are equally true in regard to individuals. The setting of a life, like the setting of a jewel, will affect not only its luster but its value. Although forces beyond our control have a part to play in all life, that which is within the province of choice should be determined with the greatest care. It is interesting to note an illustration of this fact in the lives and characters of the two persons to be considered in this paper, the one standing among women as the greatest of Britain's novelists, and the other as the greatest of Britain's woman-poets. We shall note some similarities that characterized the beginning of their careers, and as striking contrasts that characterized the close.

George Eliot's full biography is yet to be written, or perhaps it must ever remain unwritten and unknown, for we cannot fail to see

that in the (selected) *Letters and Journals,* published by her husband, and in the few other available sources relating to her life, we are but allowed to gather about the outskirts of her great and unfathomed nature, and are not permitted to know the real inner conquests and failures of which her outer life and writings were but results. She was endowed with an exquisitely delicate and womanly nature—a gentle, shrinking girl, intensely emotional, yet with a marked reserve. As she was passionately fond of the beautiful in nature and in every line of art, her sensitiveness and shyness were enhanced by the fact that she possessed a very plain face. One of her school friends, who knew her at thirteen, said it was impossible to imagine her as a baby—that it seemed as if she must have come into the world full grown, like a second Minerva. Her features were mature at an early age, and she had a serious look that was almost startling for her years. The charm of her nature, as she grew older, described itself in her manner and voice, the latter being, as Dorothea's, "like the voice of a soul that had once lived in an Æolian harp." Combined with a shrinking manner she had a restless masculine energy of mind and heart that were understood by none of her early associates. Her father was a land agent, and exercised some influence in the vicinity of Griff, in Warwickshire, where they lived. He was a man of moderate circumstances, but was esteemed for his practical energy and intelligence. He is portrayed in *Adam Bede,* although his unfailing tenderness for his "little wench," as he called Marian, suggests Mr. Tulliver in *Mill on the Floss.* Her mother comes to us as Mrs. Hacket in *Amos Barton,*—a woman with good sense and a kind heart, but far from being able to understand the deep and complex nature of her gifted and heart-hungry child.

When Marian was sent to a boarding school, at the age of thirteen years, her biographer says: "There was never anything of the school-girl about her. She looked like a mature woman, and was one day taken for the teacher by a visiting stranger." The eagerness and thoroughness with which she plunged into books—English, French, and German—gave her associates a humiliating sense of their inferiority, and they involuntarily shrank from her. Yet, beneath her granite-like exterior, there was an aching heart that passionately craved human tenderness and companionship.

On the blank pages of her German dictionary, she used to write

original verses expressing very pathetically her craving for love. Strong religious convictions began to take possession of her about this time. Having no sufficient outlet for her ardent nature, she flung herself passionately into the acceptance of Christianity, which was her heritage by birth and kinship. She had a singular independence for one of her nature, and expressed fearlessly and with vehemence what she considered right, although there was ever a struggle between the insistent demands of her intellect and the cravings of her heart. She felt an absorbing hunger for something that could give her abiding peace, and was continually reaching out for that which seemed to elude her grasp. Her religious life is faithfully and pathetically portrayed in the character of Maggie Tulliver.

Up until the age of seventeen or eighteen, and long after her mother's death and the changes it involved of leaving the early home and becoming her father's housekeeper, at Foleshill, she was considered the most pious member of her family. Passing from one stage of religious thought to another, she was first a member of the simple Church of England; then Leon Church; then Anti-supernatural, in which she wore, as was the custom with extremists, an Anti-supernatural cap. About this time she had a visit from her aunt, Mrs. Elizabeth Evans, who was a Wesleyan Methodist, and preached in certain neighborhoods. While a beautiful young girl and through middle life, Mrs. Evans, attired in a Quaker dress and bonnet, used to walk across the bleak treeless Derbyshire hills gathering the poor and the neglected about her and pouring forth words of earnest conviction that, as she said, "brought many to the Lord." Marian Evans wrote to a friend about her: "I really loved my aunt very much, although we used to have religious debates about predestination, for I was then a strong Calvinist, and she had the spirit of love which clings to the bad logic of Arminianism. Her second visit to me was less interesting than the first, for I was at that time less devoted to religious ideas; her third visit was painful, for then I had given up all forms of Christian belief, and was in a crude state of free-thinking." This aunt's life and work were so clearly portrayed as Dinah in *Adam Bede* that, upon her death, friends placed a memorial tablet in the Methodist chapel at Wirksworth with the following inscription:

In memory of Mrs. Elizabeth Evans
(known to the world as Dinah Bede),
who, during many years, proclaimed alike in the open air,
in the sanctuary, and from house to house, the love of Christ.

Marian Evans's early religious experiences were wholly the product of her emotional nature, and not the intelligent subjection of her will to the will of God. In those adolescent years of girlhood she anticipated Christian experiences too old for her age; and later, as her mind developed without a corresponding increase of religious experience, she began to doubt. She had amassed quite a library at the age of twenty by her unassisted efforts, and was reading Æschylus in Greek and doing advanced work in French, German, and Italian.

When more and more she became troubled with questionings and doubts, there was no one in her narrow circle to whom she could go for counsel; and with all her eagerness and earnestness, religion had never brought light to her. If she had but waited and kept her heart's shrine sacred, she might eventually have come out from under all darkness and found the face of God.

Elizabeth Barrett seems to have almost lisped in numbers. She was the favorite child of a wealthy father, who was ambitious for her and taught her Latin and Greek himself. She was given difficult studies by him when very young. In her poem "Hector in the Garden," we get a pretty picture of her as a child forced beyond her powers, yet learning facts and history as so-called "play" without any aim or object. She says: "At nine years of age, the only thing the mystic number nine suggested to me was that the Greeks had spent nine years besieging Ilium. The Greeks were my demigods, and haunted me out of Pope's *Homer* until I dreamt more about Agamemnon than I did of my black pony." She was devoted to her father from babyhood to the end of her life, and ever sought his pleasure. At eleven years of age she wrote an Epic, seventy-two pages in length, on "The Battle of Marathon," and dedicated it to him. He was so proud of it that he had fifty copies published and distributed among their friends.

Very little is known of her mother. She died when Elizabeth, the eldest of her children, was young. Her brother near her own age was her constant companion and joy. She wrote in early life a poem entitled *Verses to My Brother.* She addressed him as "Beloved and best, . . . my Brother." One of the verses ran thus:

Together have we passed our infant hours,
  Together sported childhood's spring away,
Together culled young hope's fast-budding flowers,
  To wreathe the forehead of each coming day.

She was shut off from companionship with schoolmates largely on account of the frailness of her constitution, and was taught by private tutors in her home. She had a dreamy, meditative disposition, was devoted to books, and grew up knowing authors through the spirit of their books. Her father employed as her tutor the well-known Greek scholar Hugh Boyd, a profound student of Hellenic literature, and an accomplished author. In her poem on "Wine of Cyprus," she shows how, under him, she learned to grasp the most characteristic features of Greek literature.

At fifteen years of age she had the misfortune to fall from her horse, and in so doing, injured her spine so that she could not walk for several years. She was very patient and affectionate, although proud and sensitive, and wanted no expressions of pity. She had a nature capable of the keenest enjoyment and the keenest suffering. No illness interfered long with the unconquerable demands of her intellect.

Her "Essay on Mind," written at seventeen, is remarkable, says her biographer, for the precocious audacity with which she deals with the greatest names in literature and science. Locke, Berkeley, Plato, Bacon, and Bolingbroke, all come in for treatment in her argument. This essay, with other poems, was published in book form that year.

In her solitary life she found much enjoyment in the speechless voices of nature. But, with all the sources of pleasure within her reach, she was often heart-hungry and desolate. She says, in speaking of these early years:

I felt a mother-want about the world,
And still went seeking like a bleating lamb
Left out at night in shutting up the fold;
As restless as a nest-deserted bird
Grown chill through something being away, tho' what
  It knows not.
  . . . . . .
I seem born to make my father sadder, and myself
  Not over-joyous surely.

If in those formative years of her life she could have met and known Marian Evans, both possessing such a restless energy of mind and heart, it is not difficult to imagine that they would have been friends. As it was, they but heard of each other later in life and at a distance, like "ships that pass in the night."

Elizabeth Barrett was religious from her childhood; and although during the long years of her illness, when for months together she could not speak above a whisper, her mind wrestled with life's dark problems and felt the awful mystery of suffering, yet she held on to that faith and hope that have been the common heritage of true Christians through the centuries. Through her friend and teacher, Mr. Boyd, she laid intellectual foundations for faith. Not only among immortal pagans did they follow hand in hand, but with him she studied those noble Christian bishops, Chrysostom, Basil, Augustine, and others. Early in her twenties she made the acquaintance of the authoress, Miss Mitford, who says of her: "My beloved Miss Barrett is more wonderful herself than her writings, extraordinary though they be." Through Miss Mitford and Miss Barrett's cousin, John Kenyon, she became known to some of the leading scholars of the day—among others Edgar Allan Poe, Walter Savage Landor, Mrs. Jamieson, Harriet Martineau, and Robert Browning. Her writings were profuse, scores of poems following each other in quick succession. Yet her heart-hunger for a satisfying human love never left her. She writes such plaintive words as these:

> To sit alone
> And think, for comfort, how, that very night,
> Affianced lovers leaning face to face,
> With sweet half-listenings for each other's breath,
> Are reading haply from some page of ours,
> To pause with a thrill, as if their cheeks had touched
> When such a stanza, level to their mood,
> Seems floating their own thoughts out—
> "So I feel for thee." "And I for thee: this poet knows
> What everlasting love is." . . . .
> To have our books
> Appraised by love, associated with love
> While *we* sit *loveless!* It is hard, you think?
> At least 'tis mournful.

At the tragic death of her brother, who was drowned within sight of land, Elizabeth grew more frail until her friends thought

she would not live from one season to another. But great was their mistake; for instead of death, the most momentous event of her life—the turning point of her destiny—was at hand. As she learned to know Robert Browning, all the griefs and sufferings of her life became as illusory and transient dreams. She says:

> I saw in gradual vision through my tears,
> The sweet sad years, the melancholy years,
> Those of my own life, which by turns had flung
> A shadow across me. Straightway I was 'ware
> So weeping, how a mystic shape did move
> Behind me, and drew me backward by the hair,
> And a voice said, in mastery, while I strove,
> "Guess now who holds thee?" "Death!" I said. But there
> The silver answer rang, "Not Death, but Love!"

To return now to George Eliot and sketch her mature life and work. There is such a radical difference between her earlier and later beliefs and her later works, that it takes an effort of the mind to realize that they are the expressions of the same person. The period from twenty to thirty is usually the most important in one's life. The intellect in the consciousness of expanding capacity delights in exercising its strength in considering and criticising the opinions, laws, and institutions usually accepted as unalterable. It is upon this stage of George Eliot's life that we are now entering.

At Foleshill, where she lived with her father for a number of years, she began to acquire that vast range of knowledge and universality of culture which so eminently distinguished her. At the home of her next-door neighbor she met for the first time Mr. Bray's family. This family consisted of Mr. and Mrs. Bray, and her brother and sister, Mr. and Mrs. Hennell, all of whom were authors of more or less repute. A friendship began with them at this time that ended only with death. In *The Westminster Review,* a critic said of Mr. Bray's philosophical publications: "If he would reduce his many works to one, containing nothing unessential, he would doubtless obtain that high place among the philosophers of our country to which his powers of thought entitle him." From a letter written at this period by Marian Evans, it appears that the *Inquiry Concerning the Origin of Christianity,* a book written by Mr. Hennell, had made a powerful impression on her mind, as also had a recent book of

Mr. Bray's called *The Philosophy of Necessity.* The problems in this book are the same as those discussed by Comte in his *Philosophie Positive,* Buckle's *History of Civilization,* and Spencer's *Sociology.*

Slowly, but inevitably, she felt as she pursued her literary work among these friends, that her former religious beliefs had led her into childish superstitions that must be given up. The friendship with this family bore such speedy fruit that at the close of 1841 she had given up entirely her former habit of attending church services. This fact almost alienated her from her old father, who went to live with another daughter, thus causing Marian regret to the end of her life.

She accepted the urgent invitation of the Brays at Rosehill to become one of their household. In this home distinguished guests were constantly coming and going. Here, in a pleasant garden planted with rustling acacia trees and opening on a wide prospect of undulating country, many topics were discussed by men who made their mark. Froude was known there and George Combe and Emerson, who was entertained there when on lecturing tours in England, besides other well-known scholars and thinkers. Among Marian Evans's first friends was Herbert Spencer, with whom she became intimate, and who first introduced her to George Henry Lewes.

Dr. Chapman urged her to assist him in the editorship of *The Westminster Review,* which had at one time been edited by John Stuart Mill. After accepting this work, she boarded at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Chapman, and was brought into frequent contact with the contributors to this magazine, James and Harriet Martineau, Herbert Spencer, Professor Edward Forbes, George Henry Lewes, and others. *The Westminster* was the leading expositor of the philosophic and scientific thought of the age, and the articles she contributed to it at this period are considered among the most brilliant examples of periodical literature. They are interesting, as they seem to occupy a position between her earliest and latest phases of religious belief. The antagonism she met with from certain quarters made her sarcastic, and she writes with stinging satire. In her article on "Worldliness and Other Worldliness," there is a scathing passage against certain theological forms of belief. To lose this stage in her mental development

would be to lose one of the important links in her history, for we cannot fail to believe that the change in the character of her writings during her later life was due to her final renunciation of all faith in the Unseen, and her acceptance of life from a materialistic standpoint.

She was a finished German scholar, and by her translation of Strauss's *Life of Jesus,* Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity,* and other works, she became considered one of the most distinguished writers of the times. Her mind was on top, as it were, and she laid aside her youthful beliefs as belonging to her youth, and was enjoying a sense of mental expansion and growth. She became alienated from her relatives and early friendships, but this seems to have meant nothing to her, except as it caused pain to her father, whom she loved devotedly to the last. And now, when she had the congenial society for which she had long sought, and had risen to power through her pen, she formed a union with George Henry Lewes, who had a living wife and three sons. This ostracised her from society, even the society of her closest friends, the Brays, for a long period of time. There could be no legal union, for, although separated from his wife, Mr. Lewes could not get a divorce in England. Every lawful way was hedged about, and Marian Evans defied law and society for that which she had been led to think was the highest impulse of her nature. Whether or not there were ever regrets or heart-pangs after this step was taken, is not known. In the accounts of her life none are given. But we know that in the writings of her first novels, which began not long after this union, the material is drawn from her earliest sources of memory—from the life of her childhood and girlhood, to which she may have sometimes turned yearningly as to a long-lost paradise. In a letter to a friend about her first novel, *Adam Bede,* she said: "How curious that any one should think Dinah's sermons, prayers, and speeches were copied, when they were written from past memories that made the hot tears stream down my cheeks."

To a nature like hers this union must have been a disappointment, and yet she could not attribute that directly to any fault in Mr. Lewes, who, it is said, remained the same devoted companion during their entire life together; who did her every homage as the faithful mother of his children; who was ever the

brilliant versatile genius. And yet he was surely lacking in that warmth of nature and largeness of soul that was needed to meet the best cravings of this great woman. The tragedy of love is so vividly portrayed in *The Spanish Gypsy* that it seems as if the author must have known the experience of that tragedy. Else how could she have pictured it with such power that one feels the spell at its height, and with it the keenest regret that this writer should have been deprived by anything or anybody of that which alone could have satisfied her nature?

Nothing in all her writings equals her first books, *Adam Bede, Silas Marner,* and *Mill on the Floss.* There is a swiftness of movement, a brilliancy of wit, an insight into spiritual life, which we look for in vain in her last books, *Daniel Deronda* and *Theophrastus Such.* It was after she began her work as a novelist that she assumed the *nom de plume* of George Eliot. Where do we find in literature any more striking examples of self-sacrifice than in *Janet's Repentance* and *Silas Marner?* Who that has read the *Sad Fortunes of the Rev. Amos Barton,* and enjoyed the delicious bubbling wit of Mrs. Poyser, and felt the deep spiritual wrestlings of poor little Maggie Tulliver, and followed the development of the character of Tito, has not felt George Eliot's power and insight into human nature?

Really one would not be as much impressed with the naturalness of the living characters themselves as when we see and know them through the genius of this woman. Sympathy was the keynote of her nature. It was the source of her subtle knowledge of character, her humor, and her dramatic power. She never went out of her way for the eccentric in human nature, seeing that human nature itself appeared to her the epitome of all incongruity; although hers was such a thoughtful outlook on life that, while she took note of the inconsistencies and blunders of her fellow-men, she found the source of laughter very near to tears. She says in a passionate plea for mankind:

> Give me no light, great heaven, but such as turns
> To energy of human betterment.

The writing of *Romola* marks a new departure in her literary career. It is a ponderous work, in which she says she began a young woman and ended an old one. In *Felix Holt* the ground-

work of the book is politics; in *Romola,* the Renaissance in Florence during the closing years of the fifteenth century; and in *Daniel Deronda,* the plot concerns the Jews. What there is of spiritual teaching in these books is grasped and handled by the author *intellectually.* There is none of that fresh heart-to-heart contact with the Divine that cannot fail to impress one in her earlier books. In these later books George Eliot shows a distorted view of morality in Dorothea and in Gwendolen. There is a great chasm between Maggie Tulliver's adherence to right at any cost and Gwendolen Harleth's weakness.

Perhaps the fundamental principles of George Eliot's belief or unbelief during these years cannot be more clearly, though briefly, indicated than by using the words of a personal friend in his report of a conversation with her. He says: "Taking as her text the three words which have been used so often as the inspiring trumpet-calls of men—the words *God, Immortality, Duty*—she pronounced with terrible earnestness how inconceivable was the first, how unbelievable was the second, and yet how peremptory and absolute was the third. Never, perhaps, have sterner accents affirmed the sovereignty of recompensing law."

Her theory of life led her to consider only man's relation to his fellow-men, and thus she defines duty to be that course of action which tends to make those around us the happiest possible. So that right and wrong resolve themselves into mere questions of results. An act must indicate its near and ultimate end. Although she drew many of her ideas from Comte's *Philosophie Positive,* she declares she was not in the strictest sense a positivist. Her sympathy was profound up to the last, and her mind ever at war with her heart. Yet she was perfectly calm in resigning all faith in the Unseen. In a conversation she had with Tennyson as they walked together, he said, when bidding her farewell: "Well, good-by, you and your molecules." She answered in her deep, low voice: "I am quite content with my molecules."

When she was sixty-one years of age, and scarcely two years after the death of Mr. Lewes, she was married to Mr. Cross, a man many years younger than herself. Within a year after her marriage she died, leaving as her last legacy to the world the words of a cold materialist. "I've been just and honest," she

said, "not because I expect to live in another world, but because, having felt the pain of injustice and dishonesty, I have a fellow-feeling with others who would suffer if I were unjust to them. The pathos in the thought of human mortality lies nearer the fountain of moral emotion than the conception of an extended existence."

Although this woman was endowed with such a large and benevolent nature, life from her standpoint could not, by any wisdom, by any action, be made anything but a journey no whence, no whither—the flame of a vanishing spark. More deeply than she sorrowed for mankind must we sorrow for her that she rejected that faith in the Unseen, which would have given her the assurance that if she wrought for those who needed help she wrought in unison with mighty allies, unseen but unconquerable, under whose marshaling they were moving straight forward through seeming failure to lasting victory.

This was the hope and faith that inspired Elizabeth Barrett Browning. She faced life from a point of view exactly opposite to that of George Eliot. From her young womanhood and on through life, she cultivated spirituality, while George Eliot fought it. George Eliot sought the companionship of those who she knew would blight her faith; Mrs. Browning sought the companionship of those who she knew would strengthen and deepen her faith. George Eliot, with a certain kind of bravery, dared to open her mind to all forms of materialism and skepticism; Mrs. Browning, with a higher bravery, dared to shut out all forms of unbelief that she feared might compromise her spirit in its high outreachings. George Eliot's biographer says: "It is curious that she who in her own life followed such an independent course, severing herself from her past with all its traditional sanctities, should inculcate the opposite teaching in her books. Thus in all her best characters, from first to last, the power and beauty of their lives are drawn from that very religion which she professes to have exhausted and outgrown."

Mrs. Browning advanced no creed in her writings that she did not honestly believe and conform to in her life. After her marriage with Robert Browning, she was stirred with new ambitions. Her woman's heart being satisfied in its union with the great and noble nature of her husband, their marriage became as complete

a poem as any poem either of them ever wrote. Robert Browning has told in his immortal poet-speech how he had at last realized his ideal in his wife, and Mrs. Browning has glorified love in her exquisite "Sonnets from the Portuguese." Her religion became so much a part of her existence that it colored everything she wrote. In her preface to *The Seraphim,* a lyrical drama, she says:

> The subject of this suggested itself to me when I was engaged on my translation of the *Prometheus Bound.* I thought that had Æschylus lived after the incarnation and crucifixion of our Lord he might have turned from the solitude of Caucasus to the deep desertness of that crowded Jerusalem where none had any pity; from the glory of him who gloried that he could not die, to the sublime meekness of the Taster of death for every man. But if my dream be true that Æschylus might have turned to the subject before us in poetic instinct, and if its tenor and pathos would have shattered into weakness the strong Greek tongue, how much more may I turn from it with the instinct of incompetence. I have felt, in the midst of my own thoughts upon my own theme, like Homer's "Children in a Battle."

Her novel in blank verse, *Aurora Leigh,* which is of as great length as *Paradise Lost,* was characterized by Landor as being in some respects the greatest poem of the age. A specimen of her philosophy is expressed in it thus: "All men are possible heroes—every age heroic in proportion. The best men doing their best know, peradventure, least of what they do. Men usefulest in the world are simply used." The altruistic spirit of our day was pre-eminently her spirit. She let go wrestling with all unfathomable mysteries, and embracing eagerly the philosophy of St. Paul, she "pressed toward the mark for the prize of her high calling of God in Christ Jesus." During these ripe years of her life she had but the one purpose, to bless humanity and point it to something higher. The Greeks said: "Let no man be called happy until his death." To which Mrs. Browning says: "Let no man be called unhappy until his death. Measure not the work until the day is done and the labor is ended."

Edgar Allan Poe said, in speaking of her poem concerning child labor, entitled *The Cry of the Children:* "It is full of a horror sublime in its simplicity, of which Dante might have been proud." This poem hastened and helped the passing of the initial act of Parliament restricting the employment of children of tender years.

Mr. and Mrs. Browning spent part of their time in Italy, and her interest in the cause of Italian freedom was one of the most absorbing of her later years. She wrote to a friend: "I see daily a people who have the very life crushed out of them, and yet of their oppression the English press says nothing." But her voice was loud and brave for them. No Italian patriot gave greater sympathy to the aspirations of 1859 than did Mrs. Browning. Thus her Christianity was not confined to Church, or to theory. It meant civilization. It meant practical service to the needy, the ignorant, the poor, the oppressed. She believed in extending her democracy beyond its political expression, and wrote, talked, and forwarded social regeneration.

The contrast between these two women of genius is exactly the contrast to-day between the body of so-called humanitarians, on the one hand, who cut in twain the greatest commandment, and attempt to apply the last half while discarding the first half; and, on the other hand, the true, honest souls who accept it as a whole, and believe that all the philanthropies and benevolences of the ages point their index finger to him who was and is the Light of the World.

When the sweet, brave woman-poet was called to lay down her pen, and knew her last song was sung, one alone watched her breathing—he who had for fifteen years been her constant companion and inspiration. At the last moment she opened her eyes, and looking into his face, she uttered her last words: "O, Robert, it is beautiful!"

. . . . . .

Upon Casa Guido, her residence in Florence, the municipality of Florence placed a white marble slab, and thereon are inscribed in letters of gold these words:

HERE WROTE AND DIED
ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING,
WHO, IN HER WOMAN'S HEART, UNITED THE WISDOM
OF THE SAGE AND THE ELOQUENCE OF THE POET;
WITH HER GOLDEN VERSE LINKING ITALY TO ENGLAND.
GRATEFUL FLORENCE PLACED THIS MEMORIAL,
A.D. 1861.

THE POET-SINGERS OF THE LAND OF THE MAPLE.

BY NEWTON MAC TAVISH.
EDITOR OF "THE CANADIAN MAGAZINE."

SOME one has said that it is impossible to find a true poet who has not lived within sight and hearing of the sea. Whether or not that is merely thought for reflection, I should like to make the more extraordinary remark that it is impossible to live in Canada and not be a poet. One may live in Canada and not be recognized as a poet or suspected of poesy; indeed, here one may never even attempt a measure of original song, and yet if the truth were known, if every humble or exalted soul could be laid bare, in every instance sensible or insensible response to poetic moods would be revealed. And why? Why is Canada a land of poets? Because nowhere in the whole Dominion can one get away from the sea, or at least from the moods that the sea inspires. In the Maritime Provinces, whence much of our best poetry has come, the encroachments of the sea are everywhere visible; and even at Fredericton, where Bliss Carman and the Robertses have spent many communing days, the tidal washes of the St. John River are a constant phenomenon of nature. Across the Bay of Fundy, in the Basin of Minas, Carman received the inspiration for "Low Tide at Grand Pré," which appeared first in *The Atlantic Monthly:*

LOW TIDE AT GRAND PRÉ.

The sun goes down, and over all
  These barren reaches by the tide
Such unelusive glories fall,
  I almost dream they yet will bide
  Until the coming of the tide.

And yet I know that not for us,
  By any ecstasy of dream,
He lingers to keep luminous
  A little while the grievous stream,
  Which frets, uncomforted of dream—

A grievous stream, that to and fro
  All through the fields of Acadie
Goes wandering, as if to know
  Why one beloved face should be
  So long from home and Acadie!

Was it a year or lives ago
  We took the grasses in our hands,
And caught the summer flying low
  Over the waving meadow land,
  And held it there between our hands?

The while the river at our feet—
  A drowsy inland meadow stream—
At set of sun the after-heat
  Made running gold, and in the gleam
  We freed our birch upon the stream.

There down along the elms at dusk
  We lifted dripping blade to drift,
Through twilight scented fine like musk,
  Where night and gloom awhile uplift,
  Nor sunder soul and soul adrift.

And that we took into our hands—
  Spirit of life or subtler thing—
Breathed on us there, and loosed the bands
  Of death, and taught us, whispering,
  The secret of some wonder-thing.

Then all your face grew light, and seemed
  To hold the shadow of the sun;
The evening faltered, and I deemed
  That time was ripe, and years had done
  Their wheeling underneath the sun.

So all desire and all regret,
  And fear and memory, were naught;
One to remember or forget
  The keen delight our hands had caught;
  Morrow and yesterday were naught!

The night has fallen, and the tide
  Now and again comes drifting home,
Across these aching barrens wide,
  A sigh like driven wind or foam;
  In grief the flood is bursting home!

Here was born also Burton Wellesley Lockhart, whose associations with what was once Acadia have inspired this charming Nova Scotian lyric:

BY THE GASPEREAU.

Do you remember, dear, a night in June,
  So long ago, so long ago,
When we were lovers, wandering with the moon,
  Beside the Gaspereau?

The river plashed and gurgled thro' its glooms,
  Slow stealing to the sea,
A silver serpent; in the apple blooms
  The soft air rustling free.

And o'er the river from afar the sound
  Of mellow tinkling bells
From browsing cattle stirred the echo round
  In gentle falls and swells.

No sound of human sorrow, nor of mirth,
  Streamed on that peace abroad,
And all the night leaned low upon the earth
  Like the calm face of God.

And in our hearts there breathed, like life, a breath
  Of most delicious pain:
It seemed a whisper ran from birth to death,
  And back to birth again,

And bound in airy chains our shining hours,
  Past, present, and to come,
In one sweet whole, strong to defy the powers
  Of change, till Time be dumb.

Yes, you remember, dear, that night in June,
  So long, so long ago,
When we were lovers, wandering with the moon,
  Beside the Gaspereau.

New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are both rich in rural beauty and picturesqueness, and it is to these qualities that we are indebted for Charles G. D. Roberts's transporting "Songs of the Common Days." Of one of these, "Where the Cattle Come to Drink," Mrs. Humphrey Ward has said that there is nothing better of the kind in the English language:

WHERE THE CATTLE COME TO DRINK.

At evening, where the cattle come to drink,
  Cool are the long marsh-grasses, dewy cool
  The alder thickets, and the shallow pool,
And the brown clay about the trodden brink.
The pensive afterthoughts of sundown sink
  Over the patient acres given to peace;
  The homely cries and farmstead noises cease,
And the worn day relaxes, link by link.

A lesson that the open heart may read
  Breathes in this mild benignity of air,
  These dear, familiar savors of the soil,—
A lesson of the calm of humble creed,
  The simple dignity of common toil,
And the plain wisdom of unspoken prayer.

Both Carman and Roberts have had a profound influence on the literature of their country. When young men, they roamed their native forests in New Brunswick, and with the fine sense of the poet beheld the majesty of the Fundy tides and all the peaceful pastoral scenes for which their own and the neighboring province are noted. Roberts early assumed the responsibilities of a pedagogue, teaching literature in one of the maritime colleges, but Carman was always a vagabond, and his volume "Songs of Vagabondia," one of his early publications, was the outcome, not so much of affection as of genuine nomadic predilection.

As we come up the St. Lawrence, our greatest wonder is that more poets have not sung of the beauties of nature and the simplicity of human character as encountered among the purple hills that border the river all the way from the Bai des Chaleurs to the foot of Mount Royal. French-Canadian poets of high merit there have been whose childhood days were passed along these shores, particularly Louis Fréchette, whose verses were crowned by the French Academy. On the occasion of this mark of recognition, John Reade, a poet of fine sympathy and a *litterateur* of acknowledged authority, wrote the following appreciation:

O gifted son of our dear land and thine,
We joy with thee on this thy joyous day,
And in thy laurel crown would fain entwine
A modest wreath of our own simple bay!
Shamrock and thistle and sweet roses gay,
Both red and white, with parted lips that smile,
Like some bright maiden of their native isle—
These, with the later maple, take, we pray,
To mingle with thy laureled lily, long
Pride of the brave and theme of poet's song.
They err who deem us aliens. Are not we
Bretons and Normans, too? North, south, and west
Gave us, like you, of blood and speech their best,
Here, reunited, one great race to be.

As a translation of a Fréchette poem would scarcely do in a review of this character, we reprint in the original French his impression of the River Saguenay, which is the chief tributary of the St. Lawrence:

LE SAGUENAY.

Cela forme deux rangs de massifs promontoires,
  Gigantesque crevasse ouverte, aux premiers jours,
  Par quelque cataclysme, et qu' on croirait toujours
Prête à se refermer ainsi que des mâchoires.

Au pied de caps à pic dressés comme des tours,
  Le Saguenay profond roule ses ondes noires;
  Parages désolés pleins de mornes histoires!
Fleuve mystérieux pleins de sombres détours!

Rocs foudroyés, sommets aux pentes infécondes,
Sinistres profondeurs qui défiez les sondes,
  Vast mur de granit qu' on nomme "Eternité,"
Comme on se sent vraiment chétif, quand on compare
A vos siècles les ans dont notre orgueil se pare,
  Et notre petitesse à votre immensité!

But Quebec has appealed to many Canadian poets who write in the English language. Looking out from the rectory gardens in Quebec City, Frederick George Scott loves to contemplate the grave, almost grim, Laurentian range. These hills have been for him the source of many an inspiration, the result of one of which we quote:

THE LAURENTIANS.

These mountains reign alone, they do not share
  The transitory life of woods and streams;
  Wrapt in the deep solemnity of dreams,
They drain the sunshine of the upper air.
Beneath their peaks, the huge clouds, here and there,
  Take counsel of the wind, which all night screams
  Through grey, burnt forests where the moonlight beams
On hidden lakes, and rocks worn smooth and bare.

These mountains once, throned in some primal sea,
  Shook half the world with thunder, and the sun
    Pierced not the gloom that clung about their crest;
Now with sealed lips, toilers from toil set free,
  Unvexed by fate, the part they played being done,
    They watch and wait in venerable rest.

While not at once obvious, there is a feeling of Canadian fortitude in these lines, and behind the whole conception one finds the influence of the sea.

Quebec has furnished many themes for Duncan Campbell Scott, and although he is an inlander by birth and rearing, we feel again in his muse the effect of the St. Lawrence and the sea.

His "Above St. Irénée" is a charming idyl, of which five stanzas are here given:

ABOVE ST. IRÉNÉE.

I rested on the breezy height,
In cooler shade and clearer air,
Beneath a maple tree;
Below, the mighty river took
Its sparkling shade and sheeny light
Down to the somber sea,
And clustered by the leaping brook,
The roofs of white St. Irénée.

. . . .

The sapphire hills on either hand
Broke down upon the silver tide,
The river ran in streams,
In streams of mingled azure-grey,
With here a broken purple band,
And whorls of drab and beams
Of shattered silver light astray,
Where far away the south shore gleams.

I walked a mile upon the height
Among the flowers along the road,
Asters and golden-rod;
And in the gardens pinks and stocks,
And gaudy poppies shaking light,
And daisies blooming near the sod,
And lowly pansies set in flocks,
With purple monkshood overawed.

. . . .

And there I saw a little child
Among the tossing golden-rod,
Coming along to me;
She was a tender little thing,
So fragile-sweet, so Mary-mild,
I thought her name Marie;
No other name methought could cling
To any one so fair as she.

And when we came at last to meet,
I spoke a simple word to her,
"Where are you going, Marie?"
She answered and she did not smile,
But oh! her voice,—her voice so sweet,
"Down to St. Irénée,"
And so passed on to walk her mile,
And left the lonely road to me.

From Quebec the St. Lawrence takes one on up to its confluence with the Ottawa, near Montreal. It was above this junction that the Irish poet Tom Moore received the suggestion for "A Canadian Boat Song":

> Softly as tolls the evening chime,
> Our voices keep tune and our oars keep time.

And it was undoubtedly these same rapids that inspired Charles Sangster's spirited poem,

THE RAPID.

All peacefully gliding,
The waters dividing,
The indolent batteau moved slowly along,
The rowers, light-hearted,
From sorrow long parted,
Beguiled the dull moments with laughter and song:
"Hurrah for the Rapid! that merrily, merrily
Gambols and leaps on its tortuous way;
Soon we will enter it, cheerily, cheerily,
Pleased with its freshness, and wet with its spray."

More swiftly careering,
The wild Rapid nearing,
They dashed down the stream like a terrified steed;
The surges delight them,
No terrors affright them,
Their voices keep pace with their quickening speed:
"Hurrah for the Rapid! that merrily, merrily
Shivers its arrows against us in play;
Now we have entered it cheerily, cheerily,
Our spirits as light as its feathery spray."

Fast downward they're dashing,
Each fearless eye flashing,
Though danger awaits them on every side;
Yon rock—see it frowning!
They strike—they are drowning!
But downward they sped with the merciless tide:
No voice cheers the Rapid, that angrily, angrily
Shivers their bark in its maddening play;
Gaily they entered it—heedlessly, recklessly,
Mingling their lives with its treacherous spray!

This old-time waterway of the voyagers naturally takes us into Ontario, the region of the Great Lakes; and it is here that we encounter perhaps the greatest of all Canadian poets, the late Archibald Lampman, and it also introduces us to a more versatile singer, William Wilfred Campbell, whose "Lake Lyrics"

have made his name famous. Lampman, Campbell, and Duncan Campbell Scott lived at Ottawa, and all three were employed in the civil service there. Lampman died twelve years ago, but Campbell and Scott remain. Lampman and Scott were fast friends, almost companions in art, and in their moods can be traced some things common to each. Lampman was born on the shore of Lake Erie, but for all that he is a poet of the forest and the field. He is a sublime poet of nature, and he has instilled into his lines a true Canadian sentiment. This is particularly noticeable in the poem that follows:

SAPPHICS.

Clothed in splendor, beautifully sad and silent,
Comes the autumn over the woods and highlands,
Golden, rose-red, full of divine remembrance,
Full of foreboding.

Soon the maples, soon will the glowing birches,
Stripped of all that summer and love had dowered them,
Dream, sad-limbed, beholding their pomp and treasure
Ruthlessly scattered:

Yet they quail not: Winter, with wind and iron,
Comes and finds them silent and uncomplaining,
Finds them tameless, beautiful still and gracious,
Gravely enduring.

Me, too, changes, bitter and full of evil,
Dream by dream have plundered and left me naked,
Gray with sorrow. Even the days before me
Fade into twilight,

Mute and barren. Yet will I keep my spirit
Clear and valiant, brother to these my noble
Elms and maples, utterly grave and fearless,
Grandly ungrieving.

Brief the span is, counting the years of mortals,
Strange and sad; it passes and then the bright earth,
Careless mother, gleaming with gold and azure,
Lovely with blossoms—

Shining white anemones, mixed with roses,
Daisies mild-eyed, grasses and honeyed clover—
You and me, and all of us, met and equal,
Softly shall cover.

The manner with which the poet here enjoins himself to

. . . Keep my spirit
Clear and valiant, brother to these my noble
Elms and maples, utterly grave and fearless,
Grandly ungrieving,

is a fine reflection of stalwart Canadianism. It is a big poem, big in its conception simply as a poem, big and poetical, but bigger still in its assumption of what the Canadian spirit is, or at least ought to be:

Yet they quail not.

These two friends, Lampman and Scott, have both written of September. We shall quote from both for the interest of comparison, but without comment:

SEPTEMBER.

BY ARCHIBALD LAMPMAN.

The morns are grey with haze and faintly cold,
  The early sunsets arc the west with red;
  The stars are misty silver overhead,
Above the dawn Orion lies outrolled.

Now all the slopes are slowly growing old,
  And in the dales a deeper silence dwells;
  The crickets mourn with funeral notes and bells,
For days before the summer had grown old.

Now the night-gloom with hurrying wings is stirred,
  Strangely the comrade pipings rise and sink,
    The birds are following in the pathless dark
    The footsteps of the pilgrim summer. Hark!
  Was that the redstart or the bobolink?
That lonely cry the summer-hearted bird?

SEPTEMBER.

BY ARCHIBALD LAMPMAN.

Now hath the summer reached her golden close,
  And, lost amid her cornfields, bright of soul,
Scarcely perceives from her divine repose
  How near, how swift, the inevitable goal:
Still, still she smiles, though from her careless feet
  The bounty and the fruitful strength are gone,
  And through the soft long wandering days goes on
The silent sere decadence sad and sweet.

The kingbird and the pensive thrush are fled
  Children of light, too fearful of the gloom;
The sun falls low, the secret word is said,
  The moldering woods grow silent as the tomb;
Even the fields have lost their sovereign grace,
  The corn-flower and the marguerite; and no more
  Across the river's shadow-haunted floor
The paths of skimming swallows interlace.

Already in the outland wilderness
  The forests echo with unwonted dins;
In clamorous gangs the gathering woodmen press
  Northward, and stern winter's toil begins.
Around the long, low shanties, whose rough lines
  Break the sealed dreams of many an unnamed lake,
  Already in the frost-clear morns awake
The crash and thunder of the falling pines.
. . . . . .

Under cool elm trees floats the distant stream
  Moveless as air; and o'er the vast warm earth
The fathomless daylight seems to stand and dream,
  A liquid cool elixir—all its girth
Bound with faint haze, a frail transparency,
  Whose lucid purple barely veils and fills
  The utmost valleys and the thin last hills,
Nor mars one whit their perfect clarity.

Thus without grief the golden days go by,
  So soft we scarcely notice how they wend,
And like a smile half happy, or a sigh,
  The summer passes to her quiet end;
And soon, too soon, around the cumbered eaves
  Shy frosts shall take the creepers by surprise,
  And through the wind-touched reddening woods shall rise
October with the rain of ruined leaves.

Although his "Lake Lyrics" form but a small portion of his output, it is to Wilfred Campbell that the Great Lakes have made their greatest appeal. With them for inspiration, this poet has written mary charming lines, but none more so than

How One Night Came in the Lake Region.

For weeks and weeks the autumn world stood still,
  Clothed in the shadow of a smoky haze;
The fields were dead, the wind had lost its will,
And all the lands were hushed by wood and hill,
  In those grey, withered days.

Behind a mist the blear sun rose and set,
  At night the moon would nestle in a cloud;
The fisherman, a ghost, did cast his net;
The lake its shores forgot to chafe and fret,
  And hushed its caverns loud.
. . . . . .

When one strange night the sun like blood went down,
  Flooding the heavens in a ruddy hue;
Red grew the lake, the sere fields parched and brown,
Red grew the marshes where the creeks stole down,
  But never a wind-breath blew.

That night I felt the winter in my veins,
A joyous tremor of the icy glow;
And woke to hear the North's wild vibrant strains,
While far and wide, by withered woods and plains,
Fast fell the driving snow.

This author's most popular lyric is

A Canadian Folk-Song.

The doors are shut, the windows fast,
Outside the gust is driving past,
Outside the shivering ivy clings,
While on the hob the kettle sings,—
"Margery, Margery, make the tea,"
Singeth the kettle merrily.

The streams are hushed up where they flowed,
The ponds are frozen along the road,
The cattle are housed in shed and byre,
While singeth the kettle on the fire,—
"Margery, Margery, make the tea,"
Singeth the kettle merrily.

The fisherman on the bay in his boat
Shivers and buttons up his coat;
The traveler stops at the tavern door,
And the kettle answers the chimney's roar,—
"Margery, Margery, make the tea,"
Singeth the kettle merrily.

The firelight dances upon the wall,
Footsteps are heard in the outer hall,
And a kiss and a welcome that fill the room,
And the kettle sings in the glimmer and gloom,—
"Margery, Margery, make the tea,"
Singeth the kettle merrily.

In order to trace farther our impulse of the sea, we must fare westward again until we reach, in words of the poet, Charles Mair,

The Prairie realm, vast ocean's paraphrase.

Mair felt the sublimity of the West and its kinship with the sea; but he is not a sublime poet, and therefore he has not left us the heritage of Western song that we crave. E. Pauline Johnson, the Indian poetess, has given us in "The Song My Paddle Sings," "The Cattle Country," and "The Trail to Lilloet," an inkling of the West; but admirable as these poems are, they give no more than an inkling. "The Cattle Country" has more of the spirit of the prairie than the others:

THE CATTLE COUNTRY.

Up the dusk-enfolded prairie,
  Footfalls soft and sly,
Velvet cushioned, wild and wary;
  Then—the coyote's cry.

Rush of hoofs and roar and cattle;
  Beasts of blood and breed—
Twenty thousand frightened cattle;
  Then—the wild stampede.

Pliant lasso, circling wider,
  With the frenzied flight;
Leaping horse and cursing rider
  Plunging through the night.

Rim of dawn the darkness losing,
  Trail of blackened loam,
Perfume of the sage-brush oozing
  On the air like foam.

Foothills to the Rockies lifting,
  Brown, and blue, and green;
Warm Alberta sunlight drifting
  Over leagues between.

That's the country of the ranges,
  Plain, and prairie-land;
And the God who never changes
  Holds it in his hand.

Arthur Stringer also gives us in "Morning in the Northwest" a taste of the spirit of the West; but, again, it is only a taste:

MORNING IN THE NORTHWEST.

Grey countries and grim empires pass away,
And all the pomp and glory of citied towers
Goes down to dust, as Youth itself shall age.
But, oh, the splendor of this autumn dawn,
This passes not away! This dew-drenched Range,
This infinite great width of open space,
This cool, keen wind that blows like God's own breath
On life's once drowsy coal, and thrills the blood,
This brooding sea of sun-washed solitude,
This virginal vast dome of opal air—
These, these endure, and greater are than grief!
Still there is strength: and life, oh, life is good!
Still the horizon lures, the morrow calls,
Still hearts adventurous seek outward trails,
Still life holds up its tattered hope!

For here
Is goodly air, and God's own greenness spread!
Here youth audacious fronts the coming day
And age on life ne'er mountainously lies!
Here are no huddled cities old in sin,
Where coil in tangled languors all the pale
Envenomed mirths that poisoned men of old,
Where peering out with ever-narrowing eyes
Reptilious Ease unwinds its golden scales
And slimes with ugliness the thing it eats!
Here life takes on a glory and a strength
Of things still primal, and goes plunging on!
And what care I of time-encrusted tombs?
What care I here for all the ceaseless drip
Of tears in countries old in tragedy?
What care I here for all Earth's creeds outworn,
The dreams outlived, the hopes to ashes turned,
In that old East so dark with rain and doubt?
Here life swings glad and free and rude, and I
Shall drink it to the full, and go content!

J. D. Logan, who has made the interesting observation that Archibald Lampman, Bliss Carman, and Wilfred Campbell were all born in 1861, and Charles G. D. Roberts a year earlier, and that these men were the first Canadians to write poetry in a systematic manner, is himself a poet of distinction as well as a critic of discrimination. His "Midnight in Dakota" is, in its big conception and spacious outlook, in keeping with the spirit of the Canadian West:

MIDNIGHT IN DAKOTA.

Lo! in that land where myriad starlit eyes
  Look on the graves of those wild Hearts of Fire
  Who heard in their strange souls the august choir
Of mountain, stream, and plain, and vaulted skies
Tone forth its hymns of pristine harmonies,—
  I stood and caught from Nature's mighty lyre
  Great chords that melting all my vain desire,
Subdued my meanest fears and made me wise
  O'er time and circumstance. And I had stayed
To hark for aye, lest the solemn sanctities
  That rose in me and hushed my soul should fade,
As fade the waking dreamer's reveries,
  When high above I heard: "Be not afraid!
These are thine earnest of holier ecstasies!"

As yet we have made mention of but one Canadian poetess, E. Pauline Johnson, but in this portion of our review there is the work of one other woman which we should not overlook, that of

Isabella Valancy Crawford. Miss Crawford spent most of her life near the water, first near the banks of the Otonabee River, in Ontario, and later on the shore of Lake Ontario. She died a quarter of a century ago, and her fame is increasing year by year. Until the present time she has enjoyed almost undivided honors, because in the departed band of Canadian singers hers is the only feminine voice whose note is distinctive and exceptional. We quote two of her poems:

THE MASTER-BUILDER.

O, Love builds on the azure sea,
And Love builds on the golden sand;
And Love builds on the rose-winged cloud,
And sometimes Love builds on the land.

O, if Love build on sparkling sea,
And if Love build on golden strand,
And if Love build on rosy cloud,
To love these are the solid land.

O, Love will build his lily walls,
And Love his pearly roof will rear,
On cloud, or land, or mist, or sea,—
Love's solid land is everywhere!

THE AXE OF THE PIONEER.

Bite deep and wide, O Axe, the tree,
What doth thy bold voice promise me?

"I promise thee all joyous things,
That furnish forth the lives of kings!

For every silver-ringing blow
Cities and palaces shall grow!"

Bite deep and wide, O Axe, the tree,
Tell wider prophecies to me.

"When rust hath gnawed me deep and red,
A nation strong shall lift its head!

His crown the very heavens shall smite,
Æons shall build him in his might!"

Bite deep and wide, O Axe, the tree;
Bright Seer, help on thy prophecy!

It has been shown, I think, that the poetry of Canada has been preëminently the poetry of nature. It is with the elements of nature that Canadians mostly have had to conspire, and they have seen in sea and lake and river and stream and mountain and hill

and sky those forces and those beauties against which they also have had to contend. But while they have been poets of nature, they have interpreted nature as it affects humanity. The conflict of classes, the strife of race and creed have not stirred them into either song or dirge, nor has the clash of personality or the ambitions or despairs of humanity made with them a universal appeal. There are, of course, outstanding exceptions, such as Stringer's "The Woman in the Rain," which is a poetical study of the woes that attend the woman who is neglectful of her virtue and profligate with her charms. And up to this point we have been considering poetry that is mostly of a generation earlier than ours, but now we come to the current poetry of Canada. We can accept it as authoritative knowledge, I think, that Canada to-day is producing some of the best poetry that is being produced wherever the English language prevails. That appears to be a sweeping statement; but, after all, it may not mean so very much, because, when one comes to think about it, one realizes that but little poetry of fine merit is now being written anywhere in the English-speaking world. So that while we claim ascendency for Canada in this barren period, perhaps we are not claiming too much. As to that, however, we should be glad to await the opinion of posterity. In all, we have had not more than fifty years of poetical musing in Canada, and during that time there has been no national crisis, nothing that would inspire a singer to strike a national chord or sound a national hymn. Volumes of patriotic effusions there have been, but they have effused the overwrought senses of individuals rather than the pent-up sentiment of a people. Perhaps there is one important exception—Roberts's

AN ODE FOR THE CANADIAN CONFEDERACY.

Awake, my country, the hour is great with change.
  Under this gloom which yet obscures the land,
From ice-blue strait and stern Laurentian range
  To where giant peaks our western bounds command,
A deep voice stirs, vibrating in men's ears,
  As if their own hearts throbbed that thunder forth,
A sound wherein who hearkens wisely hears
  The voice of the desire of this strong North,—
    This North whose heart of fire
    Yet knows not its desire
Clearly, but dreams, and murmurs in the dream.
The hour of dreams is done. Lo, on the hills the gleam!

Awake, my country, the hour of dream is done!
  Doubt not, nor dread the greatness of thy fate.
Tho' faint souls fear the keen confronting sun,
  And fain would bid the morn of splendor wait;
Tho' dreamers, rapt in starry visions, cry,
  "Lo, yon thy future, yon thy faith, thy fame!"
And stretch vain hands to stars, thy fame is nigh,
  Here in Canadian hearth, and home, and name;—
    This name which yet shall grow
    Till all the nations know
Us for a patriot people, heart and hand
Loyal to our native earth, our own Canadian land!

O strong hearts, guarding the birthright of our glory,
  Worth your best blood this heritage that ye guard!
These mighty streams resplendent with our story,
  These iron coasts by rage of seas unjarred,—
What fields of peace these bulwarks will secure!
  What vales of plenty these calm floods supply!
Shall not our love this rough, sweet land make sure,
  Her bounds preserve inviolate, though we die?
    O strong hearts of the North,
    Let flame your loyalty forth,
And put the craven and base to an open shame,
Till earth shall know the Child of Nations by her name!

The reference we have already made to Arthur Stringer should have distracted us from the line we have been following and caused us to consider as briefly as possible the band of present Canadian poets whose work is generally more artistic, more of the heart, more philosophical, and more universal in its scope. Mr. Stringer's appeal is unrestricted when, in "The Woman in the Rain," he says:

In God's uncleansing rain
  It sits and waits,
This huddled heap of rags and ashen hopes,
This timeless thing of mumbling unconcern,
That holds, all coffined in its agued bones,
The embittered lives of men.

Of this later group Isabel Ecclestone Mackay is a sincere and gifted poetess, and her source and inspiration are pure. She has spent most of her days in inland Ontario, but a few years ago she removed to a home within sight of the Pacific; and since then we have had this delightful example of her imagery:

THE SHINING SHIP.

All day I see the ships sail in, the sun upon their spars,
And, silently, at night they pass between me and the stars,
  Oh many, many ships there be,
  From Biscay Bay and China Sea,
  But never comes a ship for me
Across the flooding bars!

All day I watch the ships sail out, so brave and gallantly,
And while I sleep they sail away, impatient for the sea;
  Strange ways are theirs, where strange winds blow,
  Strange islands loom and strange tides flow—
  But round and round the world they go,
And never wait for me!

One day a shining ship shall ride at anchor by the quay,
From her slow-furling sails shall shake the scents of Araby—
  She bears no name; she cannot stay,
  But on her bridge I'll sail away
  To China Sea and Biscay Bay—
Oh, she's the ship for me!

Mrs. Mackay is a serious singer, and she possesses to an unusual degree the sense of the beauty of sadness. We realize this in such a poem as the following, which we take from *Harper's Magazine:*

LAST SPRING.

This morning at the door
  I heard the Spring;
Quickly I set it wide
  And, welcoming,
"Come in, sweet Spring," I cried,
"The winter ash, long dried,
Waits but your breath to rise
  On phantom wing!"

A brown leaf shivered by,
  A soulless thing—
My heart in quick dismay
  Forgot to sing—
Twisted and grim it lay,
Kin to the ghost-ash gray,
Dead, dead—strange herald this
  Of jocund Spring!

I spurned it from the door,
  I longed that Spring
Should come with song and glow
  And rush of wing,

Not this, not this!—But O
Dead leaf, a year ago
You were the dear firstborn
Of Hope and Spring!

In the past in Canada most of the poets have been men; but in addition to the women already mentioned, we have had, in late years, from Marjorie L. C. Pickthall, Helena Coleman, Virna Sheard, Agnes Maule Machar, Jean Graham, Jean Blewitt, Katherine Hale, poems that are being worthily appreciated. Miss Pickthall, a young woman who has not yet published a book of poems, has a marvelous sense of color and tone values, with a remarkably haunting rhythm to everything she writes. Her "Lamp of Poor Souls"[1] is regarded by many as a masterpiece. We reprint it from *Scribner's Magazine:*

THE LAMP OF POOR SOULS.

Above my head the shields are stained with rust,
The wind has taken his spoil, the moth his part.
Dust of dead men beneath my knees, and dust,
Lord, in my heart.

Lay Thou the hand of faith upon my fears.
The priest has prayed, the silver bell has rung,
But not for him. O unforgotten tears,
He was so young!

Shine, little lamp, nor let thy light grow dim.
Into what vast dread dreams, what lonely lands,
Into what griefs hath death delivered him,
Far from my hands?

Cradled is he, with half his prayers forgot.
I cannot learn the level way he goes.
To whom the harvest hath remembered not
Sleeps with the rose.

Shine, little lamp, fed with sweet oil of prayers;
Shine, little lamp, as God's own eyes may shine,
When he treads softly down his starry stairs
And whispers, "Thou art Mine."

Sleep, little lamp, for love hath fed thy gleam.
Sleep, little soul, by God's own hands set free.
Cling to his arms and sleep, and sleeping, dream,
And dreaming, look for me.

[1] In many English churches before the Reformation, a little lamp was kept continually burning, called the Lamp of Poor Souls. People were reminded thereby to pray for the souls of those dead whose kinsfolk were too poor to pay for special prayers and masses.

From intellectual readers George Herbert Clarke receives a sympathetic response. His writings are marked by exquisite craftsmanship and unusual phraseology. We quote an example from *The Canadian Magazine:*

THE LAST LULLABY.

The shepherd moon mothers her shining sheep,—
The little stars that cluster close and deep;
And soon they sleep.

The flower's wings are folded to her breast:
She hears a whisper from the darkling west;—
How pure her rest!

Dim droop the drowsing birds upon the trees;
The boughs are still as they: no unquiet breeze
Troubles their ease.

The far and lonely waters feel the spell,
Whose monotones sound slowly out, and tell
Their sway and swell.

All nature is asleep and dreaming dreams
Aglow with wonder that on waking seems
But broken gleams.

So let my spirit sleep the sleep of death:
Close, eyes; be idle, hands; and silent, breath!
Wait what It saith!

From the Atlantic Coast we have this gem from Eric Mackay Yeoman, who died a few years ago in the first flush of his genius:

AUTUMN.

Where once fresh violets filled the wood with blue,
And lavish verdure spread its green around,
Red leaves and yellow lie in simple rue,
Mingling with dead flow'rs on the barren ground.
And in the winds, with lofty grief distrest,
The melancholy Autumn sees on Earth
Her heritage of beauty lose its worth,
And flees distraught into the moaning west;
Yet watches where her perished kingdom lies,
At some high spirit new-called to the skies,
Fleeting from Earth to Paradisic light,
With sudden sorrow moved,
Might linger sadly in her flashing flight,
And long for one she loved.

And so the husbandman, at close of day,
  Scanning the portents of the rueful west,
Might be beguiled to linger in his way,
  His heart and Autumn kindred in unrest;
And moved to own his days in reckless flight
  To nakedness forlorn, well might he turn
  For lore in memory, the shrunk past's urn,
Where records lie of perished things' delight,
  Shadows of dimming forms in precious bloom,
  And faces smiling through the jealous gloom.
Then might he take his way, the skies forgot,
  And portents of the morrow,
Knowing alone that rapture filled his lot,
  And measures of sorrow.

Miss Coleman possesses a beautiful fancy, an example of which we quote:

TO A BLUEBELL.

I watch thy little bells of blue,
So delicate of form and hue,
And when I see them swing and sway
I listen for the chimes to play;
But dull has grown the mortal ear,
And I can never, never hear
The dainty tunes, but only guess
Their music from thy loveliness.
. . . . . .
Keep thou thy silence, fairy bell,
Thou art no less a miracle;
No less a rapture thou dost bring
Because we cannot hear thee ring;
For they who give attentive ear
Must catch thy silvery cadence clear,
And know a joy no language tells,
When in the heart there sings and swells
The music of thy magic bells.

From *Scribner's Magazine* we take this fine bit of optimism from Alan Sullivan:

SUPPLIANT.

Grant me, dear Lord, the alchemy of toil,
  Clean days of labor, dreamless nights of rest,
And that which shall my weariness assoil,
  The sanctuary of one beloved breast:

Laughter of children, hope and thankful tears,
  Knowledge to yield, with valor to defend
A faith immutable, and steadfast years
  That move unvexed to their mysterious end.

We have refrained from considering here the French Canadian dialect verse of William Henry Drummond, or the ballads of Robert Service, because we believe that they do not come within the compass of this essay. Drummond's work is artistic and popular, and well worthy of especial treatment, while Service's has been received by the public with astounding acclaim. But, quite apart from them, one might write on indefinitely were space available and readers indulgent. Such poets as E. W. Thomson, John Boyd, Ethelwyn Wetherald, and L. M. Montgomery might be quoted, and to good purpose; but we hope that it has already been shown that to the great sum of English literature Canada has contributed something that is distinguished both by merit and individuality.

Toronto, Canada.

A PRAYER.

I DO not ask that I should have no cross,
That I should hold life's gain without its loss,
That I no burdens share;
But grant me that my arm may never fail,
That at the worst my courage may not quail,
That I have strength to bear.

I do not ask that I shall have no sorrow deep,
Mine eyes should ever smile and never weep,
My heart be always gay;
But grant that when the bitter cup I drink,
My faith may look to thee and never shrink,
And love all pain outweigh.

I do not ask thy mighty laws should turn
And bring back those for whom my life doth yearn,
Those loved ones gone before;
But when at last there comes the long, long night,
Be thou with me, my never-failing Light,
Eternal, evermore!

MARY MCKINNON MCSWAIN.

CHRISTIANITY AND RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL TENDENCIES.

BY REV. H. MALDWYN HUGHES, D.D.,
WESLEYAN METHODIST CHURCH.

THE question of the attitude of philosophy to Christianity is one to which we cannot be indifferent, if we believe that the divine Spirit is the animating principle of all knowledge. The tendencies of modern philosophy of most importance from the Christian standpoint are:

I. *The Revolt Against Intellectualism.*—The Idealistic successors of Hegel have undoubtedly rendered a great service by their vindication of a spiritual interpretation of the world against the assaults of naturalism. But apart from other limitations which might be named, their method was too intellectualistic. It has been said, for instance, that the Cairds only find the Supreme at two removes from what can be recognized as concrete experience. It is not surprising that this exaggerated intellectualism has evoked a revolt from more than one direction—*e. g.*, Pragmatism, which starts with human conditions and needs; Bergson, who denies the final competence of the intellectual in matters philosophical, and relies on an ultra-intellectual intuition; and Eucken, whose fundamental assumption is the activity of a transcendent spiritual life in man.

II. *The Recognition of the Worth of the Phenomena of the Spiritual Life.*—This is seen in the respectful treatment now accorded by psychology to the phenomena of spiritual experience, as for example, conversion and mysticism.

Perhaps the best course to pursue will be to examine the three outstanding movements of recent philosophy in their relation to Christian truth.

(*a*) PRAGMATISM.

Pragmatism holds that the truth of an idea is determined by its workability. A belief which from the standpoint of human needs and conditions works, is pragmatically true. The universe consists not so much of finished facts as of possibilities. There

is no such thing as absolute truth. Truth is in the making, and we are helping to make it. It is evident that this method can yield nothing more than a hypothetical theism. Indeed, James inclines to a Pluralism in which God is no longer sovereign, but the president of a republic with strictly limited powers.

As a method, Pragmatism is capable of both a perverse and a fruitful application. An instance of the former is Modernism, which reduces dogma to "a prescription of practical order," "the formula of a rule of practical conduct." Inge quotes from Le Roy illustrations of this Catholic Pragmatism. To say "God is personal," means "behave in your relations with God as you do in your relations with a human person." To say "Jesus is risen from the dead," means "treat him as if he were your contemporary."

On the other hand, the pragmatic method is fruitfully applied in so far as it helps us to realize that (1) Experience is a vital factor in the solution of the truth problem. The higher we ascend in the scale of truth, the more scanty does theoretical evidence become and the more dependent are we on practical motives. (2) Speculation, even if it yield an assurance of the existence of God, cannot give us an intimate knowledge of his nature. Such can be won only by experience.

But as a philosophy, Pragmatism is utterly inadequate, especially when judged from the Christian standpoint. (1) So long as man is conscious of the resistless power of a spiritual nature, he can be satisfied with no interpretation of life which does not "penetrate beyond the surface of things to their fundamental nature." His spirit presses on to the discovery of ultimate goals. (2) If the truth of a belief depends on its workability, we are entitled to ask, What is the standard of workability? It is difficult to see where this standard is to come from on purely pragmatic principles. (3) There is a wide gap between the Pluralism of Pragmatism and the Christian conception of God as the one Father of spirits, the one Source of goodness, and the one Refuge of humanity. (4) Pragmatism may easily be used to justify intellectual indolence and an obstinate adherence to obsolete views, approaching to disloyalty to the Spirit of Truth. The Goths in the days of Ulfilas might well have defended Arianism on the ground that it worked, and obscurantism might be justified on

the ground of the piety of many of its professors. Workability cannot be judged from a narrow span of time. That a belief appears to be workable does not prove it to be wholly true, but only that it has in it some elements of truth, which cannot fail to bring forth fruit.

(*b*) Bergson.

Bergson has not yet developed his philosophy in relation to the religious life. He denies the competence of the intellect in philosophical matters on the ground that its outlook has been shaped by practical needs. Scientific knowledge, valuable as it is, is different in kind from philosophic knowledge, which, standing as it were upon the shoulders of scientific knowledge, attains to supra-intellectual intuition and apprehends Reality as life, freedom, creation, progress, influence, tendency, movement, force, conscious activity. Bergson will not admit that this creative impulse is endowed with a purposive quality, and so far separates himself from Christianity, which is concerned with the realization of an eternal purpose. Nevertheless, as Dr. Garvie has pointed out, we may learn two things from Bergson: (1) We may insist that Christian faith, like Bergson's intuition, is an immediate contact with reality and not merely assent to doctrines about reality. (2) Just as he finds reality in movement, creative evolution, vital impulse, so may we prove the reality of Christian faith in its abounding vitality and vigor.

(*c*) Eucken.

Eucken has called his philosophy Activism. By this he means that he postulates in man the activity of a Spiritual Life which has a reality and independence of its own, which "applies its standards to the testing and sifting of the whole content of our human life," and which makes spiritually fruitful the lives of those in whom its activity is allowed free course. This Spiritual Life unifies and transforms our personalities; "it holds before us a regenerated world, in the light of which it passes judgment on things as they are; it lifts us above the narrow limits of our private and particular existence, and transforms our relations to our fellow-men," joining us to them in the fellowship of a hidden life. It cannot possibly be self-originated, demanding as it does toil and sacrifice and a revolution which shifts the very life-center. It can

only be explained on the assumption of the invasion of our life by a new order of reality.

It will be seen that this is closely akin to Christian teaching. Eucken's philosophy offers a stimulating and helpful field of study to the Christian teacher. But Eucken refuses to admit that Christ exercises a unique function as the Mediator of the Spiritual Life. The dogma of Christ's deity, he says, has been the source of much confusion. The personality of Christ must be recognized to be "simply the high-water mark of a movement which embraces the whole of humanity." Eucken is not alone in this. Philosophy can understand immanence, but incarnation is a stumbling-block to it. After all, it is not surprising. Philosophy is not religion, and necessarily falls short of it in spiritual insight and experience. There is a profound truth in the saying of Ritschl, "We know the nature of Christ only in his worth for us." Philosophy is not competent to pronounce on the Person of Christ until it has been enlightened by the experience of his indwelling.

Southport, England.

WORDSWORTH'S HEALING POWER.

BY MRS. F. L. TOWNSEND.

I THINK no English poet has carried so much *impedimenta* as William Wordsworth. His trivialities jar unpleasantly on the ear of his lovers, for lovers he must have as distinguished from the admirers that hold aloft the name of, say John Milton —Milton, the immortal, whose appeal may be to the few of each generation, but to the few whose judgment is mighty enough to swing his name onward for each succeeding generation to pass upon.

For Wordsworth we may not have the warm and intimate feeling that stirs our hearts for the Scotch lyrist. A consensus of the world's opinion would give to Burns the highest place among the poets of all time, if we judge by the standard of love, —the power to express love, to strike that chord which vibrates in the great heart of humanity, no matter what age or clime we consider.

One may well set aside the true master-poet in any comparative estimate. Shakespeare alone has swept the gamut of human emotion. In portrayal of love, hatred, ambition, jealousy, all the profounder as well as the lighter feelings of our common nature, the Bard of Avon stands preëminent, and it is scarcely conceivable that time shall bring forth a greater than he. Our estimate of Wordsworth must, then, be based on the assumption that he is to be judged by the standards that apply to those high spirits that follow Shakespeare.

For pure beauty, Keats and Shelley; for force and originality, Byron; for unexcelled rhythm, the very music of words united to spiritual beauty, Tennyson; for rugged strength that dominates the religious world in spite of obvious defects, Browning; —but for that calm, clear insight into the spirit's higher realm, for majestic poise of soul, the restfulness of a fixed faith, let me turn to Wordsworth and thank God for the poet's high mission.

There came to me a period when worn nerves cried out for rest, when the overtaxed body clamored for a pause in order that Mother Nature might re-create the spent forces. Not for me then

were the records of man's struggles throughout the world's history. Tales of oppression and oppression's wars should not strike against my bruised spirit. Not for me were myth and legend of an older day when men fought toward that great Light which shines now in our luminous heaven, if so be our eyes are open to see the glory of it. Not for me the march of that loved host created by the masters of fiction. The glint of Dickens's humorous eye, the dear glamour of romance which Scott has thrown over his pages, the soul's battles as exemplified in Silas Marner or Jean Valjean,—all these were thrust aside as something beloved but fitted for a clearer day. I would turn to the poets who so often clarify our atmosphere and help us to see the wider reaches that encompass our lives.

For Shakespeare I was too tired. In vain the familiar clarion call to my brain. The humor of Falstaff, the light foolery of Gobbo, the charm of Rosalind, the tragic pathos of Desdemona, alike struck dully on the unresponsive ear. Not for me the pagan beauty of Keats, the lyric sweetness of Shelley, the passionate power of Byron. Beneath the music and charm of them was always the underflow that spoke of sad lives, of restless hearts, of unfaith.

In front of me, on the wall, hung a small print representing Wordsworth in his favorite attitude—head inclined on hand, while every line of his face suggested thoughtful peace. No storm-tossed spirit here, no passion-swayed soul. The world had not wrecked the man's vitality. Surely here was promise of a soothing influence that was worth seeking for. I began reading the poet as I had never read him before, and during those weeks of enforced idleness I grew into a loving companionship with him, drawing from him, day by day, a little here and more there, till mental health began to keep pace with the body's restoration. To-day I am greatly debtor to the poet, and lovingly recall lines that suggest different stages of progress toward a deeper happiness which found no expression except, often, to lie still with the book beside me—open at a place where a few lines had been read and their deep, sweet meaning brooded over.

Prosing lines that had been wont to rouse a feeling or impatience were quietly passed by,—the *impedimenta* which so often keep the new reader from a further knowledge of the great poet.

Discard all this as superfluous, agree with the assumption that he tried the impossible when he undertook to throw the halo of poetry about the most trivial, everyday incident, we will still have that left which lifts our spirits until they rest "on top of golden hours." And for me, during those convalescent days, as never before, the spiritual force of the poet, that which Matthew Arnold referred to in the lines:

> Time may restore us in his course
> Goethe's sage mind and Byron's force:
> But where will Europe's later hour
> Again find Wordsworth's healing power?

Lying thus, day after day, letting the world sweep by, turning my mind in upon itself, many a vision of earth's natural beauty struck deep upon mine inner eye. Not simply for the perfection of the poem, "I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud," was I grateful to the seer, but for the hint of things that one may call up from his own half-forgotten past.

> For oft when on my couch I lie,
> In vacant or in pensive mood,
> They flash upon that inner eye
> Which is the bliss of solitude;
> And then my heart with pleasure fills,
> And dances with the daffodils.

My bedroom walls vanish. Instead of their narrowness, wide spaces fill my vision's reach. In the horizon mountain ridges blend with a tender sky. In the foreground a broad green valley lies resting under the springtime sun, while a sturdy river rushes by with many a murmuring song. Here, just beside me, an age-scarred tree reaches outward over the water, while high up, in its hollowed side, a violet blooms in soil that long ago was deposited there by the river's overflow. Oh, the beauty of it! The lovely landscape so vital to the eye, the lesson of strength out of weakness, the serene restfulness of the flower there, rooted in seeming chance, yet steadily fulfilling its inner law.

Thanks to the poet for healing thoughts that spring from memories like to these. Thanks for the habit of mind that draws strength from sweet and simple things.

To-day, though years have intervened, those quiet weeks so project themselves on the present that I seem to be living them over again, and shall write as if speaking to the hour.

As these years, in passing, have brought somewhat of that philosophic mind of which Wordsworth speaks, it has seemed to me that for us in America the serene poet should have a message of deep significance,—for the individual and for the nation.

Amid the fret and fume of woman's changing condition, her effort for adjustment to new freedom, her struggle for recognition as man's equal, there came to me a feeling of protest against the shadowy place that is accorded Dorothy Wordsworth. To be known simply as the poet's sister seemed to me but scant recognition for a woman so great of heart and brain. I reasoned that she was making of herself a sacrifice to feed his spirit, to smooth out life's difficulties for him; that if she had given freedom to her own powers, had developed her own individuality, the ages might have honored her as creator of some great work instead of remembering her as the vestal virgin who kept her brother's kitchen fires alight. I do not see it so to-day. In Wordsworth's case, as in the race at large, the woman-heart was keeping true to its God-appointed mission—aiding, directing, befriending, where the soul's fine issues are involved. If Dorothy Wordsworth had broken with her brother, had set up some bachelor-maid establishment and written from her own brain, we might have had poems that lack the dull and tedious lines which cumber her brother's pages, but, by every proof from world-history, we would never have had from her the calm philosophy, the profound and spiritual vision that belong to William Wordsworth. Without the sister's influence the brother's genius might never have reached its highest point, and thus the ages would have suffered loss. As I see it now, Dorothy Wordsworth, during those long years, was fulfilling, in a large sense, the highest mission of woman. As the mother nourishes and vitalizes the life-germ in mysterious, miraculous way, gives spiritual as well as physical growth to the embryonic being lying near her heart, so the sister fed the spirit of the poet, gave to him the supreme love that he needed, the thoughtful care, the brooding tenderness which passed into quiet strength and wisdom for the healing of sick and tired hearts. What greater fate for a woman than to go down in history as the nourisher of such a spirit? There is something infinitely satisfying in turning from our day of unrest, of blatant divorcees, of strenuous clubdom for woman, and letting one's mind rest on the

peaceful life of brother and sister, shut off as they were from the city's blare, surrounded by the loveliness of the Lake Country, and living truly the simple life.

It is worth while to recall the fact that of all our poets no one has held a higher view of woman. During the first years of the French Revolution, Wordsworth's mind was astir with the hopes and expectations that flowed, a mighty current, throughout the waiting world. But later, when humanity stood looking down on a seething, storm-tossed scene where brute force promised itself ascendency, where God himself seemed to have been ordered out of existence, and all stable social law was on the brink of overthrow, the poet's serene mind clung unhesitatingly to the old forms and fixed itself in steadfast conservatism.

One can imagine that he might turn from the British suffragette movement with a feeling that now, as never before, do these lines fit his country's need:

> Milton! thou should'st be living at this hour:
> England hath need of thee: she is a fen
> Of stagnant waters! Altar, sword, and pen,
> Fireside, the heroic wealth of hall and bower,
> Have forfeited their ancient English dower
> Of inward happiness.
>
> Plain living and high thinking are no more:
> The homely beauty of the good old cause
> Is gone, our peace, our fearful innocence,
> And pure religion breathing household laws.

Verily England has need of Milton, Carlyle, Browning,—her prophetic seers, who were brave enough to speak in thunder tones against all forms of unrighteousness. England—with her physical decline, her day of stalwart soldiers gone, the old prolific breed giving way before the modern idea of childless families—surely needs no Hardy to undermine the foundations of the home by weakening the marriage bond. Rather does she need to have the Wordsworthian idea of woman stamped deeply on the public mind and conscience. Old lines they are, familiar by usage, yet are they perpetually new:

> A Being breathing thoughtful breath,
> A Traveler between life and death;
> The reason firm, the temperate will,
> Endurance, foresight, strength, and skill;

> A perfect Woman, nobly planned,
> To warn, to comfort, and command;
> And yet a Spirit still, and bright
> With something of angelic light.

It is always thus—that insistence on the spirit, setting Wordsworth apart from so many of our poets who have been richer in beauty, more vivid in imagination. Because of it we might more readily spare others who are lacking in the defects of Wordsworth. Always and everywhere humanity has need of this uplifting power, and the poet who fails to give us somewhat of it misses the highest note in his music, falls short of supreme excellence.

If England and England's women have need of the Wordsworthian message, of a truth America is no whit behind in that need,—restless, turbulent America, grasping, sinning, then turning, in fierce repentance, to find some sinner upon whom to vent the strength of her awakening conscience.

There is no greater commentary on the spirit's preëminence than the fact that each generation must have spiritual leadership.

It is no far stretch of the imagination to foresee a time when Tolstoi will be known and loved—not for theories and proposed social experiments, not simply for the power of his words as examples of present-day literature, but largely because, throughout his writings, moving as the Spirit of God upon the face of the waters, brooding, fructifying, miracle-working, is that unescapable "power that makes for righteousness."

So of Wordsworth. Quiet, strong, conservative, haunted by no visions of sensuous beauty, clear-eyed, and wide-sweeping in range of intellect, he shall be known, in a higher sense, as being what Matthew Arnold called Emerson, "a friend and aider of the spirit." As such America has need of him. Struggle as we may, there is no freeing ourselves from the spirit's dominance. Tie ourselves as we will to the dead body of materialism, there is somewhat within us that calls for higher things. The building of colossal fortunes, luxurious living, all the refinements that culture develops, cannot satisfy us. The American ideal demands freedom; but we will continue to find that freedom and the soul's anarchy are not synonymous. We cannot discard the oldest and deepest-rooted facts of our existence. If woman, in

her eagerness for the greatest freedom, should throw aside, as an incumbrance, the miracle of motherhood, she will find herself losing at the most vital point, discarding the power that has set her above kings, and has given her rule over the realm of the spiritual. Assuredly no day in history has seen such rapid changes in the life of women as these passing years are bringing about. And herein lies the danger.

> Thus gifted Friend, but with the placid brow
> That Woman ne'er should forfeit, keep thy vow;
> With modest scorn reject whate'er would blind
> The ethereal eyesight, cramp the wingèd mind!

How long will it take us to realize that the largest vision of woman's "ethereal eyesight" is worth infinitely more to the race than all the enterprises, however great, on which she is spending so much of her strength? Enterprises are they, so manifold that her mind is confused and cannot clearly judge as to which is of greater worth; they are enterprises, too, which often tax her physical being till nerves rebel and the "placid brow" is gone forever.

. . . . . .

To learn from Wordsworth is no light and vanishing thing. As the years go by and you come to him with a deepening insight into the heart of humanity, you grow into an absorbing love for such poems as the "Ode" and "Lines on Tintern Abbey." These are of a kind so preëminent in beauty, youth itself must recognize their greatness. At the high noon of life they have a meaning they could not have in its earlier years. When the afternoon shadows begin to cast themselves along your path, they will have a profounder beauty for you—a beauty that penetrates the heart and stirs it with a sense of the greatness and the nobleness of life.

There was no lyric of Shelley's, no love-song of Burns, nothing of Keats, not Hamlet's soliloquy, not Browning's "Saul," that draws me as do these two poems of Wordsworth's. I cannot go to them with intent to quote a line without finding that I must read on, uncounting of time.

The "Ode to the Skylark" has all the musical charm that one finds in the lyric poets, but added to it is that which appeals to the pure spirit that animates us.

Up with me! up with me into the clouds!
For thy song, Lark, is strong.
Up with me! up with me into the clouds,
Singing, singing,
With clouds and sky about thee ringing,
Lift me, guide me till I find
That spot which seems so to thy mind!

Joyous as morning,
Thou hast a nest for thy love and thy rest.
And, though little troubled with sloth,
Drunken Lark! thou wouldst be loth
To be such a traveler as I.
Happy, happy Liver,
With a soul as strong as a mountain river
Pouring out praise to the Almighty Giver,
Joy and jollity be with us both!

Scarce could we find a better tonic for the heart a-weary than song like this, and I, as Wordsworth to the Lark, would say to such poet:

Alas! my journey, rugged and uneven,
Through prickly moors and dusty ways must wind;
But hearing thee, or others of thy kind,
As full of gladness and as free of heaven,
I, with my fate contented, will plod on,
And hope for higher raptures when life's day is done.

Thus it is, always, with our poet. Pure beauty there is, unsullied by earthly strain, clear as the radiance of unclouded night when moon and stars shine forth; and shall I disclaim or ignore such beauty because the message is addressed to the *spirit* of man? Are these perfect lines less beautiful because of their ethical quality—these oft-quoted lines to Duty?

Flowers laugh before thee on their beds,
And fragrance in thy footing treads;
Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
And the most ancient heavens, through
Thee, are fresh and strong.

Ah! no. As custom stales the infinite variety of life, as age withers the transient flowers of youth, give me to look with spirit eyes on the greater things that abide. And

When the fretful stir
Unprofitable, and the fever of the world
Have hung upon the beatings of my heart,
How often shall my spirit turn to thee,

thou poet who hast helped me to attain

> that blessèd mood
> In which the burthen of the mystery,
> In which the heavy and the weary weight
> Of all this unintelligible world,
> Is lightened:—that serene and blessèd mood,
> In which the affections gently lead us on,
> Until, the breath of this corporeal frame
> And even the motion of our human blood
> Almost suspended, we are laid asleep
> In body, and become a living soul:
> While with an eye made quiet by the power
> Of harmony, and the deep power of joy,
> We see into the life of things.

Leaksville, N. C.

REPENTANCE.

Do not reproach yourself for wrong that you have done!—
'Tis that way madness lies;
Say rather, "With the coming of to-morrow's sun
I will the stronger rise;
Remembering my sin, I will more gentle be
To him who does me wrong,
And, mindful of the mercy that abides with me,
My weakness shall grow strong:
And if to-morrow too my wayward feet shall stray,
As they too often do,
With steadfast heart I still will hold my upward way,
And keep my purpose true.
And, with the dawn of each new day, still will I seek
To right the wrong I do,
To stay the steps that faltered where my own were weak,
And thus my strength renew;
That when my day is done and evening shades grow long,
And comes death's silent night,
My heart shall hold no unrepented sin, no wrong
I have not tried to right:
And if, with all its weight of sin, my soul shall rise
To greet the gates of light,
I'll make no plea to enter in save that my eyes
Were ever toward the right."

FRANCIS MCKINNON MORTON.

San Antonio, Tex.

THE RESURRECTION OF JERUSALEM.

BY PROFESSOR GEORGE B. EAGER.

THE new interest in Jerusalem is witnessed, not only by the increased space given to it in the newspapers and other ephemeral forms of writing, but by a phenomenal increase of the literature of the subject which is of real and abiding value. This is seen in the works of the various Palestine Exploration Societies, the monographs of exact learning in German, French, and English upon the geography, the history, and the archæology of Jerusalem, and the special articles on one or another phase of the subject which have appeared in the great reviews or the leading magazines and in the new Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias. As samples of those that have appeared in English, I may mention such general works as Sanday's "Sacred Sites of the Gospel" and Ramsay's "Cities of St. Paul," and such special works as George Adam Smith's "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times to A.D. 1870," Selah Merrill's "Ancient Jerusalem," and Professor Lewis Bayles Paton's "Jerusalem in Bible Times"—all works of the highest value.

I.

If asked to account for this wide and growing interest, I would say, suggestively, it is due,

First. To the application of the historical method and the higher criticism to the study of this, as of kindred questions.

Second. To the application of the canons and methods of the new archæology, and the exploration and interpretation of the ruins of Palestine, as well as of Egypt and Mesopotamia.

Third. To the Zionist movement that has aroused the Jews the world over to favor or oppose an effort to recover their fatherland and establish there a Jewish State, where, protected and unhindered, they may work out their destiny and mission.

Fourth. To the Young Turk movement, and the new constitutional régime in Turkey that guarantees religious liberty to all, and adopts toward the Jews especially an exceptionally liberal policy. Four-fifths of the population of Jerusalem are now Jews. Jewish colonies abound from Dan to Beersheba. The

Plain of Esdraelon has been largely bought up by Jews, and the Jordan Valley, once the property of the deposed Sultan, is invaded by Jewish capitalists who are seeking to buy up all the arable land. Bethlehem, Nazareth, and Gaza, which a few years ago were closed to Jews, have now Jewish quarters and synagogues. Thousands of Jews are entering Palestine from Persia, and every steamer from Odessa carries Jews from Russia to the ancient home of their race. A Zionist banking company is doing all in its power to encourage this migration. This great change has come about since the rise to power of the modern Turkish party.

All these things, not to speak of other influences, such as the long residence of Christian missionaries in the land, and the making Jerusalem a sort of world-convention city of recent years, have worked together to arouse a new interest in, and to direct universal attention toward, this ancient capital of Israel. But, account for it as you will, the city that for centuries has been the center of the worship of one part of the race, has become the wonder and study of the other part. Among alien and far-away peoples live sparks have been kindled or rekindled of a love and interest for the city almost as ardent and jealous as those of her own children. Then the new literature of the subject is profoundly significant. Not since that enterprising American scholar and pioneer, Dr. Robinson, inaugurated the new method of exploration and study in Palestine, has the tree then planted borne better fruit or a richer yield. The authors of these books are worthy to be placed alongside of such masters in this realm as Robinson, Burckhardt, Stanley, Barclay, Thomson, Porter, Ritter, Conder, Sayce, Tristram, Bliss, and MacAlister. Their books really mark a new epoch in research and book production on this subject.

II.

As a summarist of the work of geologists, geographers, and archæologists, and as a literary exponent of the findings of leading explorers, George Adam Smith is worthy of first mention. His monumental achievement will cause him to stand henceforth in the relation to the Holy City as Belzoni does to the Pyramids, Layard to Nineveh, Flinders Petrie to Sinai and

Egypt, Fred Bliss to Lachish, and A. H. Sayce to Hittite land. "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times," no less than the "Historical Geography of the Holy Land," will take a high place in that vast literature which constitutes the bibliography of Palestine. Its value, for instance, is seen in this, that in a region that bristles with controversial questions—the topography of Jerusalem—he is one of the safest and most engaging of guides. If the reader is not convinced in every case that his guide is right, he is sure that he has a reason for the faith that is in him. In his articles in the "Encyclopædia Biblica," George Adam Smith impressed many as leaning to the radical side in criticism; he here exhibits rare caution and equilibrium of judgment. In this work, too, he breaks fresh ground in his delineation of ancient Jerusalem in relation to industry, trade, commerce, and natural resources. He makes the city and its environments live before us, teeming with a strenuous population, whose economic conditions we are made to realize. He gives us, moreover, not only the history of Jerusalem, but, suggestively, also the philosophy of the history of the chosen people.

The chapter entitled "The Ideal City and the Real" is a fine example of his treatment. Here he tries to realize the point of view of the prophets after the exile—to show how the prophetic pictures of the city are double, and in a sense contradictory, and how this dualism is to be accounted for in a way well worthy of the study of the exegete and the preacher. The concluding chapters on "Jerusalem in the Time of Christ" are illuminative and of kindling interest, from both the literary and the historical point of view.

Dr. Selah Merrill, the author of the second great work I mention, was for sixteen years American Consul in Jerusalem, and representative of the American Palestine Exploration Society. He was also lecturer on Oriental Research and Discoveries before the Lowell Institute, Boston, and the Peabody Institute, Baltimore. He says that during his years of preparation for this work on ancient Jerusalem, everything in the way of helpful literature on the subject was carefully examined by him, and close relations were maintained with excavators and engineers whose labors have added greatly to our knowledge of the city;

moreover, that everything in his power was done to secure absolute accuracy in detail and statement.

Taking 70 A.D., where George Adam Smith leaves off, as his starting point, and Josephus as his chief guide, he has searched the ruins and excavated the grounds of the city so as to lay before us in this four-hundred-page volume, as the result of thirty-five years of exploration and research, about all that may be known as things now stand concerning the site and arrangement of the ancient city. George Adam Smith gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to him. "I owe much," he says, "especially to Dr. Merrill, who has generously laid his stores of knowledge at the disposal of inquirers." As to the spirit and method of Dr. Merrill, I may quote what he says in the preface: "In my study of Jerusalem I did not start with a preconceived theory, or, as many do even in this enlightened age, with a belief in the infallibility of tradition. For a long period of years I collected facts and tried to see whither they would lead or point. . . . During the past thirty years I have paid a great deal of attention to the ancient topography of Jerusalem—have studied the subject from every conceivable point of view, always regarding the point of time at which the subject was approached of great importance." (Pages 19, 21, 22.) His collection of Jerusalem relics, Palestinian coins, utensils, birds, mammals, vases, tear-bottles, etc., is exceptionally rich, as the writer had opportunity to find out when in Jerusalem a few years since, and it has been so used as to shed light on many a puzzling question. He recognizes, as all explorers do, that the excavation of Jerusalem, though it has been important and thorough, so far as it has gone, is nevertheless incomplete. Notwithstanding the fact that the "recovery of Jerusalem" becomes more and more impossible year by year because more and more acres are every year covered with modern structures, and the free ground left for the pick and the spade grows less and less, still he thinks we have abundant reason to be thankful that step by step for half a century so much progress has been made in the solution of problems that for so long seemed to baffle the skill of archæologists and special students of disputed points of topography and history.

Fortunately Dr. Merrill supplements George Adam Smith at

many points. For instance, George Adam Smith ended his labors with the Jerusalem of the Gospels. He leads up to within four decades of the great tragedy, the destruction of the city, but there he halts. Dr. Merrill takes up the story here, and depicts with graphic power the changing fortunes of the city from that time on. Then, in his discussion of the ancient walls of the city, George Adam Smith's caution comes out strongly, and his conclusions are sorely disappointing. "We do not know," he says, for example, "how the second wall ran from the first to the Tyropœon; or whether it ran inside or outside of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher." Dr. Merrill, on the other hand, claims to have discovered and excavated this second wall, and to have shown conclusively that it was outside of this that Christ was crucified and buried. He has placed us under no small obligation for what he has accomplished toward the recovery of the Jerusalem of Christ's day, and given us additional reason to be thankful that so much progress has been made in the solution of the problems that cluster about it.

Dr. Paton's book, "Jerusalem in Bible Times," while modest in size (one hundred and sixty-seven pages), is by no means of small importance. It complements the other more elaborate and costly books admirably, bringing the best results of archæological researches within easy reach of the ordinary student, teacher, or tourist. Dr. Paton is the well-known Professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Criticism in Hartford Theological Seminary, and has enjoyed opportunities scarcely second to those of the other authors for personal observation and research in Palestine. His book is particularly valuable for his masterly argument in favor of the new view that Zion is to be identified with the eastern hill instead of the western, and as a scholarly summary of what these men and others have given us of real value.

III.

It may not be uninteresting to illustrate somewhat in detail what the application of the historical method and the new archæology to this subject has done toward giving us a completer history of Jerusalem. For instance, the discovery, translation, and interpretation of the Tel El-Amarna tablets have taken us back thirty-three centuries and unveiled to us Jerusa-

lem, first emerging into history beneath the noontide and approaching decline of Egypt's glory. We are made to see that, in the period preceding that of Amenhotep IV., the only possible rivals of the Pharaoh were the kings of Mesopotamia and Babylonia. This Pharaoh (Amenhotep III.) was recognized as sovereign of Syria, and his influence extended even to Armenia. His vast empire, his lavish building throughout Egypt and Nubia, his magnificent temples at Thebes, his mines, his organization of trade, his wealth, along with the art and luxury which prevailed under his dynasty and their acknowledged influence on the Greek world, represent the zenith of Egyptian civilization. Amenhotep IV. (B.C. 1400), the younger Pharaoh of the Tel El-Amarna letters, was unable to preserve the conquests of his predecessors, but became noted as effecting a temporary revolution in the religion and art of Egypt, in the establishment of the worship of Atem, the Sun's Disc, and of styles of art that were, in contrast with those going before, singularly free and natural.

Now these tablets were from the site of the capital of Amenhotep IV., and contain a correspondence which was conducted between this Pharaoh's father and himself on the one side and their Syrian feudatories and the Trans-Euphrates kingdoms on the other.[1] The letters are full of human interest—intense, informing, and at times most amusing. In them Canaan is, what we find it later, the high bridge of communication between the Nile and the Euphrates. Over it we see in these letters the caravans moving and Egyptian gold and oil passing in exchange for Mesopotamian manufactured gold, precious stones, enameled ornaments, chariots, horses, and slaves. We see also Phœnician ships bearing to Egypt copper, bronze, ivory, ships' furniture, and horses, and taking back silver, oil, and oxen.

Such are a few of the details of the letters, which are so many and so intimate that it is thought that before the Roman Empire there is no period for which we have records more replete with the details of life and social customs, or with fuller

[1]See H. Winckler's translation of the tablets, Berlin, 1896; Wallis Budge's last chapter of "The History of Egypt"; Sayce's "Patriarchal Palestine," and an article from Sayce on "Canaan in the Century Before the Exodus," in *Contemporary Review*, 1905, Vol. 88, pp. 264-277.

revelations of personal character and policy. All is lifelike, vivid, passionate, and, for the most part, frank. But the chief interest for us now is, that, of this busy, abounding human life and full-grown ancient civilization, *Jerusalem was a living part;* though it is found lying not on the great military highway of the land, but near by one of its main arteries of trade and travel. Along with the letters from the feudatory chiefs of Palestine are not a few from the then ruler of Jerusalem. These letters reveal the duties that Egypt required of her feudatories, the awe in which they held her power, and all the intrigue and duplicity arising from so ambiguous a situation; and by the names they contain, with their alternative derivation, they open up the question of the racial character and religion of the early masters of Jerusalem. Were they Semitic or Hittite? Or were they a Hittite aristocracy ruling a Semitic people? Or again, were they and their subjects alike part of a Hittite migration which had settled in this part of Palestine?

Professor Sayce is led to conclude that the Jebusites, whom Israel found in possession of Jerusalem, were descendants of the Hittite Arzawaya.[2] If this is so, then Ezekiel's statement, that "the mother of Jerusalem was Hittite," may be taken as exactly historical, and Von Luschan may have good reason for saying that the features of Jews and Syrians indicate a mixture of Semitic blood with that of the primitive Hittites of Asia Minor and Palestine. It is thought by some that the Deuteronomic phrase "all the land of the Hittites," may mean broadly the whole of Syria, which the Assyrians certainly seem to have meant by "the land of the Khatti." It is of kindred significance that Hittite and Amorite are used interchangeably in the Pentateuch, and that Esau's Hittite wives are called "daughters of Canaan" (Judges x. 5 and xv. 63).

These letters, and the discoveries they have led to, have raised some interesting religious questions, into which I shall not attempt to enter. But it is worthy of note in this connection that Abd-Khiba, "the king of Jerusalem," about 1400 B.C.—who, according to Sayce, was not under the Pharaoh as other feudatory rulers were, though he was his friend, but derived his power

---

[2] *Contemporary Review,* Vol. 88, p. 274.

directly from "the god" (Sayce taking "mighty king" to mean "the god")—founds his appeals to Amenhotep IV. not to desert Jerusalem on the fact that "the king has set his name on Jerusalem forever."[3] Winckler and others take this to mean simply that Amenhotep IV. had instituted in this vassal city of Egypt the worship of Atem, of whom he conceived himself to be the incarnation.[4] The remarkable thing about it is that the form of the Egyptian religion which most nearly approached Monotheism[5] should have been imposed even for a brief period upon Jerusalem.

As to the city itself, these letters reveal, not only its site, but that it was a fortress or stronghold of considerable strength, that it contained an Egyptian garrison, and that it had a "territory" belonging to it.

It is interesting to note that the name of the city in the Babylonian script of these tablets is spelled U-ru-sa-lim.[6] This has precipitated a notable discussion and given rise to a considerable literature. There are seen to be two main lines of tradition as to the original form of the word, and the question arises, Which is the original form, the Babylonian or the Hebrew? This, furthermore, is found to involve a matter of no little historical importance. It opens up the larger question: "Was the name of the city a native, *i. e.*, a Canaanite name, or was it given by the Babylonians during the well-known period when the Babylonian culture pervaded and dominated Palestine? The first part of the name, *U-ru,* is taken by Assyriologists to mean "city." Sayce says the second part, *sa-lim,* is the name of a god, and so he translates it "City of Salim." Haupt, on the other hand, translates it in analogy to the Arabic *Dares Salam,* "a place of safety," recalling the term "stronghold" as applied to the town in Hebrew, making it a compound of the Summerian word for "fortified place" and the Semitic *Shalim,* "safety." What the etymology of the word in either case is, it is hard to decide. And so the controversy rages, for this and other rea-

---

[3]Winckler, 180 1. 60f. [4]*Ibid.,* 194f.

[5]Sayce's "Religions of Ancient Egypt," etc., 92ff.

[6]See Winckler, and cf. Sayce in "Records of the Past," 2nd series, Vol. 5, 60f and 72f.

sons. Some derive *Uru* from the Semitic root *ur* or *ir*, "to lighten," from which we have Hebrew *ur*, "fire" or "hearth." (Cf. Arabic.) This is significant if we read with Cheyne and others Isaiah's name for Jerusalem, *Ariel*, "God's lion," or *Uriel*, "God's hearth," and suppose it formed in analogy to the name of the city.

IV.

But let us take another question which more nearly interests us as Bible students, one connected with the story of David's capture of the city (c. 1000 B.C.)—viz., David's reasons for the choice of Jerusalem as his capital and the effect of this choice on the subsequent history of Israel. In dealing with the narrative of the capture of the stronghold in 2 Samuel v. 6ff, George Adam Smith accepts the critical emendation of the text by Wellhausen, etc. I note only that when David went up against the Jebusites, according to the narrative, they taunted him with his feebleness. "Nevertheless," it is said, "David took the stronghold of *Sion*." Now this is the first appearance of the name Sion in the history. A little later it is added, "And David dwelt in the stronghold and called it David's burgh" (G. A. S.). But the author now proceeds to show that the capture of Jerusalem was as necessary to Israel's independence of Philistia as it was to their unification. To do this he draws upon his ample geographical, as well as his historical and critical, resources. For David to have settled in Shechem, the natural center of the country, or to have chosen one of the fortresses of Ephraim, would have aroused the slumbering jealousy of his own southern clans. His capital, as things were, had to lie somewhere between the two, most fitly between Bethlehem and Bethel, and had to be near the head of one of the passes leading up from the Philistine territory. To meet all these conditions, *no other position was comparable to Jerusalem*. Then Jerusalem added the supreme excellence of a neutral site, one that had belonged neither to Judah nor the northern tribes. Here, too, was found the only spring or springs of the region capable of sustaining the population of a town of importance. So the site would supply David, as monarch of all Israel, with a capital strong by natural position and water supply, and politically suitable by

neutrality toward the rival interests, north and south. And though Jerusalem had no neutral command of traffic and commerce, these considerations might well outweigh all others. By virtue of her political supremacy her kings could easily supply this defect—could command and secure commercial organizations and alliances and an adequate population for all essential purposes, as they did.

"Historians are premature," George Adam Smith suggests, Vol. II., p. 39, "who at this point celebrate all the meaning of Jerusalem in the history of Israel, as if it were due to David alone." He goes on then to show in a quite significant way that the work of making the city was in a true sense divine and required ages for its fulfillment. The most we can say of David historically, after accrediting him with the splendid insight and courage with which he met the exigencies of his day, and with the exceptional religious devotion he exhibited, is that in giving Israel Jerusalem as it was, he gave them the possibility of that which it was yet to be. But we should remember that the after history clearly reveals, that for centuries after David the position of the city remained precarious. It was violated by Shishak, and harassed by the Northern Kingdom, so far as it was a capital, and ignored, so far as it was a sanctuary. Elijah passed her by when he went to seek Jehovah at Horeb; and, according to Amos viii. 14, the religious devotees of Jehovah in the eighth century preferred Beersheba as a shrine to Sion. Indeed, it required the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom, the desecration of the rural sanctuaries by the Assyrians, the proof of her own inviolableness by Isaiah, and the centralization of worship in the Temple in the seventh century under Josiah, before Jerusalem did become the heart and soul of the nation, from which all their life beat forth, and with whose fall they died.[7] Thus, and thus only, did Jerusalem acquire that preponderance of influence which in coming centuries rendered the rest of the country but the fringe around her borders. Her impregnable position, her material size, her strength, and her noise, vivid and near as they were at this time, are found to be dim be-

[7] "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times," Vol. 2, p. 39.

side the burning word-pictures in which Isaiah at last reveals her moral and religious significance.[8]

V.

As a final and crowning example of the method and spirit of Dr. Smith and of kindred writers of the day on this subject, I may cite his Chapter XI. on "The Ideal City and the Real" for more special mention. Here, after showing how gradual was the rise of Jerusalem to preëminence among the shrines of Israel, his method reveals itself in the bringing out into the clear, not only that for such centralization of the worship the religious motives were high and strong, but that they would hardly have achieved so full a victory without the aid of others, which were partly political, having begun with David, and partly economic, having been at work at least from the eighth century on. He shows how the urban forms of society gradually replaced the agricultural, how the capital city absorbed the political talent, the military strength, and the industrial efficiency of the people; and how thus it came about that the bulk of the Jewish exiles that were taken away into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar were the choice men of Jerusalem, to whom their city was everything, and the rest of the land but the fringe of her queenly robe; and, furthermore, that, at the moment of the Exile, Jerusalem represented, not only the actual and efficient nation, but the Divine Idea for which the nation lived and had its being. Thus, and thus only, as he sees it, can we explain the paradox that Jerusalem had hardly fallen and been drained of her people, when we find her regarded in Jewish literature, not only as still alive, but as comprising in herself all the significance of Israel. To Ezekiel, for instance, who is careful to keep in sight the rest of the land up to its ideal boundaries, Jerusalem is Israel, the nation's guilt is her guilt, their king is the "king of Jerusalem." (Ezekiel, chapters xvi., xxii., and xxiii.) So, likewise, in the great dirges of Lamentations, ii. 31-iv. 22, "Daughter of Sion" is as national a designation as "Daughter of Moab"; the body of Jerusalem is broken, but her spirit still lives and is called by the writer to bewail her ruin and the death of her

[8] "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times," Vol. 2, p. 137.

children—to pray for her restoration and revenge upon her enemies. Everywhere here Jerusalem, or Sion, stands for the whole people of God; not merely as mother or mistress of the nation, but the ideal figure in whom Israel is concentrated.[9]

So, too, the great "prophet of the Exile" (Isaiah, chapters xl.-lv.) describes the exiles as naming themselves by the Holy City (xlviii. 2). He addresses Jerusalem and "my people" as one and the same (xl. 1, 2). He is commanded to say unto Sion, "My people art thou." "God," he says, "hath comforted his people, hath redeemed Jerusalem" (lii. 9). This identification, however, quite notably, does not occur in the passages on the Servant of Jehovah; but everywhere else Sion, the daughter of Sion, or Jerusalem, is the name of the banished Israel, the spiritual figure of God's people. (Cf. Zephaniah iii. 14; Isaiah lix. 20 and lxvi. 8.) The same note is struck in the Psalms,—the Babylonian captivity is the captivity of Sion, the songs of Jehovah are the songs of Sion, and it is Jerusalem which the exiles cannot forget, and upon which they pour out their hearts:

> By the rivers of Babylon we sat down and wept,
> Remembering Sion.
> . . . . . .
> How can we sing the songs of Jehovah
> In the land of the stranger?
> . . . . . .
> Jerusalem, if I forget thee,
> My right hand be withered!
> My tongue cleave to my mouth
> If thou do not haunt me,
> If I set not Jerusalem
> Above my chief joy. (Psalm cxxxvii.)

Such, now, the historian conceives to be the stages, which he sets before the reader much more in detail, in the gradual exaltation and transformation of Jerusalem:—her choice by David as capital; the building of her Temple by Solomon; the revelation by Isaiah of God's purpose in her history, with a seal put upon this by her deliverance in 701; the concentration of the national worship upon the Temple under Josiah; and, at last, her captivity, effecting the release of her life from the guilt and the habits of a history which, however divinely guided, has been

[9] "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times," Vol. 2, p. 288.

full of apostasy, and affording to her children the vision of her, seen through the distance and tears of the exile, as the image and the name of the spiritual people of God. From this on it will be found, in tracing her history, that, whatever may happen to her earthly frame, there will still be, free from its fluctuating fortunes, a "Sion" and "Jerusalem," ideal, immortal. It was from such premises that remote generations in the long years to come are found constructing their vision and doctrine of the "New Jerusalem" and the "heavenly Jerusalem"—the first radiant sketches of which, indeed, are already traced by the inspired pencil of Ezekiel.

I may be permitted, in conclusion, to repeat what I suggested at the outset, that this new treatment of the subject, according to the new methods of study that are regnant in our day, and under the new light cast upon it by the new archæology, the ample study of the languages involved, especially of personal and place names, a more fully equipped textual criticism and a saner higher criticism, with the aid of the comparative sciences in general, has not only helped to awaken the new interest in the subject that is characteristic of our day, but has given us results well worthy of the study of the historian, the exegete, and the preacher. There is a golden wealth of suggestion here as to how to make fit and effective use of the Old Testament in the preaching and the teaching of to-day.

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS.

I. THE EDITOR'S COMMENTS ON THE CONTRIBUTED ARTICLES.

I.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

By the Editor.

THIS is the day of great collective social movements for the betterment of the conditions of men. The gospel of the day is the "social gospel," and its theme is "social righteousness." Now, while we would not disparage or discourage these movements, or any movement that has for its object the suppression of social evils and the diffusion of all forms of social good, we yet need to be reminded that there is danger of magnifying one side at the expense of another. There is danger of an unwholesome and mischievous lopsidedness. There is danger that in our enthusiasm for all these forms of benevolent activity, we should overlook or neglect other things that are of more fundamental import. In short, there is grave danger that in our contagious enthusiasm for humanity we should ignore God and the relations of the individual man to him. The emphasis on these outward social activities is so great that it does obscure what is even more essential. No doubt many, whether consciously or unconsciously, actually substitute their service to humanity for their obligations to God. There are those who openly declare and profess that their religion is to do good to man, and they profess to believe that they completely fulfill their relations and obligations to God in the act and fact of their ministering to men. It is very natural to choose the duties that are easiest, and to follow the line of least resistance.

At this time and in view of the present situation, it seems most appropriate and necessary that we should turn for guidance to Him who by all parties is accepted as the supreme and final authority. For even those who make "social righteousness" their religion defer to Jesus as the Teacher, and quote him as their authority and guide. The object of the paper of the Editor is to find the setting of the social teaching of Jesus and to see how it is related to the primary aim of his mission and the basal principles of his teaching, as well as to give a brief outline of the content of his social ethics. The paper makes full recognition of the essential, organic nature of his social

teachings, as well as of the value and importance of all current movements for social reform and reconstruction as a potential content and the legitimate outgrowth of his principles and as a part of his unfolding programme.

Assuredly current forms of social service are one way, and a very good and necessary way, of serving God; but it is not the only way, as some think and even avow. Nor is it, in and by itself, the most effective way of serving God—or man. There are not wanting those who have made the actual experiment of serving men by giving the chief emphasis to efforts and movements for the improvement of the material conditions of the masses. Here is the testimony of one who made that experiment and who later discovered his mistake. These words of R. J. Campbell, pastor of the City Temple, London, are profoundly significant:

> There is certainly a change of emphasis in my work. A few years ago my sympathy with the masses in their uprising to claim their share of the material inheritance of God's earth caused me to attach a great deal of value, and to give a great deal of time, to such social efforts. To-day I have come to see that while they have a just claim on our sympathy, it is a mistake for a man like myself to expect that very much is going to be done in that way or to diffuse my energy upon these activities. I am therefore laying more and more stress upon the spiritual appeal and making that central in my ministry. Nothing is deeper and more universal than the soul's inarticulate cry for God, and the preacher who deals primarily and mainly with the central spiritual situation will be surprised at the results.

Mr. Campbell said later in a meeting of the Congregational and Presbyterian ministers of New York:

> I have to confess that the Modernists and Liberals in theology do not succeed in reaching the man in the street a whit better than the most conservative and orthodox. And I have come to believe that the failure of religious liberalism is due to its working far too much along an intellectual plane rather than along a spiritual plane.

II.

Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel.

By Professor William Adams Brown.

Dr. Brown is a native of New York City, where he was born only forty-six years ago. His mother was a daughter of Dr. William Adams, who was pastor of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church for twenty years (1853-73) and from 1873 till his death (1880) was President and Professor of Sacred Rhetoric and Pastoral Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, where Dr. Brown is now Professor of Systematic Theology. Dr. Brown is the author of a work entitled *The Essence of Christianity* (1902) and of *Chris-*

tian Theology in Outline, which is said by some to be the best work on Systematic Theology ever written by an American. He contributed a year ago to this REVIEW an article on *Changes in Theological Thought in the Last Generation.* It was a study and statement of certain theological doctrines in the abstract, and wholly without reference to practical ends or practical work. But when he comes to apply the test of preaching to theological doctrines or views, that is another thing. In the article in the present number of the REVIEW we have Dr. Brown face to face with the preaching of the gospel and its practical and immediate application to the actual needs of actual men and women. We feel at once the difference. It is the difference between the preacher and the speculative theologian. What a man preaches reveals what he is at heart, and shows what his real, vital creed is. Perhaps it was Ritschl who said that only that which can be preached to the people is good theology, or words to that effect. Compare Jonathan Edwards as a speculative thinker and philosopher with Jonathan Edwards the earnest, practical, evangelical, mighty gospel preacher. With Bushnell it was different. He got his theology through his preaching, and hence it was vital as well as theology. There are actually preachers whose preaching contradicts their theology. For example, Spurgeon's preaching contradicted his Calvinism and his Calvinistic theology, as he practically admitted once in a conversation with this writer. The same is said to be true of Professor Foster, of Chicago University. So it was with Edwards: his preaching implicitly contradicted his speculative philosophy and his iron-clad theology. Or at least in preaching he ignored both. That theology is not fit to be held which cannot be preached. John Wesley's preaching and theology coincided exactly and completely. Indeed, he had no theology but what was embodied in his preaching and is imbedded in his sermons. And there have been no great speculative Methodist theologians. It would simplify things greatly if we would eliminate and leave out of our theology all that is not preached and preachable.

Dr. Brown's article in this issue is concerned with showing how the method of the so-called new theology contributes to effectiveness in preaching the gospel to this age. This method simply takes in *all* the facts, and not just part of them, as the method of the older theologians did. The new method, including a wider range of observation, shows us, for example, that religion is one of the ultimate facts of life, a universal fact of human nature. This is shown by an historical study of the religions of other peoples, and is revealed in such contemporary phenomena as Christian Science, So-

cialism, etc. The new method enables us, by comparative processes and by giving us a standard for judging so-called religions, to get at the one true religion as contrasted with the many false religions. The result is that "Christianity is the true religion, and there is no other." Christianity is the synthesis of the whole history of religion.

Another result of the method is the emphasis that is laid on CHRIST as the center and norm of Christianity. The distinctive thing about Christianity is CHRIST. So it comes about that "the last word of the new theology is the first word of the old evangelism—'COME TO JESUS.'"

III.

MR. WESLEY'S RELATION TO THEOLOGICAL STANDARDS.

By Chancellor Burwash.

DR. BURWASH, who has been Chancellor of Victoria University for twenty-four years, is a native of the province of Quebec, in Canada. He was educated at Victoria University, Yale University, and Garrett Biblical Institute. He was a pastor for six years, then a professor in Victoria University, then dean of the theological faculty. He is a member of the Senate of the University of Toronto, and of the Council of Education of Ontario. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He is the author of *Wesley's Doctrinal Standards, A Handbook on the Epistle to the Romans, Inductive Studies in Theology,* and *Manual of Christian Theology.*

In his work on the Doctrinal Standards of Methodism he takes a new position and propounds an original view of the subject of doctrinal standards. Substantially, his view is that the standards of Methodism are not in the form of systematic theology or the form of articles of religion, but are contained in the Sermons of Mr. Wesley—those sermons in which he gave the gospel to the English and American people of his day, and through which he brought about the great revival that saved England from the double blight of rationalism and heathenism and from a repetition of the French Revolution. These standards are not formal and lifeless, as theological treatises and articles of religion usually are, but are full of the pulse and throb of spiritual power, and hence are vital to the core.

Dr. Burwash's article in this number of the REVIEW is preliminary and preparatory to a fuller exposition, which is to follow in a second article.

In this article he shows how the spirit and methods of Mr. Wesley are in strict accord and full harmony with the scientific spirit and methods of this age. His studies open up a new outlook for the student of theology, and are vital and stimulating in the highest degree.

IV.

CHARLES DICKENS AFTER A HUNDRED YEARS. *By George Herbert Clarke.*

PROFESSOR CLARKE came to us from Canada. He was educated at McMaster University, where he received his B.A., and at the University of Toronto, where he received his Master's degree. He came to the United States in 1896, and was a student for some time in the University of Chicago. He was for three years Professor of English Literature in the Peabody College for Teachers, in Nashville, and is now Professor of English Literature in the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. He has contributed to this REVIEW articles on *Hamlet, the Tragedy of Inaction,* and on *The Ring and the Book.*

A specimen of his own poetry is found in the article on *The Poet-Singers of the Land of the Maple,* in this number. The poem is entitled *The Last Lullaby.*

Those who read his former articles are prepared to expect much in his article on Charles Dickens, written in commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of his birth, and they will not be disappointed.

Of Dickens it may be said, more truly than perhaps of any other writer in English literature, that he was of the common people, he wrote about the common people, and he wrote for the common people. This is finely brought out in Professor Clarke's informing and engaging paper—how he portrayed just common people, how he has pleased and entertained and cheered common people. Of *Pickwick Papers* it has been said: "They mark an era in English literature. It was the first of a series of fiction exhibiting the life and manners of the middle and lower classes, which up to that time had rarely found an exponent. *Oliver Twist* and *Nicholas Nickleby,* which followed next, are among the first of those *social* novels which form so marked a feature of modern literature." They were both written with a purpose: the first was a ludicrous exposure of the workhouses of England, and the second was aimed at the cruelties inflicted upon their wretched pupils by the cheap schoolmasters of the time. His *Hard Times* was aimed at the manufacturing interests, and it went home. In the character of Little Nell he exhibited a power of setting forth child life and child thought unequaled before the appearance of George Eliot.

Those who are already acquainted with Dickens will be delighted to renew their friendship with him and his characters in reading Professor Clarke's paper; while to others it will serve as an introduction, if perchance there be any among the readers of this REVIEW or any other readers in the world of English-speaking people who, not being acquainted with him, need an introduction.

V.

THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD-WIDE MOVEMENT FOR THE LIBERATION OF WOMAN.
By Miss Belle H. Bennett.

MISS BENNETT has for years been closely identified with the woman's work for missions, both home and foreign, in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. She was, until the unification of the two Boards by the last General Conference of the Church, at Asheville, in May, 1910, the President of the Woman's Home Mission Society of the Church. She is now President of the *Woman's Council,* which controls and directs the activities of the joint Board, both in the foreign fields and in the home land. At their recent meeting this Council determined that they would undertake a forward movement of large dimensions in their work for next year.

The history of the work and the achievements of women in recent years in all forms of Christian activity and social reform is a veritable revelation—a matter of special wonder. It is the opening of a new chapter both in the providence of God and in the history of man. It is the advent of a new force in the terrific struggle of the kingdom of God against the kingdom and powers of darkness. It marks, no, it makes, an epoch in the history of humanity. We wonder why it did not come sooner. We can but marvel that God permitted it to delay so long. But it has come, and by every test and token God has come with it; or rather let us say that God has come in it—it is another coming of God into the world. And the man who would fight it must be a man of great courage. In this connection one is reminded of the words of a certain doctor of the law, who, in referring to the men that were introducing a new movement on earth, said, "And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this work be one originated by men, it will come to naught, but if it is of God, ye will not be able to stop them. Let them alone, I say, lest sooner or later ye wake up to find that ye are fighting against God himself." So in view of the religious, philanthropic, and social work of the Christian women of this day, everything should be done to encourage and help them, and, falling on their knees, men should give thanks to God for this new reënforcement coming to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

Miss Bennett's paper is not primarily or chiefly a plea; it is really a history of the beginnings and the development, in different countries, of the world-wide movement for the liberation of woman. It does not confine itself to woman's widening sphere and multiplying opportunities for work in religious, philanthropic, and social activities, but includes also a history of the extent to which the rights

and privileges of civil citizenship have been granted to her in different countries.

Miss Bennett treats the subject under the following heads:

1. The history of the extension of the privileges of higher education to women.

2. The history of the evolution and the present status of laws regarding the property and personal rights of women.

3. The history of the entrance of women into industrial occupations.

4. The history of the extension by governments of rights and privileges of civil and political citizenship to women.

5. The history and status, past and present, of the participation of women in the government and administration of the various Churches.

The paper is a most informing one—a distinct and valuable contribution to the history and literature of the great and vital subject which it treats.

VI.

THE FIRST LIFE-AND-DEATH STRUGGLE OF CHRISTIANITY.

By Profesor John Alfred Faulkner.

PROFESSOR FAULKNER is by birth a Canadian. He was born at Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, in 1857. He was educated at Acadia College, Nova Scotia (1878), and at Drew Seminary (1891). He studied in the University of Leipzig in 1892-3, and the University of Bonn in 1893-4. He served as pastor in Pennsylvania and New York for several years. He has been, since 1897, Professor of Historical Theology at Drew Seminary. He has written several works, all bearing on the history of Methodism.

The subject on which Professor Faulkner writes in this number of the REVIEW is one of the most interesting in the whole history of Christianity, and it is one of the most difficult of elucidation, as is shown by the different and conflicting interpretations of it quoted by Professor Faulkner. Harnack defines it in one way, Walther in another, and Seeberg in yet another, while Lipsius differs from all.

The principles out of which Gnosticism was developed, or rather of which it made a perverted use, are found in the New Testament itself, where we find in the writings of both Paul and John notes of different grades of Christian attainment. Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians of those who were in some sense "carnal" while others were "spiritual" (1 Cor. iii. 1-3). Again he speaks of a certain class of believers as "perfect" or full-grown (1 Cor. ii. 6, Phil. iii. 15). See also 1 John ii. 20. Different grades of attainment are recognized and

provided for in the Roman Catholic Church all through its history and at the present time. There is the great mass of its members who *belong* to that Church, who attend its service of mass, and who pay their dues; and there are others whose lives are really conformed both inwardly and outwardly to the New Testament standards of righteousness. Then again there are distinct orders, brotherhoods and sisterhoods, composed of those whose lives are wholly consecrated to the duties of religion, such as the Jesuits, the Franciscan monks, the Carmelite monks, the Trappist monks, and others for men, and the various orders of nuns for women. The same thing is seen, though in a less formal way, even in the Methodist Church. There are those who become members of that Church as "seekers" or "probationers," those who are truly regenerated, and those who have attained what, in Methodist phraseology, is termed Christian perfection or entire sanctification. These are differences that force themselves on the attention of thoughtful persons in every Church, whether there be technical terms of distinction or not.

And—if the statement be not misunderstood—there is undoubtedly a true Christian *gnosis,* by which is meant an inner spiritual enlightenment which enables its possessor, freed from the illusions of sense and of the world, to discern spiritual realities and to see all things in their true light and to estimate them at their real value. Paul speaks explicitly of this state in 1 Cor. ii. 15: "He that is spiritual discerneth all things." And John means the same thing when he says: "And ye have an anointing from the Holy One, and ye *know* all things" (1 John ii. 20).

But this Christian *gnosis* is different from Gnosticism in two respects at least:

1. It is not a boastful profession, as is implied in 1 Tim. vi. 20, and as was conspicuously true of the Gnostics of the first, second, and third centuries, and is true, though in a less degree, of the Gnostics (Christian Scientists) of our day.

2. It does not undertake and profess to construct a philosophy of the universe and to give a solution of its "riddle," as it was a specialty of all forms of ancient Gnosticism to do, and as the founder of our contemporary Gnosticism (Christian Science) so naïvely professes to have done.

The same thing is true in the heathen religions, where the distinction is made between the "initiated" and others. In these the distinction is based on "knowledge"—a term which in many instances is really a technical one and has a technical meaning and application. It is so to this day in Buddhism, for example. Indeed,

the very word "Buddha" means "the perfectly enlightened one," "the wise one." We have the same thing to-day, crystallized in the word "theosophy," which literally means *wisdom or knowledge concerning God,* but in its modern form claims to embrace the truth underlying all systems of religion, philosophy, and science.

An instance which is more familiar to us is the system which is known as "Christian Science." Here again is the word for knowledge, for "science" in this phrase has the meaning which it has in the old English of the passage in 1 Tim. vi. 20. There the Greek word is *gnosis,* the regular word for *knowledge.* Christian Science, then, is the modern form of Gnosticism, and the Christian Scientists are the modern Christian Gnostics. It is not accurate to call the "advanced thinkers" or the rationalistic theologians of to-day the modern Gnostics. Their spirit and method are both different from those of the Gnostics of the early centuries, with the possible exception of Marcion.

At any rate, the facts that have been given in the foregoing paragraphs will enable us fairly to understand how Gnosticism originated and what its basal principles were.

Professor Faulkner, touching first the biblical hints concerning the distinctions of grade in spirituality, which are marked by different degrees of knowledge, goes on to indicate those tendencies in the Christian writers of the sub-apostolic period, as well as in non-Christian Jewish writers and in the Hellenic world, which leaned toward Gnosticism, as well as the elements which came in from the cosmogany, astrology, and magic of the Orient. In the next place he explains the situation in the early Church which made it possible for the teachers of this new eclectic system, this synthesis and syncretism of all sorts of vagaries, to invade the Church and there teach their doctrines. He then gives a very informing statement of the ten constituent elements of this new *Christian* "knowledge" (compare "Christian Science"). This paragraph shows what this *Christian* Gnosis—*i. e.,* Gnosticism—was, in its entirety, as a system. It is one of the best summaries that we have ever seen. Then, summing up and generalizing, he gives his definition of Gnosticism after having shown the unsatisfactoriness of the definitions of Harnack, and Walther, and Seeberg, and Lipsius.

He devotes special attention and considerable space to a more thorough study of the system of Marcion, the most brilliant and dangerous of all those early Christian Scientists. His system was so plausible as to deceive the very elect. Indeed, one great German scholar of modern times has called Marcionism "the Protestantism of

the ancient Church." But, as Faulkner says, it was not true Christianity at all, it was really "fundamental heathenism with Christian elements."

In the last place, we are told how Gnosticism was overcome and how the Church was saved from its destructive blight. It was by direct refutations of its teachings by Church Fathers, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Hyppolytus; by the production of brief and ready, but conprehensive, confessions of faith, gathering up the apostolic faith in a few short statements, and expressing the fundamental facts of the life of Christ over against Gnostic evaporations. Another potent means of overcoming the Gnostic movement was the fixing of the Canon of the New Testament and excluding from it the swarm of false Gospels, Acts, and Epistles forged and put in circulation by the Gnostics to support their views. One of these was the so-called *Gospel of Peter*. And, lastly, Gnosticism was overcome, strange to say! by absorption. Some of the Gnostics themselves were won back into the Church, and some of their views and methods were either taken up by the Church or were allowed to modify the doctrines and influence the practices of the Church.

The case of Tatian is one of special interest and of real significance also. He enjoyed high honor in the Church in spite of his (mild) Gnosticism, as is shown by the wide acceptance of his Gospel Harmony, or Diatessaron, as it is generally called, which is a blending together of our four Gospels into one continuous history. This Harmony, containing, as it does, the Fourth Gospel, is a testimony to its existence and its equal acceptance by the Church, which reaches back to within less than a lifetime of the death of the apostle John, and is a strong external witness to John's authorship of the Gospel.

VII.

George Eliot and Elizabeth Barrett Browning.

By Mrs. Gross Alexander.

The writer of this article is already well known, through the products of her pen, both to the readers of the Review and to a wider circle beyond. She is the author of two books, one of which was published in the South, the other in the North. One of these is *The Life of Lucinda B. Helm,* the founder of the Woman's Home Mission Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; the other is *Light Through Darkened Windows.* She has contributed to this Review, among other things, an article on *Judas Iscariot,* which

for its striking originality attracted wide attention and was the subject of much comment and discussion in the press.

It was a happy, as it was a very original, thought that led Mrs. Alexander to couple together the names of George Eliot and Elizabeth Barrett Browning, and to make a comparative study of their lives, characters, and work. The method makes each character and career stand out more vividly by the comparison and contrast. The result is an incisive and vigorous study and analysis of these two great personalities. The treatment follows closely the tenor of their lives. It traces the similarity of their dispositions and tendencies in childhood and youth. It notes the striking parallelisms—as also the contrasts—in their early life. It describes the process and progress of their education. Says the writer: "If in the early and formative years of their lives they could have met and known each other, it is not difficult to imagine that they would have been friends. As it was, they only heard of each other later in life and at a distance, like 'ships that pass in the night.' "

But if in earlier life there was in many respects a striking similarity in their dispositions, tastes, tendencies, and even their characters, and a striking resemblance in their education and development, in middle and later life the divergence between them began and continued to grow ever wider, till at the last it was the contrast between light and darkness.

The process that led to George Eliot's renunciation in mature life of the religious beliefs of her childhood and girlhood is skillfully traced by our author. As to her inward life, her religious experience was not thorough and vital. It was, perhaps, "the product of her emotional nature." At any rate, her intellectual power and development were precocious, disproportionate, almost abnormal. And she had no religious teacher who understood her case and could guide her through the crisis of those fateful years.

On the contrary, just at this juncture she was brought into contact and even intimacy with a circle of very intellectual people, who at the same time were skeptics or agnostics, the Brays, the Hennells, Herbert Spencer, Lewes, Harriet Martineau, and others. This environment was congenial to the deeper strain of her nature. Her intellectual craving and pride were fascinated and flattered by these companionships. She deliberately renounced her faith in Christianity, and was now free—free to think as she pleased, and free to do as might seem to her to be expedient. The sad sequel is not surprising. It might easily have been foreseen. The convictions that are based on the expediency theory of morality are not strong

enough to withstand the storm and stress of the hour and power of strong temptation. The shallowness and the weakness of this view and theory of moral obligation are shown in the answer which George Eliot gave to a question of Lady Ponsonby, which was in substance this: "If there is no God and no future, why should we trouble ourselves to do what is right?" Her reply was in substance: "Because one feels better afterwards, just as one feels better after taking a bath." Surely this needs no comment. But the sad sequel to the fateful act of George Eliot's great renunciation is drawn with such skill and pathos in our article that nothing remains to be said. And it becomes all the more pathetic in contrast with the growing radiance and beauty, as well as the deepening peace, of the mature life and the last years of Mrs. Browning—woman, poet, seer, saint—as these are portrayed by Mrs. Alexander.

VIII.

THE POET-SINGERS OF THE LAND OF THE MAPLE.

By Newton MacTavish.

THIS article was written at the request of the Editor by Mr. Newton MacTavish, the editor of *The Canadian Magazine,* a high-grade periodical, which is in the Dominion what the *Century Magazine, Harper's Magazine, Scribner's Magazine,* and *The Atlantic Monthly* are in the United States.

Canada has produced a very extensive, varied, and rich literature, which began back in the period of French domination in what is now the province of Quebec and the neighboring island of Nova Scotia. Several of the works of this period, both in prose and poetry, were crowned by the French Academy—couronné par l' Académie Française. That this romantic land of the far north had the materials, of a rich literature is evidenced by the touching story of Evangeline of Acadie, which has been enshrined in the soft, flowing verse of our own Longfellow.

Most of the poems quoted by Mr. MacTavish are poems of nature inspired by the glorious scenery of that dreamland of beauty and splendor. The growing spirit of nationalism and patriotism also is voiced in some of the poems quoted by Mr. MacTavish. That spirit had another and rather emphatic expression in the rejection of the reciprocity proposal of Mr. Taft. Here is another patriotic poem, not quoted by Mr. MacTavish, called

DOMINION DAY.

Canada, Canada, land of the maple,
Queen of the forest and river and lake,

Open thy soul to the voice of thy people,
Close not thy heart to the music they make.
Bells, chime out merrily,
Trumpets, call cheerily,
Silence is vocal, and sleep is awake.

Canada, Canada, land of the bravest,
Sons of the war-path and sons of the sea,
Land of no slave-lash, to-day thou enslavest
Millions of hearts with affection for thee.
Bells, chime out merrily,
Trumpets, call cheerily,
Let the sky ring with the shout of the free!

Canada, Canada, land of the fairest
Daughters of snow that are kissed by the sun,
Binding the charms of all lands that are rarest,
Like the bright cestus of Venus, in one.
Bells, chime out merrily,
Trumpets, call cheerily,
A new reign of beauty on earth is begun.

Robert W. Service is the interpreter who gives voice to the experiences and the moods of the rough pioneers and gold hunters of the Yukon. Here is a specimen verse from his

SPELL OF THE YUKON.

I wanted the gold and I sought it,
I scrabbled and mucked like a slave;
Was it famine or scurvy?—I fought it.
I buried my youth in a grave.

I wanted the gold, and I got it;
Came out with a fortune last fall—
Yet somehow life's not what I thought it,
And somehow *the gold is not all.*

The poetry of Canada is not without the flavor of a delicious, bubbling humor, which has also the savor of healing in it. W. H. Drummond, of Montreal, has written verses in the broken English which is spoken by the French (who speak English at all) in the province of Quebec. He tells of a storm on Lac St. Pierre, in which an old wooden scow was wrecked and all on board were drowned:

THE WRECK OF THE "JULIE PLANTE."

De win', she blow, blow, blow,
De men got scart an' run below,
For de win' she blow lak hurricane.
Bimeby she blow some more,
And de wood-scow bus' on Lac St. Pierre
Wan arpent from de shore.

Now all good wood-scow man
  Tak warnin' by dat storm,
An' go an' marry nice French girl
  An' leef on wan beeg farm.
De win' can blow lak hurricane,
  An' spose she blow some more,
You can't get drown on Lac St. Pierre
  So long you stay on shore.

The paper of Mr. MacTavish speaks for itself. It is, for the most part, a collection of representative poems from the heart of the sons and daughters of our Lady of the Seas and the Snows—and they also speak for themselves.

It will serve as an introduction for us of the Sunny South to the pulsing literature of the Land of the Maple, the stalwart Queen of the Northern Lands and Seas. And the fine specimens given by him will whet our appetites for more.

IX.

Christianity and Recent Philosophical Tendencies.

By Rev. H. Maldwyn Hughes.

Dr Hughes is a native of Wales. He was born at Trefeglwys in 1875. He is now pastor of the Wesleyan Methodist Church at Southport, England. He was educated at the famous Kingswood School, at Aberystwyth University College, and Didsbury College.

He was a delegate from the Wesleyan Methodist Church to the recent Ecumenical Conference at Toronto. His paper on *Christianity and Recent Philosophical Tendencies,* while one of the briefest, was one of the ablest given at the Conference. With singular mastery of the present philosophical situation in its bearing on Christianity, he passes by all that is unessential and seizes on the two salient facts, one of which is the revolt against the barren intellectualism which has been prevalent, and the other the recognition of the worth of the phenomena of the spiritual life. With equal insight and discrimination he singles out the three outstanding movements of contemporary philosophy, and examines them in their relation to Christian truth.

The first of these is *Pragmatism,* the chief exponent of which is an American, Professor William James. His exposition and criticism of Pragmatism is a marvel and a model of conciseness and lucidity. His paragraph on the subject gives a clearer conception of the true and the false in Pragmatism, of its strength and its weakness, than any article or book that we have seen. For example: "Pragmatism holds that the truth of an idea is de-

termined by its workability. . . . That a belief appears to be workable does not prove it to be wholly true, but only that it has in it some elements of truth, which cannot fail to bring forth fruit."

The second of the three is the philosophy of Bergson, a Frenchman. Bergson denies the competence of the intellect in philosophical matters on the ground that its outlook is shaped by practical needs. Philosophic knowledge, standing on the shoulders of scientific knowledge, attains to supra-intellectual intuition and apprehends Reality. But Bergson's intuition, while it is immediate contact with reality, apprehends reality without purposive quality, while Christian faith is immediate contact with Reality as concerned with the realization of an external purpose.

The third movement in contemporary philosophy is that of the great German thinker, Eucken, who calls his philosophy *Activism*. By this he means the activity in man of a Spiritual Life, which has a reality and independence of its own,[1] and which makes spiritually fruitful the lives of those in whom its activity is allowed free course. This Spiritual Life unifies and transforms our personalities, and joins us to our fellow-men in the fellowship of a hidden life. And it cannot possibly be self-originated, but can only be explained on the assumption of the invasion of our life by a higher order of reality.

As to Christ, Eucken considers him "simply the high-water mark of a movement which embraces the whole of humanity." But, as Dr. Hughes points out, "Philosophy is not religion, and necessarily falls short of it in spiritual insight. Philosophy is not competent to pronounce on the Person of Christ until it has been enlightened by the *experience* of his indwelling."

X.

WORDSWORTH'S HEALING POWER. *By Mrs. F. L. Townsend.*

THE name of Mrs. Townsend is already familiar to the readers of the REVIEW. She is one of its most valued contributors, and she is one of its stanchest friends. Her last contribution before the present one was a fine appreciation of Mrs. Humphrey Ward's book, *Marriage à la Mode*. She not only gave a discriminating valuation of the book, with some just criticisms of its faults; she herself also took up the social problem which it is the purpose of the book to treat, and in her quiet, womanly, effective way, she dealt with that social evil, in which our own dear land has attained such an unen-

[1] This is closely akin to the view of Schleiermacher. Compare the review of his theology in this number of the REVIEW.

viable notoriety, such a bad preëminence—the divorce evil. Mr. Roosevelt, on receiving a copy of the number containing the article, wrote the Editor: "I was immensely struck with Mrs. Townsend's article. I thank you sincerely for having sent it to me."

In the present article she deals with a subject of finer quality. She comes to apply her delicate touch to the elusive secret of Wordsworth's inimitable art. She does not give us a dry discussion of the abstract principles of the poetic art, as the common method is. She employs a method which is the most effective of all—she gives in concrete terms, in terms of personal experience, a charming story of the soothing and healing effect which the reading of Wordsworth's poems had on her during a long spell of illness, when her powers were so spent that nothing else could appeal to her. Homer does not undertake to describe the beauty of his heroine; he describes the effect which her beauty had on others. Mrs. Townsend does not undertake to analyze Wordsworth's poetry, or to discourse learnedly about "The Philosophy of Composition," or to expound in abstract terms "The Poetic Principle" or "The Rationale of Verse." She tells how she was affected, soothed, rested, refreshed, restored, through contact with the pure and gentle spirit that breathed in certain of Wordsworth's poems.

As in her former article she touched incidentally upon a great social problem, so here she touches incidentally, though very deftly, the current question of woman's sphere, in connection with her appreciation of Dorothy Wordsworth, the poet's sister. She holds to the old conservative view, in this respect differing with Miss Bennett's view as expressed on another page.

XI.

THE RESURRECTION OF JERUSALEM. *By Professor Geo. B. Eager.*

THE new interest in Jerusalem is witnessed by the phenomenal increase in the literature of the subject not only in the papers of the Palestine Exploration Society, where, of course, one would expect it, but in the monographs of exact learning in German, French, and English, special articles in the great reviews and in the new Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, and in new volumes that are devoted wholly to the subject, such as that of George Adam Smith, that of Selah Merrill, and that of Lewis Bayles Paton. How is it to be accounted for? Dr. Eager enumerates four causes to which it is to be ascribed.

He takes up in turn the three volumes just mentioned, and gives what is a very good review of each one of them—an interesting study

in itself. In the next place, he illustrates in detail what the application of the historical method and the new science of archæology has done toward giving us a completer history of Jerusalem from the date of the Tel El-Amarna tablets, about thirty-three centuries ago. He reconstructs the abounding human life and the full-grown civilization which is reflected in these letters, and shows that Jerusalem was a living part of it all. Some of the letters are from the feudatory chief of Jerusalem who held it as a tributary of Egypt. Dr. Eager's discussion of the question as to who the Jebusites were leads him to favor the view that they were of the inscrutable Hittite race. He descends to the time when David chose Jerusalem as his capital, gives the reasons why he did so, and points out the effects which that choice had on the after history of Israel. He traces the history on down to the time when Jerusalem rose to preëminence among the shrines of Israel, and at last as comprising in herself all the significance of Israel and standing for the whole people of God, as in Ezekiel and in the Psalms of the Exile.

> If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,
> My right hand be withered;
> My tongue cleave to my mouth,
> If I prefer not Jerusalem
> Above my chief joy. (Psalm 137.)

But no synopsis or summary can do justice to the contents of this scholarly and interesting paper of Dr. Eager.

II. BOOK REVIEWS.

THE GREATEST WORK OF THE GREATEST GERMAN THEOLOGIAN.[1]

It is the consensus of opinion among students of theology that the name of Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher is the greatest (as it is also the longest) in the history of theological thought since Martin Luther and John Calvin, and his work the most influential and far-reaching. "His influence is increasing with every decade. The multitudinous references to him in almost every subject of present-day theological inquiry, together with the import and fruitfulness of his suggestions, has kindled in very many minds a deep de-

[1] *The Theology of Schleiermacher.* A Condensed Presentation of his Chief Work, *The Christian Faith.* By George Cross, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Newton Theological Seminary, Newton Center, Mass. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois. 1911. Pp. 337. Price, $1.65, postpaid.

sire to find these for themselves in his system of doctrine, and to read them in their context and wider bearings, and also to catch something of the impulse and sweep of his thought." It seems most opportune just at this time, when there is such unrest and uncertainty in theological thinking and so many attempts at theological reconstruction, that his formal treatise on Theology should be brought prominently to the attention of the theological public, and especially fortunate that it should be given to the public of America and Great Britain in an English dress. That this had not been done long before now, is unaccountable—unless it was due to the fact that his thought is so profound, his reasoning so abstruse, and his style, with its interminable and complex sentences, is so baffling, that nobody had the courage to undertake it. The work of Professor Cross is not a translation proper; it is a condensation in English of the substance of the master's masterpiece, *The Christian Faith.* In the original the work covers twelve hundred pages; Professor Cross has gotten the heart of it into one hundred and eighty pages. But even with this well-put condensation and summary, it is difficult, if not impossible, to understand it without possession of the setting, without a knowledge of the life of Schleiermacher, his intellectual and religious development, the influences and processes and forces that played upon him, and, above all, his own personal religious experience. Mr. Cross gives us in his first section of sixty-four pages a succinct and vital sketch of the *Life of Schleiermacher,* and in the next section of forty-six pages an account of his *Relation to Earlier Protestantism,* which, while it is helpful, is not so clear and satisfactory. These two sections of historical introduction supply the setting for Schleiermacher and his work. Without it, it would be impossible to understand either. And even with it, it is by no means easy to follow understandingly the course of thought.

Schleiermacher was born at Breslau in Prussia in 1768 (and not in 1763, as Professor Cross has it). He was the son of a preacher, who was a chaplain in the army, and the grandson of a preacher. But that was a matter of no great significance, for at that time, as alas! in too many instances at this time, preachers in the (State) Church of Germany were mere religious officials, knowing little or nothing of the experience of the spiritual life, and having none of the qualifications for the business of preaching the gospel in any vital or powerful way. But *it happened* that when the boy "Fritz" was ten years of age, the regiment of which his father was chaplain was quartered at a place called Gnadenfrei, which was one of the chief centers of the Moravian Brotherhood. While he was there, through

the "personal evangelism" of one of the Moravian brethren, the father was converted and became a subject of that supernatural grace which the Moravians made central in their Christian life and teaching. From this time all was changed. As was natural, the converted chaplain became anxious for the conversion of his wife and children. The conversion of the mother brought a new and powerful religious influence into the home. The eldest child, a daughter named Lotte, was soon converted, and Fritz became greatly distressed. He attempted to reproduce in himself that sense of utter sinfulness and that experience of supernatural change which was demanded in response to the teachings of the Moravians. Their experience and profession of a conscious intercourse of soul with Christ prompted in him longings and strivings which for some years remained unsatisfied. His mother saw in all this an answer to her prayers, but she did not know how to bring him relief. After a year or more at a boarding school, where he became deeply interested in classical studies, he returned to the home, where he was a good deal with his father, and they often talked together about religious subjects. Twenty years afterwards, in a letter to a friend, he recalls a walk he took in company with his father when there came to him the feeling that he was at last "a subject of divine grace," as the Moravians expressed it. In this letter, written in 1802, he says, referring to that walk with his father: "Here it was that there came to me, *for the first time,* the consciousness of man's relation to a higher world. Here was the beginning of that mystical experience which has been of so much worth to me, and which, through all the storms of skepticism, has supported and preserved me. Then, it was only in germ; now [1802] it has attained to full development, and I can say that, after all I have passed through, I have become a Herrnhuter [Moravian] again—*only of a higher order.*"

In May, 1783, he joined the Moravian Society and entered the Moravian Pædagogium at Niesky, which was a sort of preparatory college for young men who wished to enter the ministry. It was a student-cloister where the students became members of a new family. The teachers had a sort of parental relation to them; and while the course of study was fairly broad, including a high standard in Greek and Latin classics and instruction in science and the fine arts, the aim of the institution was mainly heart-culture. (It would be a great thing if the Christian schools and colleges of our day would imitate their example and adopt the same standards and aims as primary.)

After remaining two years and a half at Niesky, he was, in 1785,

promoted to the theological seminary at Barby, where the aims and conditions were much the same as at Niesky. Undoubtedly the régime was too rigid and exacting, and it produced a spirit of revolt. Some of the students began to read forbidden books surreptitiously, and they began to study philosophy and the works of the rationalists. Schleiermacher felt suspicious of a theology that was afraid of open battle with its opponents. Suspicion deepened into doubt and doubt into skepticism, and by the end of the second semester he had definitely rejected the orthodox theology; and after much hesitation and struggle he informed his father, whose heart was broken over it. He had to leave the Moravian seminary on account of his changed views, and he spent the next two years at the University of Halle, where he gratified his omnivorous appetite by the reading and study of the Greek philosophers, the Church Fathers, the theologians of the Reformation, Spinoza, Descartes, and Locke, and the works of Lessing, Kant, Wolff, Herder, and others. He was determined to know what all the great productive thinkers had said, and he traversed the history of human opinion down to his own day and his contemporaries. Though it was a matter of poignant distress to his father and to his sister Lotte, who throughout her life was a very guardian angel to him, it proved in the end a blessing and a benefit, that for a time he was under the spell of rationalism and skepticism.

He passed through a period when rationalism swept away the doctrinal beliefs which he had earlier in life received on the authority of others. But through this experience he came to know rationalism, and to understand its strength and its weakness. He found nothing to satisfy the demands of his nature in rationalism, which employed and trusted entirely the intellect and ignored the claims of feeling; and he returned to the simple faith of his early Moravian experiences. Writing in after years to a friend, he said: "My religion is so through and through a heart-religion that I have no room for any other." And still later, when he was court preacher at Stolpe (1802-1804), he wrote concerning his circle of friends there: "How sweetly do we all cleave with the same religious feeling to the loving and informing Christ! Never since I left the Herrnhut Congregation [*i. e.*, the Moravian Society] have I so rejoiced in my Christian feelings and in my Christian faith; nor have I ever beheld its living power so spread around me." There is little doubt that but for his earlier experience of genuine conversion, while among the Moravians, he would never have recovered from the blight of rationalism, for he would have had nothing to return to. He would have known nothing but the barren processes of intellectual going to

and fro among the theories and vagaries of men. Such a security is a genuine, thorough experience of real conversion in early life, when the native sense of sin and need responds and surrenders unquestioningly to the gospel without having to go through all the processes of the rational (and rationalistic) justification and demonstration of the truth of religion, and, as an effect of this surrender, gets an actual experience of such a radical, complete, pervasive inward spiritual transformation and re-creation that at the time there is no room left, no inclination, no ability to doubt that it is God who has done it.[2]

It was this ineffaceable and unforgettable fact in the life of Schleiermacher that saved him from the death-by-starvation effect of a soulless, blind, barren, and brutal rationalism. And from the point of view of this vital fact of a conscious experience of God in the soul, he was able to construct, and did construct, a new theology, which was also substantially the old theology, but on a broader and firmer basis.

The true significance of Schleiermacher is expressed in these words of another: "He was the first thinker of note to undertake the task of reconstructing the doctrinal system [of Christianity] from the standpoint of evangelical religious experience." The task in its details which confronted Schleiermacher was this:

> To describe the inner nature of religion, and especially of Christianity, so as to exhibit its basis in an original human induement, and its freedom from dependence, on the one hand, on a body of objective knowledge, or, on the other hand, on a form of morality; to relate Christianity as an historical religion to other historical religions so as to bring into relief its preëminence among the various forms of religious faith; to indicate the place of the Christian religious experience in the realm of human consciousness so as to vindicate the claim that it supplies the highest interpretation of the universe; to restate the interpretations of the Christian faith which have appeared in the great historical confessional and credal symbols so as to bring out their religious content, and at the same time to clear away those traditional, philosophical, and superstitious excrescences which had obscured the truth of Christianity; to furnish to aggressive Protestant Christianity an instrument for its advancement, in the form of a reasoned systematic statement of its own inherent nature.

His accomplishment of this task is found in his work on *The Christian Faith.* The body of the volume of Professor Cross is devoted to a presentation, in condensed form, of the substance of this, the chief work of Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher begins by laying a foundation for his work in the very nature of religion in general,

[2]It is a fact of deep significance that as Schleiermacher who saved theology was saved from rationalism by the Moravians and their simple gospel of faith and regeneration, so, by the same people and the same gospel, Wesley was saved from formalism and England from heathenism.

which is not a product of thought or an inference from moral principles, but an original, inalienable, constituent element and induement of the human consciousness. "Religion is an immediate experience of the self-consciousness in the form of feeling. It is *immediate* in that it is not derived from any other experience or exercise of the mind, but is inseparable from self-consciousness: it is *feeling* in that it is subjective experience and not objective idea, and in this respect it is a form of self-consciousness." Then he proceeds to the exposition of his system of Christian Theology. He first explains what is meant by Dogmatics. His method is to unfold the religious self-consciousness in general, and then to develop the *Antithesis in the Religious Self-Consciousness* in Christian experience. The first side of the antithesis is the unfolding of the consciousness of sin; the other side of the antithesis is the unfolding of the consciousness of grace. Under this latter head he discusses the Person of Christ and the Work of Christ. Then follows his exposition of the manner in which communion with the Redeemer and salvation is expressed in the individual soul, namely, through regeneration which is mediated through repentance and faith, and is accompanied by justification and sanctification, which he describes as "movement toward holiness."

The book closes with an *Estimate,* by Professor Cross, of the significance of Schleiermacher's contribution to Christian thought and theology, together with *Critical Comments on Important Elements* of his system.

GROSS ALEXANDER.

Nashville, Tenn.

THE FIFTH GOSPEL.[1]

IN the Introduction to his *Vie de Jésus,* Renan wrote: "J'eus devant les yeux un cinquième Evangile, lacéré mais lisible encore."[2] Upon reading this little book by Brückner, packed as it is with interesting and important and sometimes startling facts and suggestions, one is made to feel that the Holy Land is indeed a Fifth Gospel, certainly when viewed by as observant eyes and discriminating a mind as those of this author. It is surprising that he was able to gather so much material of the very first importance during only three months spent in Palestine, as a member of the archæological institute in Jerusalem. But as a biblical scholar of the first rank, he was already steeped in the literature and had the best facilities for gathering informa-

[1] *Das funfte Evangelium (Das heilige Land).* By Dr. Martin Brückner, in the Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher series. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1910.

[2] I had before my eyes a fifth gospel, lacerated but still legible.

tion. Throughout the book he shows a knowledge of the language spoken to-day by the people, as well as of the necessary ancient languages. There is no danger of his being taken in by the superstitions and traditions everywhere to be found in Palestine, and yet he knows how to turn even these to good account.

While the book sparkles with graphic details, one serious purpose runs through it all. The author stands in the midst of a fierce conflict that is raging in Germany and elsewhere regarding the Gospels and Jesus, and he has personally a keen sense of the gravity of the questions involved. His great concern is to determine what light the "Fifth Gospel" can throw on the situation. For example, Kalthoff held that Christianity was a movement of the masses in which the idea of a personal founder was but a personification of the ideals and experiences of the community. According to him, the Gospels originated in Rome. Our author shows that Palestine to-day is very much what it was two thousand years ago (with the exception of those evidences of human progress, the cigarette and the gun); and with wealth of detail and effective pointedness he proves that references to clothing, food, dwellings, occupations, vegetation, physical conditions, animals, social classes, demon-possession, burial customs, and other things, point clearly and unmistakably to the Palestinian origin of the Gospels. (This does not, of course, mean that the Gospels in their present form were necessarily written in Palestine.) To give an illustration, some of the parables of our Lord reflect economic conditions found in the more productive sections of Palestine to-day, where farmers are in a position of absolute dependence, "over their ears in debt," while the capitalists who own the land live in Beirut.

Incidentally our author suggests some interesting interpretations. For instance, he says that the houses of the country people are of simple construction, man and beast living under one roof. The rear room, intended for people, is pretty dark, so that the woman in the parable (Luke xv. 8) had to light her lamp in the daytime to find her lost coin. Luke does not mean to say that Jesus was born in a separate stable, which does not exist in Palestine, but rather in the apartment of the house intended for beasts. The inn referred to was probably the empty house which hospitality to-day provides for transients. As the Talmud prohibits the presence of roosters in Jerusalem, the cock-crowing in the court of the high priest was probably a designation of the time of the day. Flesh is rarely eaten in Palestine except on festive occasions. Many farmers eat it at their marriage for the first and last time in their life. In this connection

we call to mind the parable of the Prodigal Son and the parables of the Kingdom, in which the eating of flesh took place at a marriage or other feast. In the story of the cursing of the fig tree we read, "For it was not the season of figs" (Mark xi. 13); but this remark does violence to the sense. To be sure, there are no ripe figs at Easter-time, and yet in Palestine they enjoy eating unripe figs, which have a pleasant, acid taste. Since they are green, one cannot see them on the tree without approaching near. Horses are never mentioned in the Gospels, and are hardly to be found in Palestine to-day except for foreigners. Hogs are unclean for Arabs as well as Jews. Dogs are not house animals, but live in groups on the streets, where they act as scavengers. The story of the Canaanite woman (Mark vii. 28) would not fit strictly Palestinian conditions. It will be seen that these stories would not apply to Rome.

Well may one to-day look out upon the poor people of Palestine and have compassion on them, because they are as sheep without a shepherd. They are now, as then, detached from the business, history, culture, art, and science of the outside world. Let these illustrations suffice. Especially suggestive, however, are the author's remarks on popular religion, expressing itself in veneration of saints and faith in demons.

The second section of the book discusses the Palestinian localities mentioned in the Gospels. A part of this treatment is certainly astonishing, as, for instance, that dealing with the childhood home of Jesus. I cannot attempt in this review to do justice to the many and intricate questions raised in this section of the book. The judgments of the author have been largely influenced by what is known as the *religionsgeschichtliche* school of criticism. He seems even to look with favor upon W. B. Smith's derivation of the word "Nazareth," though in most cases he rejects the conjectures of Arthur Drews, Jensen, and others of that school. Yet one cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that he thinks it so much worth while to set forth and refute their views.

Another impression that the book makes is through its use of the Fourth Gospel. Critical scholars have for a number of years used this Gospel with great caution in reconstructing the life of Christ, giving the preference to the Synoptics. P. W. Schmiedel has carried this so far as to derive the Fourth Gospel from the Synoptic Gospels, as, for example, the raising of Lazarus from the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. Brückner gives the Gospel of John independent historical standing, and finds solid ground for his position in the "Fifth Gospel."

Brückner repeatedly insists that his task is a modest one. He admits that he has raised questions as well as answered questions. The ultimate questions he has not pretended to answer. But he has been successful in demonstrating that the origin of the Gospels was in Palestine, and that they cannot be derived from Greek and Roman life, from Alexandrian culture, or from social conditions in Italy. To those with whom this fact was already as good as axiomatic, his may in this respect appear to be a superfluous service; but others will find in his work a contribution to that controversy in which (not to speak of Bruno Bauer) J. M. Robertson, W. B. Smith, Kalthoff, Jensen (with his Gilgamesch-Epos), and Arthur Drews, have vehemently maintained one side, opposed by the whole so-called liberal school of Germany and notably Case in this country.

For years compact, striking little books have continued to appear in rapid succession in this popular series, and their influence is immense. From time to time I have read a number of them, and I have never seen one that was commonplace. They fill a place in Germany that has nothing answering to it in English-speaking countries.

Brückner refers more frequently to Dalmann than to any other as an authority. A large number of books are now coming out in English on the general subject, among which I might mention Paton's *Jerusalem in Bible Times,* a handbook giving the results of the latest archæological researches; Masterman's learned *Studies in Galilee;* Kent's *Biblical Geography and History;* and Huntington's *Palestine and Its Transformation.*

JOHN C. GRANBERY.

Barboursville, W. Va.

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION.[1]

THOSE who are acquainted with Dr. Moffatt's early work, *The Historical New Testament,* will eagerly get this volume on *New Testament Introduction.* All students will find in it great storehouses of information for the elucidation of the various problems sprung by the early Christian writings. Those who are critically inclined will find it a veritable Paradise, where the Tree of Knowledge blossoms in wonderful profusion, and brings forth far more than twelve manner of fruits! One rarely finds such an amount of material, historical, analytical, critical, and bibliographical, in a single volume. The only thing I think of now in this connection is Zahn's great work —but this fills three volumes, each as large as Moffatt's! But Mof-

[1] *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* By James Moffatt, B.D., D.D. International Theological Library. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911. Pages xli+630. Price, $2.50 net.

fatt represents an opposite wing in criticism to that we find in Zahn.

It is not possible in a brief notice to indicate all the points sprung by such a volume. In general, it may be said that the order of Dr. Moffatt is much to be commended. After a Prolegomena of fifty-odd pages in which he discusses general questions pertaining to the New Testament, such as canon, arrangement of writings, sources, literary forms, circulation, and some literary characteristics of the writings, he introduces us at once to the correspondence of Paul, and for over a hundred pages we keep company with these letters as they pass through the fires of criticism afresh. They all pass muster except Ephesians and the Pastorals—these are relegated to chapter three with the other Homilies and Pastorals. Ephesians itself is a "catholicized version of Colossians," while the Pastorals do not "present the personality of their author, but a tendency of early Christianity." "It is not possible to ascertain who their author was—though in all likelihood they come originally from one pen."

The second chapter of Dr. Moffatt's work is occupied with the Historical Literature. He includes under this head the first three Gospels and Acts. The Synoptic Problem has full discussion, in which those who have tastes in that direction can have their fill of Ur-Markus, Papias, and Q which modern critics have dragged from the tomb in which Matthew and Luke—as they thought—so securely buried it! The skeleton of this disinterred corpse can be seen on pages 200 and 201 as it has been variously articulated by such masters of literary anatomy as Doctors Holtzmann, Harnack, Hawkins, *et al.*

Moffatt's discussion of the Synoptic Gospels is thoroughly comprehensive and critical. As to Mark, this Gospel is "not a Gospel of Peter, but it contains a cycle of traditions for which Peter is the authority and in which he plays a prominent rôle." A strange admission is made, however, when he refers i. 38 ("For this purpose came I forth") to the *divine commission* of Jesus! Is, then, the bold Synoptic core going to demand the final Johannine expansion? We have thought so all the time. We are grateful for the corroboration of the critic.

As to Matthew, "it is essential to feel the *massive unity* of this book if any justice is to be done it either from the literary or the religious standpoint." On page 257, Dr. Moffatt thinks the author of our present Matthew "betrays the vocation of a teacher incidentally in the mnemonic and mathematical arrangement of his material." His use of *triplets, pentads, heptads,* etc., shows that he had his pupils in mind, and sought to give their memories all the pegs

he could. We have often met this remark in criticism; but the question naturally arises, Who more likely to do a bit of "figuring" than a tax-collector?—and the anti-traditionalists had better beware of stressing *this* feature too much! And the same retort may be made with regard to the "writer's engrossing interest in the sayings of Jesus." Who more liable to appreciate the teachings of this New Voice than a publican, an outcast from the commonwealth of Israel; and who more able to take down these speeches than a man who had spent several years sitting at a government official's desk? One trouble with a good deal of the so-called literary criticism of the Gospels is that it seems to proceed on the assumption that the companions of Jesus were *wooden-headed*—that it never occurred to any of that band to be impressed by anything he said or did, and it never entered into their imagination that they were hearing anything worth listening to or preserving! It is true that Jesus never seems to have told them to do this; but can we think them so obtuse that they never did it? In recent years the appeal has been from the oral to the documentary; our only plea is, let us have the documents with a vengeance, and be assured by critical investigation that it is perfectly possible to believe that in Q (or *its* ancestor) we have the words of Jesus, not only as they fell into the hearts of his hearers, but also as in a brief time they were transferred to an objective form.

As to Luke, he is a "compiler and redactor of previous sources or traditions." This need not startle us, as the world has been in possession of this bit of information since the first century; for this is simply the critical rendition of Luke's own statement in the opening words of his Gospel. The last historic book, Acts, is treated at some length and quite critically—sometimes, to my thinking, very arbitrarily. But the reader is put in possession of a splendid apparatus for the study of the fascinating problem of the historical survey of the progress of the early Church from Jerusalem to Rome.

In chapter three, Dr. Moffatt masses what he calls "Homilies and Pastorals." These are First Peter (which is saved to Peter by allowing Silas to write it!); Jude, which is credited neither to Judas the brother of Jesus nor to the apostle by that name, but belongs to the second century; Second Peter, "a homily thrown into epistolary guise" later, of course, than Jude; Ephesians and the Pauline Pastorals already mentioned; Hebrews, whose author even Dr. Moffatt does not know, but passing by all the famous names that have been suggested (from Paul all the way to Priscilla!), he sanely concludes: "No conjecture rises above the level of plausibility. He was probably a highly trained Hellenistic Jewish Christian with

speculative gifts and literary culture; but to us he is a voice, and no more." James is even more uncertain; and after canvassing the whole situation, Dr. Moffatt closes with an appeal for mercy for the critics in words which may be either *pathos* or *bathos:* "The phenomena of criticism upon the Jacobean homily are perplexing, but they are not to be taken as discrediting the science of New Testament literary research." "Two letters of John the Presbyter" (2 and 3 John) close the Homiletical and Pastoral corpus. We have several probabilities both as to authorship and date, but these two letters "stir, rather than satisfy, the curiosity of the historian. In the dark, wide bay of early Christian life, they glimmer like two adjacent specks of light, indicating some place where Asiatics dwell and work, unknown to passers-by upon the high seas." This is Dr. Moffatt's closing statement on these Johannine briefs; from it we may legitimately infer that sometimes even the critics themselves are *at sea!*

But if the latter part of the third chapter of his book lands Dr. Moffatt on the deep seas, the fourth and fifth carry him into the realm of ever-deepening mists and darkness. The Apocalypse—why was this strange book ever so named? Has it ever revealed anything? On the contrary, is it not as great a puzzle to-day as ever? As to authorship, apostolic hands are set aside, and then when other claimants come forward, unless we are content to share the pious agnosticism of Dionysius, or adopt some one of the many pseudonymous hypotheses, the balance of probability, according to Dr. Moffatt, inclines to John the Presbyter; for it is more feasible to credit him with the rabbinic erudition and the eschatological lore of the Apocalypse than the John who, in Acts iv. 13, was called "unlearned."

Dr. Moffatt's fifth chapter, on the Fourth Gospel, is a book in itself. It is impossible to give it any adequate treatment in this review. But one thing must be said, and that is with reference to Dr. Moffatt's statement on page 540. He is discussing the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists. He says: "Recent criticism of the Synoptic Gospels has brought them nearer to the Fourth Gospel." This is true, and just as it should be, and is quite a shock to that cry of superficial critics we heard not longer than a generation ago: "Back to Mark! Away with your developed Christology! Give us the Jesus of Galilee!" Well, we have him, and what now? He is as insistent and absolute as ever. He is the Lord of Life when the first syllables are penned—else they had never been put down. The only reason we have ever been able to discover why our present Gospels were written is that there were communities of Christians who needed that education which the life and teaching of Jesus

alone could give. They had already been evangelized—they had already heard and accepted the gospel; now they were eager to know the earthly life of Him who had made their heavenly life possible. And this springs the fundamental question, What was the earliest Gospel? And the answer—not of arbitrary or dogmatic traditionalism, but of cold, scientific, illuminated, unbiased criticism—is, the message of salvation proclaimed to men on the basis of the redemptive life and death and resurrection of Jesus, who was thereby mightily proclaimed God's Son and man's Saviour. This *is the Gospel* that made *the Gospels* possible, and even necessary.

An indirect proof of this fundamental fact of the New Testament Scriptures is seen in Dr. Moffatt's book. He begins with Paul, and his grasp is sure and his convictions stated with the confidence of a confirmed conservative; but the farther he gets from Paul, the less sure and confident he is. And this is no derogation to Dr. Moffatt; it is the way all present-day criticism tends. And there is no relief in harping on the mist that lies over the early Church, from the death of Paul to the journey of Ignatius to Rome! The gospel was not inaugurated in that period—and the darkness *there* cannot obscure it. The birthday of the gospel which the New Testament knows lies between A.D. 29 and A.D. 49; that is, between the death of Jesus and Paul's first letter to the Thessalonians—for here it meets us with a meaning and a momentum we cannot gainsay. And so criticism is continually confirming the consciousness of the Church that Paul's gospel is the legitimate sequent in time and the necessary antecedent in literature of what we have been pleased to call the Gospels. And there is not possible any divorce that is permanent. What history has joined together, criticism has not been able to put asunder. And the incident which Dr. Moffatt refers to in the first paragraph of his section on the correspondence of Paul is still pertinent (page 60): "When the Scillitan martyrs were asked [in 180 A.D.] what they had in their satchel, their leader, Speratus, replied, 'Libri et Epistulæ Pauli viri justi.'" (The Gospels, and the Epistles of Paul, a good and holy man.) It takes just this combination to make martyrs; and the question naturally arises, If with all our investigations as to the *earthly life and teaching of Jesus* we do not *at the same time* keep firm grip on the *apostolic message,* will we not fail to transmit Christianity? And while we are digging in the graveyard of evangelic tradition and exhuming from time to time some such long-buried skeleton as Q, do we not hear a living voice sounding out the warning, "What shall it profit a man if he gain a world of *Gospels* and lose the *Gospel?*"

This massive volume is commended for its wide range of learning, its patient spirit of investigation, its wonderfully comprehensive bibliographies, its historical tables, its full indices, and, above all, its interesting style. It is a veritable mine of erudition; and the critical student of the New Testament Literature will hardly find a more complete manual for his purpose. Some things, of course, will have to be taken *cum grano salis;* and to those who have not *salt in themselves,* I recommend the articles that have been appearing on this book in *The Expositor*—a sort of serial review from the pen of Professor Ramsay.

THOMAS CARTER.

Vanderbilt University.

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS.[1]

THE third volume of this monumental work is now out. The Bible students of the English-speaking world are already under obligation to Dr. James Hastings for the *Dictionary of the Bible* in five volumes, the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* in two volumes, and still a third *Dictionary of the Bible in One Volume,* all of which have been reviewed in the pages of this REVIEW. He is now engaged in putting through the press two other works, which are likewise projected on the generous scale on which Dr. Hastings is accustomed to do things. One of these is a series of sermonic studies of *Great Texts of the Bible,* to fill twelve volumes, two of which have been noticed in these pages. The other is *The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* three volumes of which we have reviewed. In my review of one of the former volumes, I took occasion to say that I thought the title of the work is not broad enough to cover its contents. There are many articles on subjects that could not in any way be classified under either Religion or Ethics, as, for example, *Business Calendar, Circumambulation, Conception, Camel, Concept, California, Caves, Carnival, Climate, Chartism,* etc. The articles of special interest in this volume are those on *Circumcision, Chastity, Childhood, Catechumen, Conditional Immortality, Caste, Christianity, Charismata, Church of England, Bushnell, Carlyle, Celibacy, Calvinism, Christian Science, Coleridge, Concubinage, Civilization, Cambridge Platonists, Communism, Clericalism and Anti-Clericalism, Common Sense.*

---

[1] *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.* Edited by James Hastings, M.A., D.D., Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute, etc. With the assistance of John A. Selbie, M.A., D.D., and other scholars. Vol. III. Burial—Confessions. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1911.

Among the contributors to this volume are comparatively few Americans. There are only twenty out of the one hundred and seventy contributors to this volume. There are about a half dozen Methodist scholars in the company, all of whom are English except Professor George A. Coe, formerly of the Northwestern University at Evanston, now at Union Seminary, New York.

In one respect this work is like the *Encyclopædia Britannica:* the articles are practically treatises on the several subjects. The article on *Charms and Amulets,* for example, covers eighty pages of two columns each. It would make a book of considerable size, if it were published separately.

In yet another respect it is like the *Britannica.* Its articles are written, as far as I can judge, by men who are recognized authorities on the subjects they treat. Some of them had previously written books on the same or on related subjects. No doubt for this very reason they were selected to write the articles in this work. So far as I have read, the subjects are discussed in every instance from the standpoint of evolution and in the modern scientific method. Take the article on *Childhood,* for example, which is contributed by Professor George A. Coe. This subject is discussed from the point of view of the "new psychology." The definition of childhood is: It is the period between birth and the beginning of the acquisition of reproductive capacity, that is, adolescence. The writer discusses the mental differences between childhood and later life, and says: "The chief mental difference between children and adults consists in a contrast between vague and clear, undifferentiated and differentiated, between a narrower and a wider range of objects, between immediate and remote ends, between the values of self-activity and the values of social action." In the next place he discusses *The Method of the Child's Moral Development.* He says: "Conscience is not to be thought of as present from birth. The child starts life on a non-ethical plane. In no direction is he equipped with anything like innate truths or standards.[2] When a child, being a member of a social group, such as the family or the school, and desiring to act with it, nevertheless has a strong [selfish] impulse to act contrary to the standard of the circle, reflection is awakened, he endeavors to adjust himself to the social situation and demand, and thus he begins to know moral law. The individual is brought to moral self-control only by such pressure of a social environment upon him." So says the new psychology, and so says Dr. Coe. If Dr. Coe means

[2]This is a very sweeping statement. For the opposite view, see the review of Schleiermacher's Theology on another page.

what his language says, he goes contrary to the generally accepted dictum of Kant that the Categorical Imperative ("I ought") is an original element of the human consciousness, and independent of previous mental processes or of knowledge derived from without. When he comes to the discussion of *The Actual Morals of Children*, he has some very suggestive things to say, and withal very true and instructive. "Children are blamed and punished for what they cannot see the wrong of. What is needed is to see what a given act of a child means to the child himself, for he has his own moral ideas and standards, which must differ from those of adults because his experience differs from theirs. Codes of their own spring up in schools or among the members of the 'gang' the chief principle of which is loyalty, which finds application in giving and sharing, in exclusiveness toward outsiders, in mutual endurance of hardships and taking of risks, and in keeping the secrets of the 'gang.' Then their contact with adults in the family, the school, the community, develops morality of another type. It takes the child some years to discriminate between the world of real experience and the world of dreams and imagination." Hence "children's lies" are not lies at all, and it is wrong arbitrarily to punish them or accuse them as if they were. The thing to do is to call their attention to the difference between their imaginations, or dreams, or illusions, and the actual facts in the case, so as to train them to see things as they actually are.

Now all this has been quoted to give an example and an idea of the way in which subjects are discussed in this great work. There is an article on *Children* twenty-two pages long, or rather a series of articles covering that many pages, giving accounts of the way children are regarded and reared and treated among different peoples, as the American Indians, the Celts, the Chinese, Christians, Egyptians, Greeks, Hindus, Japanese, Jews, Mohammedans, Romans, Teutonic people.

There is a very fine article on *Christianity* by Principal Garvie, of New College, London, in which he discusses the right method of studying the subject, defines Christianity, and traces the divergent tendencies in Christianity,—such as the Speculative, the Sacramentarian, the Practical, the Mystical, and the Evangelical. His definition is this: "Christianity is the ethical [as opposed to natural], historical [as opposed to spontaneous], universal [as opposed to national], monotheistic [as opposed to polytheistic or pantheistic], and redemptive religion, in which the relation of God and man is mediated through the person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ." He then discusses the *Origin of Christianity* and the current theories of it,

such as the Liberal Protestant view as represented by Harnack in his work, *What Is Christianity?;* the Modernist Roman Catholic view, of which Loisy is the pioneer and exponent; and the Radical view of Kalthoff and Pfleiderer. All these he shows to be untenable, and holds to the view that is held substantially by evangelical Christians. He closes his admirable article with an equally strong and convincing exposition of the *Development of Christianity* and a *History* [in outline] *of the Christian Church.*

In view of the impossibility of making in a book review anything like a complete survey of the contents of this single volume of this *magnum opus,* it seemed to me that the only thing to be done was to present the contents and method of one or two representative articles, in order to indicate the method, the breadth, the thoroughness, and the completeness of the work done in this monumental Encyclopedia. When completed, as it will be in about fifteen or twenty volumes, it will be a whole theological library, a theological seminary, a university of culture, for the appropriation of which all that will be needed will be time, brains, and work. In the field which it will cover, it will be easily and incomparably the greatest work in existence in any language.

GROSS ALEXANDER.

Nashville, Tenn.

CHRISTIAN FAITH AND THE NEW PSYCHOLOGY.[1]

THE scope of this volume is indicated in its title. It is a definite attempt to adjust the essentials of Christian faith to those principles and reasonings which are the stock of modern science, and which have been for the most part derived from applications of the theory of organic evolution. That a man may be an evolutionist without ceasing to be a Christian has been shown so often in practice that it no longer admits of doubt. To the minds of many that is, nevertheless, a difficult combination. There are Christians who believe that evolution is in direct contradiction of the Christian faith, and that any man who professes to accept both does so by consciously ignoring this contradiction. On the other hand are scientists who are positive that the Christian religion makes demands upon them which they could only meet by sacrificing what they hold to be clearly demonstrated scientific truths.

It is worth while, therefore, that some effort be made to smooth away these seeming difficulties. The author of this little volume

---

[1] *Christian Faith and the New Psychology: Evolution and Recent Science as Aids to Faith.* By David A. Murray, D.D., Late Principal of the Osaka Theological Training School. Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, $1.50 net.

makes an honest and sincere effort to do this. On the one hand, his work will be rejected by some who will hold that he surrenders Christian essentials; on the other, certain scientists will perhaps feel that he has not fully stated all their difficulties. It will strike many readers, however, as it has struck me, that he shows with reasonable finality that not only is it a fact that a man may be both an evolutionist and a Christian, but it is also true that he may accomplish this without mental compromises or reservations, and without surrendering, even by implication, any essential of either realm of belief. Indeed, there are lines of thought in which the evolutionary mode of reasoning—especially of considering history—affords a distinct relief in the difficult realm of Old Testament theology. Revelation on evolutionary principles and lines—that is, as progressive, and progressively adjusted to the understanding of men (Hebrews i. 1)—is far more intelligible and credible than on the basis of a hard-and-fast mode of verbal inspiration, as commonly put forward by theological writers of a generation or two ago.

The author in this treatise proceeds logically from a consideration of natural theology, where he makes good use of the etiological and teleological arguments, to treating of revelation—as synonymous with Scripture—and finally of Christology, grouping under the latter the problems of prayer and fellowship along with those of miracles, atonement, etc. In so small a volume (382 pages) of course only outline and suggestive treatment can be given to themes so essentially great. I have found myself in substantial agreement with most of the author's contentions; yet I have always been conscious of certain reservations in regard to scientific evolution. It should be remembered, however, that even when evolution is accepted at the full face value, it gives only a mode of operation—*i e.*, in short, a process. The great question of the originating force behind that process is only thrust a little farther back.

The author's handling of the doctrine of the atonement is cautious rather than conclusive. This seems to be an attitude that is common among theological writers of our day. On so great a subject it does not become us to dogmatize. Of the reality and frequency of vicarious suffering we have proofs abundant. The causes of it we see as yet but dimly. The suffering of Christ was for men, and was consequent on his being bound up in the bundle of life with them—on the reality of his incarnation, in other words. Of so much we are fairly sure; further than that, it behooves us to proceed with a due sense of our limitations.

The book is carelessly written. An irritating procession of split

infinitives drags through the whole of it; and there are numerous other solecisms that should not be allowed to mar a work otherwise so scholarly.

G. B. WINTON.

Nashville, Tenn.

ON THE BRANCH.[1]

BESIDES for mere amusement, people nowadays apply themselves to fiction as to a pleasant anodyne. Is one weary after a day's hard work? How delightful to stretch one's self upon a lounge, with the last best novel in hand, for a good rest! Is one vexed and disgusted with the evil happenings around him? "Quick!" he exclaims. "Hand me a clever book: I want new and better acquaintances." Worse than that: has real grief assaulted the soul, and torn some precious idol far, far beyond one's clasp? Even then many a poor creature seeks to drown its sorrow in some absorbing tale of other's woes. Too often the draught thus quaffed is illusive and disappointing in every way.

Publishers are too eager to secure "best sellers," to pause and consider whether the brilliant work of genius distils poison or health-giving medicine for the soul. What a surprise, then, what a boon to humanity, when a novel like *On the Branch* commands the attention of the reading public!—a French novel at that, and yet one that must be pronounced wholesome, at the same time popular enough to have gone into its one hundred and fifty-second edition in France ere it began a most successful career in America.

What are the qualities that constitute the charm of this fascinating work? I call it a work advisedly, because its author makes no pretense of having composed it without study, but speaks of her task candidly, as the fruit of several years of thoughtful study, not dashed off at one heat, as geniuses are so prone to claim for their effusions. In the first place, I should say that in her very start the author, with most pleasing sincerity and naturalness, introduced herself in a manner that corresponds to magnetism in personal address. The feelings expressed are so true to the nature of a cultivated, refined woman of warm, unselfish impulses, that she wins at once the reader's heart, and holds it to the end. A few notes, struck upon a chord to which all humanity responds, do the work.

The style of writing is plain and direct, while the translation is so perfect that one is led to the conclusion that author and translator are the same. Some aver that translation is merely mechanical work, but

---

[1] *On the Branch.* By Pierre de Coulevain. Translation from the French, by Alys Hallard. New York: Published by E. P. Dutton and Company.

no one who has ever honestly tried it can agree to that opinion. In reading the whole of this story, not a single time is one reminded that the author is employing any other tongue than her own vernacular.

Who ever heard of Alys Hallard? If she is a separate individual from the original novel-writer, she is too rare a linguist to be ignored, and seldom has a novelist had the good fortune to have her thoughts so adequately rendered into a foreign language.

This story is remarkable in many ways. It has undeniable originality without the least straining after effect, or appeal to what is abnormal in human nature. It is told in the straightforward way of one narrating fact, so that involuntarily the reader believes every word she says. After she sets out by detailing the woes of her widowhood, bereft by one fell blow of all that, for her, made life's charm—husband, a city and a country home, each delightful, good station, with wealth to support them—she goes on to tell that she turned to serving God and her fellow-creatures for comfort. The study of human nature began to fascinate her, and her interest to be aroused, so that she sought a vent for the knowledge thus obtained, and found it by stirring up, within, a long dormant gift of imagination, and she wrote a novel. It succeeded. And when she proceeds to explain that the study of men and women brought her to understand the springs of their action, and the wisdom of the great Creator of them all, her narrative proves her sincerity.

This novel, which has become the favorite of fashion, as well as of thousands who would abhor to be included in that category, teaches the plain truths of the unadulterated gospel. Our Saviour says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law"—love to God and man. So teaches Pierre de Coulevain: "If thou bringest thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift upon the altar, and go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

The only highly wrought, tragical scene in the book is when the heroine sustains intolerable mistreatment and once gives way to passion and unrelenting fury. But repentance follows surely, if slowly; and humbling herself before God, contrition brings forgiveness of those who have wronged her——and atonement, in such marvelous degree that involuntarily one gives glory to God through Christ, who can enable poor, weak human nature thus to conquer the assaults of "the world, the flesh, and the devil."

It is thankworthy that while the whole religious world is conferring together upon the desirability of all Christendom coming together into as close a union as possible, forgetting minor differences

and coalescing upon the cardinal doctrines of Scripture, that so ardent an exponent of the wisdom and practicality of such charity should appear in the person of a popular novelist. Until the last few pages her Church relationship is not revealed, nor needs to be, for the book advocates and illustrates no tenet from which any Christian, of whatever creed, would dissent.

On the Branch may be fearlessly placed in the hands of youth. And the person who has risen from its perusal dissatisfied with the entertainment therein afforded, has not been heard from as yet.

MARY STUART SMITH.

Honolulu, Hawaii.

THE LETTERS OF GLADSTONE.[1]

AN ordinary reviewer finds it a very delicate undertaking to deal with the imperial mind of William Ewart Gladstone, in even a half-creditable way: the gifts of a Lord Morley are requisite here. Mr. Gladstone was confessedly the greatest of the long line of Victorian political leaders and prime ministers. Entering Parliament in his twenty-fourth year, he rose rapidly into high rank among his contemporary statesmen and reformers. He was thrice chosen to the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, and four times to the Premiership. His administrations were replete with victories and defeats, but there was for him more of triumph than failure during his many years of public service.

In his early life Mr. Gladstone was distinguished for his religious tendencies and strong church attachment; then, and in all his after days, "he wrote out of a full heart, and the subject nearest his heart was always religion." These two volumes of his letters, covering a period of more than sixty years, are, in some sort, memorials of the genesis and development of the colossal figure that Mr. Gladstone presents to the modern age. His religious views and convictions run through the whole fabric of his life-work like a golden thread. A distinction between his letters and his conversation has been drawn by Lord John Morley, who says:

> In table-talk he could be as disengaged, as marked in ease and charm, as any one; he was as willing as any one to accept topics as they came, which is the first of all conditions for good conversation. When alone in his Temple of Peace [his library], it was not his practice to take up his pen in the same sauntering and devious humor. With him the pen was no instrument of diversion.

---

[1] *Correspondence on Church and Religion of William Ewart Gladstone.* Selected and Arranged by D. C. Lathbury. With Portraits and Illustrations. In Two Volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1910. Octavo; pp. xvi+446, viii+470. Price, $5 net.

It is in a large sense true, as Mr. Lathbury writes, that this Correspondence will be read for what Mr. Gladstone has to say, rather than for the way in which he says it. And yet, there is much of real charm in the vigor and clearness of his thought and in his well-nigh faultless diction, not to forget his occasional infusion of refined wit and humor. The preservation of these letters in a form accessible to those interested in a fuller study of Mr. Gladstone's character, and of the mighty events in which he was a foremost actor, is a thing of prime importance. In generous confidence, Mr. Gladstone's trustees intrusted the letters to Mr. Lathbury without reserve or condition, and the manner of selection was left entirely to his discretion. Readers of the work will find that this confidence is well deserved.

Of the first volume, besides Mr. Lathbury's "Introduction," five chapters treat of "Church and State," one of "Ecclesiastical Patronage and University Reform," two of "The Oxford Movement," and one of "The Scottish Episcopal Church." The history of the questions here touched upon runs irregularly from 1829 to 1894. Mr. Gladstone's opinions and suggestions, favorable and adverse, as to Establishment and Disestablishment in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales; Convocation as a moral influence; and the multitude of intricate and pertinent side-issues, are expressed in terms that prove him to be a lay-theologian of rare ability, a safe and sane Christian teacher, a valiant and enlightened defender of the gospel truth and of the peace and integrity of his Church and his country. He invited the coöperant views of learned men whose judgment he deemed acute and sound, and in general agreed with them, but did not hesitate to dissent when their conclusions were seen to be incorrect. Mr. Lathbury observes:

> It was not till Mr. Gladstone found in Manning a friend who took an equal interest in the relations of the Church to the State that he disclosed how large a place the subject held in his own thoughts. Of the Church as a Divine society subordinate to the State in the civil order, but none the less supreme in its own, he had in 1835 only occasional glimpses. He saw that the connection with the State had its dangers, but they were religious, not ecclesiastical dangers. What he feared was the harm which the position of an Establishment might do to purity of doctrine. That it might do equal or greater harm to freedom of government—a point which some fifteen years later was to take such hold on his mind—had not occurred to him.

The function of the State, as contended in these early letters, is "not to recognize the Divine society, but to teach the true religion." By conviction, as well as by training and habit, Mr. Gladstone was an Evangelical; and by the Evangelicals, as he tells us, "the pillar and ground of truth was conceived of as our venerable Establishment."

His first controversial work, *The State in Its Relation with the Church*—called forth by the lectures of Thomas Chalmers on the Establishment, in 1838—"expressed a theory of the subject which he was outgrowing even while he was constructing it: beginning the book as an Evangelical, he finished it as, in a great measure, a High-churchman." To Manning, in 1835, he wrote:

> I cannot but feel persuaded that the Establishment, even as it is at present, affords far more efficient instrumental aids for entering thoroughly into the mind and spirit of the Redeemer, than rival schools of more plausible pretensions.

And in 1837 he returns to "the hard and formidable question, which must not be evaded, How is the principle of Catholic Christianity to be applied in these evil and presumptuous days to the conduct of public affairs?" In 1838 he said: "So far as I know myself, I am not afraid of being seduced by ambition—my personal dangers lie another way; but I hope other and more competent persons may appear to witness for the principles of the Church in the councils of the State." To J. R. Hope he writes in 1844:

> The purpose of Parliamentary life resolves itself with me simply and wholly into one question: Will it ever afford the means under God of rectifying the relations between the Church and the State, and give me the opportunity of setting forward such a work? There must be either such a readjustment, or a violent crisis. The present state of discipline cannot be borne for very many years; and here lies the pinch.

In 1854 he gave a very clear exposition of his views upon the prospects of the English Establishment, stated in part by Mr. Lathbury:

> He did not think that its position was seriously threatened. The set of opinion, indeed, was toward Disestablishment, but he neither wished nor expected that it would come in his time. He had a clear conviction, however, that it would not be averted by the kind of policy which found favor with the Church's Parliamentary friends. At all events, if it was thus averted, it would only be by the sacrifice of more essential things.

His devotion to the principle of a State Establishment of religion gradually yielded to his sense of the impossibility of applying this principle in its integrity to contemporary conditions. "Disestablishment, as he thought, need not be a disaster, and might even be a blessing, if, and in so far as, the Church had made proper preparation to meet it."

The discussion of the relations between the Church and the civil power was revived, in a very acute form, by the Divorce Bill of 1857. Mr. Gladstone fought the measure "with a holy wrath," but in this he was the leader of a forlorn hope. He only succeeded in obtaining

the adoption of amendments that narrowed and abated the wrong which the bill did to the clergy. When, some twelve years later, the kindred question of marriage with a deceased wife's sister came before him, "he had satisfied himself that the Church would one day have to make the choice between having separate marriage laws for herself and for the State, and allowing the State to make the law for both." His stand here was unequivocal: he regarded the question of marriage as "the one cardinal test of the Christian civilization."

Owing to his reversal of opinion and action concerning the Irish Church and certain other forms of polity, Mr. Gladstone has been called an opportunist; and it is true that "he more than once changed his position and went over to those against whom he had fought previously. But, for any one who has studied his career carefully, these changes were not without a law of their own in his intellectual development. Each change bore a relation to a previous change; and viewing his career in the large, we perceive a steady, gradual, and consistent progress." In all situations of this kind he fearlessly met his grave responsibilities as Premier and as churchman and patriot. Under such straits, he has said: "I am a very poor creature fastened to a very great work; but my mind is clear, and I have faith that the right will stand approved."

The celebrated case of Charles Bradlaugh, the avowed atheist, was intensely distasteful to Mr. Gladstone. His attitude in this final struggle for religious equality—all that he had to urge in behalf of Bradlaugh's title to take his seat as a member of Parliament in which an English constituency had twice placed him—is not to be found in his letters (Mr. Lathbury informs us), but in his speech on the Affirmation Bill in 1883. "In the end Bradlaugh took his seat, and the original resolution of the House of Commons [denying his right to qualify under the prescribed oath] was struck out of its records eleven years after it had been passed."

A limited selection of Mr. Gladstone's very numerous letters on Ecclesiastical Patronage and University Reform are given. In all the higher appointments, Dean Wellesley was his most trusted counselor. High, Low, and Broad Churchmen had their claims recognized, the only favoritism shown being that "High-churchmen were assigned posts where the work was hardest." In the distribution of patronage, he had ordinarily a real preference for the "moderate" clergy. His letters on University Reform, in this same chapter, reflect his extreme anxiety to maintain Oxford's original connection with the Church of England.

The end of the controversy was in sight from the beginning, but he was unwilling to accept the inevitable consequences. He would not admit that there was any parallel between the work of education and the work of government. The one was religious in ways in which the other was not. The University had jurisdiction in heresy; the State had not. The agitation of religious questions, which was a bearable evil in the State, would be far worse in the Universities.

The Oxford Movement was an inevitable outgrowth of the antecedent conflict between the Church and State forces. Pusey, Newman, Manning, and Gladstone led in this fierce struggle over the interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles and correlated interests. It was kept up from 1840 to 1894. In the two chapters given to the subject, Mr. Gladstone has seventy-six letters, the whole discussion occupying one hundred and thirty-seven pages of the book. The Movement was vastly important and epoch-making for the people of Great Britain; but I conceive it to be of present interest to comparatively few readers in our country. Those few will find the unabridged letters more satisfactory than any mere summary of their contents. Mr. Gladstone was on the right side of this long-continued agitation, as he was in most of the great issues that engaged his powers of mind and heart. Throughout his long career "he never questioned the power of the Church of England to recover all that she had lost; and, even when the will to use that power seemed lacking, he had an extraordinary faculty of seeing grounds for hope which were almost invisible to less sanguine minds."

The letters dealing with matters of the Episcopal Church of Scotland relate only to the years 1858-1862. They possess no special value at this time, inasmuch as we are told of the outcome that "the Scottish Bishops let slip an opportunity which, well used, might have had a remarkably beneficial influence on the Church which they ruled."

Thus, the first of these two notable volumes has been barely skimmed through, and yet the large space taken up precludes any but the briefest mention of the second. However, I am taking it for granted that readers of this hurried survey know Mr. Gladstone and the history of his times, and will condone any shortage here. Volume two is in some respects of more interest and value than its companion volume—in fact, it is entitled to a separate and ample review. The six chapters contain two hundred and forty-one letters, with these general subjects: "Oxford Elections"; "The Controversy with Rome"; "The Controversy with Unbelief"; "Education"; "Letters of Mr. Gladstone to His Children"; "Personal." Then follows an Appendix, having eight parts that throw additional light upon each of the subjects treated in the foregoing chapters. Mr. Gladstone's

letters to his children, from 1847 to 1893, and the record of his personal life during that period, reveal the most attractive side of his versatile character. Truly, he was "a man of charm and grace in his early years, and full of dignity and grandeur in his old age." His correspondence practically came to an end in his latest years, 1894-1898. "Weakened eyesight, failing health, and a definite and long-cherished idea of the manner in which men should 'slow down toward the close,' combined to lessen the number, though not the vividness, of his interests."

In this second volume, as in the first, the judicious comments of the editor have supplied every needed connection and harmony of data—a most helpful service to the reader. The full Index is invaluable. Too much praise cannot be accorded Mr. Lathbury for the admirable work he has done.

Few such works have been embellished in a superior manner. The several portraits of Mr. Gladstone, showing him at different ages from his young manhood to within a year of his death (1898), and the illustrations of familiar scenes of his home and church life, etc., are examples of the best reproductive art.

It is with unfeigned reluctance that one withdraws from this edifying study of a real prince of men, preëminent among the nobler ruling spirits of the wonderful nineteenth century.

JOHN L. KIRBY.

Nashville, Tenn.

PSYCHIC TREATMENT OF NERVOUS DISORDERS.[1]

I HAVE read this great book with the keenest interest and with large personal profit. It is so sane, so practical, so well-founded in common sense, that one could not wish for it less than a wide reading by all physicians and pastors, and all other intelligent leaders and friends of family and social life. Physicians, as a rule, will not give the views which it maintains an open and full indorsement, and many of them will make light of the ideas which it supports. Notwithstanding these probable facts, there can be no doubt that society would be greatly helped were all scientific healers sympathetically versed in the modes of treatment of nervous disorders which Dr. Du Bois has here set forth.

The title of the book must be kept in mind, if the reader will hold

---

[1] *The Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders.* By Dr. Paul Du Bois, Professor of Neurology at the University of Berne, Switzerland. Translated and Edited by Dr. Smith Ely Jelliffe and Dr. William A. White. New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls. Price, $3.50 net.

before him the purpose of the author. He is concerned with nervous disorders, and his treatment is psychic. Neurasthenia, psychosthenia, psychoneuroses, hysteria,—these are the maladies with which he deals. But what do these include, and how do they affect the body and its functions, the "health" of the patient, and how can they be controlled and corrected? Answers to these questions form the interesting and instructive discussion of these four hundred and sixty pages, and they stamp the author as a man not only of ideas but of convictions, as a psychologist as well as a physician.

Dr. Du Bois says: "Nervousness is a disease, preëminently psychic, and a psychic disease needs psychic treatment." Organic troubles, lesions, and cerebral changes are everywhere recognized as causes of pain and nervousness, but that ideas and mental representations can attack the very personality of man, produce disease, and destroy the happiness of individuals and families, has not always been acknowledged. Many physicians will deny the psychic origin of nervousness and its attending functional disorders, and consequently they are unwilling to recognize any psychic treatment as legitimate and valid. As a rule, such physicians are completely disarmed before nervous patients. Dr. Du Bois believes that disease, painful and destructive, may originate in ideas as well as in bodily afflictions, and so he prescribes a treatment for such diseases that tends to remove these ideas and bring the ego to a healthy mental state.

The author is not friendly to suggestion, or any form of hypnotism, as a treatment for nervous disorders. His treatment has for its object not the belittling of the disorder and the deception of the patient, but the education of the will, or the reason, in order that the patient may become master of himself. He insists that moral influence plays an important rôle in the art of healing. He believes that in order that physicians should exercise an intelligent, healthy moral control over their patients, they should be students of psychology and philosophy, as well as of medicine and surgery. There can be no question as to the lack of proper knowledge of psychology in the physicians of this country. This accounts in no small degree for the spurious methods of healing and the accepted pretensions of quacks which have found a place in intelligent society. The latter have appealed to the mind of the sick, while the average physician had nothing to offer but his drugs or his knife. The "mental healing," by whomsoever practiced, has been despised by physicians, and frequently because they were not sufficiently acquainted with psychology to detect that the disease was psychic and could be reached only by a psychic treatment. When the physician is able

to treat openly, frankly, and educationally diseases that have mental origin, then the ignorant, blind, and hazardous treatments of the common mental healer, of whatever name, will become unknown. The author says: "Whether he wants to or not, the physician ought to be a psychologist, and in practice he will see that his knowledge of the human heart is more useful than his ability in normal or pathological physiology."

"Medical teaching of the twentieth century, without neglecting the conquests of the preceding one, will give a larger and larger place to rational psychotherapy. It will renounce the puerilities of hypnotism and suggestion in order to arrive at the education of the mind." So-called "magnetic healing," much of the healing by such men as Dowie, the cures of Lourdes, the healing done by Christian Scientists, the works of the Indian doctors, are all the result of suggestion. Dr. Du Bois insists that the patient can be cured as quickly and more thoroughly by disclosing the mental cause of his trouble, and by a training that leads to the overthrow and removal of those despotic ideas, than by any suggestion that does not harmonize with the truth. He would rout all unhealthy auto-suggestions, and lay bare those mental representations that grip the patient and destroy his happiness. What are some of these ideo-genetic diseases?

"Nervous dyspepsia does not differ in any way from dyspepsia of organic origin." "There are states of mental anorexia, with vomiting, emaciation, and fever, which are diagnosed as meningitis." "Alongside of *angina pectoris*, there is the false nervous angina." "There are visceral neuralgias which lead one to believe that there is tubercular peritonitis." "That which characterizes the psychoneuroses is not the various symptoms, the innumerable functional troubles, resembling those of organic diseases, or the distressing sensations that the patient may experience; it is his state of mind, his mentality." "We all of us get tired; but we know what it is, and we are assured beforehand that a little rest is all that we need. The neurasthenic, however, is frightened; he takes his weariness with great concern, and makes it last longer by the attention that he pays to himself." "The human mechanism is so complicated that hardly a day goes by without our noticing some creaking in the works; gastric trouble, a slight pain or palpitation of the heart, or a transient neuralgia. Full of confidence in comparative health, we keep right on. With nervous sufferers it becomes a fixed idea."

These quotations indicate the field of nervousness. "A critical spirit is by far the best preservative against the numerous functional troubles which are called forth by means of mental representations. It is our moral stamina which gives us strength to resist these debilitating influences." This moral stamina is to be gained not by suggestion, insinuation, or hypnosis, but by persuasion which honestly appeals to the reason of the subject. "It cruelly abuses the

mental weakness of the subject to make such suggestions to him." Yet this is what mental healers do to their patients. "The individual who wishes to preserve the integrity of his good sense and to assure his mental health, ought at every turn to appeal to his reason and keep watch over his mentality." "Education should undertake the task of delivering us from imbecile suggestibility."

Exaggerated fatigability is one important characteristic of a neurosis. The discussion of this subject is highly instructive. The cure in this case is conviction of power. The author also treats diseased sensibility. Some people are perfect fanatics about having windows open at night who would never perceive the deception were the window closed after they go to sleep and opened before they awake. Some nervous people have a headache when they see a heater. Odors cause sickness of stomach or insomnia. Variations of barometer and the temperature have exaggerated effects on nervous persons. Neuropaths exaggerate precaution in use of foods. "Nervous patients show to an extreme extent an exaggerated emotional tendency which renders them incapable of bearing what life brings to them. The slightest happenings are catastrophes to them." A telegram, the failure of a letter to come, bring distress. They are afraid of all diseases, and even afraid of fear.

"I have not seen any nervous patients who can attribute their condition to simple intellectual overwork." "Nevertheless, intellectual work plays havoc with us when it is accompanied by worry." Psychosthenia is congenital, and not acquired. By means of mental representations and auto-suggestions giving rise to emotional outbreaks, the subject creates numerous functional disorders, and nurses them or aggravates them. Such persons believe themselves misunderstood and persecuted by those who do not exaggerate with them their troubles.

Space cannot be taken to give any of the cases of illness which are described in the book. One could scarcely guess the forms of disease which nervousness may produce. Stomach, heart, kidneys, lungs, eyes, ears, have all shown marked symptoms of organic disease. Yet under the guidance and instruction of an intelligent physician who understood the human mind as well as the human body, they have in a short time been brought to normal functions. Dr. Du Bois relies for cure altogether upon his ability to educate the patient's reason and make him master of himself, but as aids in gaining possession of the patient's mentality and moral consciousness he uses Weir Mitchell's treatment of rest in bed, isolation, and overfeeding.

While he does not regard these as indispensable, he considers that they create conditions that are favorable to psychic treatment.

Such a book as *The Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders* should be read extensively by pastors who are constantly in attendance upon the sick. It would make valuable aids to the practicing physicians and a great support of the sick. In this day of possible worry, exaggerated sensibility, and contagious cautiousness, such a sensible treatise cannot fail to be of very great value to all men and women. There is one class of persons that should *not* read this book—the patrons of Christian Science healers, magnetic healers, hypnotists, and such; for this book will upset their faith, or at least cast much doubt upon the integrity of those who practice such arts of healing. To all others, this book will prove to be very valuable.

JOHN M. MOORE.

Nashville, Tenn.

THE GLORY OF THE MINISTRY.[1]

How refreshing even the title of this splendid survey of the preacher's work! How exhilarating to turn away from what we hear so much of nowadays—the drudgery, the barrenness, the dullness, and the deadness of the ministry—and under the wise leadership of Dr. Robertson read anew Paul's thrilling setting of the inspirations of the preacher's calling! For surely, if a man is going to talk about the ministry from any standpoint, he must reckon with Paul; and especially if his theme is the *glory* of the ministry, he is well-nigh shut up to that marvelous man who became all things to all men if so be he might win some, and who, in the resolute pursuit of this self-denying goal, has thrown more glory on the preacher's calling, and brought more inspiration to the preacher's spirit, than any man since the gospel came to earth.

The theme of the book is Paul's "Apologetic for Preaching," found in 2 Corinthians ii. 12–vi. 10. The method is largely expositional, with abundant references to Scripture passages and many incisive explanatory notes—especially bringing out the meaning of Greek words. The purpose and occasion can best be put in the author's own words:

> I have written this book out of love for preachers of the gospel of Jesus. Some one may find tonic and ozone, as he comes close to the heart of his mis-

---

[1] *The Glory of the Ministry.* Paul's Exultation in Preaching. By A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York and Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pages 243. Price, $1.25 net.

sion and life, in Paul's bracing words; some, for whom the ministry has no longer the old charm, may recover their first love; some who have been disposed to speak unkindly of ministers as a class, may be led to revise their judgment; some young men, who look out on the wonderful modern world, may catch a glimpse of the light in the face of Jesus, as did Paul on the road to Damascus, and yield to the appeal in that Face for a world lost in sin, a world that calls for interpreters of Jesus.

These four classes, the worker, the shirker, the knocker, and the tyro, will all find their due allotment in these rich pages. It is only necessary to give the table of contents, with its wonderfully incisive subheads, to create an appetite in every preacher to get and devour the volume. There are eight chapters, each based on a text from this great section of Scripture arranged in the following order:

I. The Disheartened Preacher's Joy—the New Standpoint.
II. The Glory that Faded. The Modern Problem.
III. The Light in the Face of Jesus. The Attraction of Christ.
IV. With Open Face. The Preacher's Privilege.
V. The Treasure in Earthen Vessels. The Human Limitations.
VI. The Weight of Glory. The Invisible Consolation.
VII. Well-pleasing unto Him. The Preacher's Master Passion.
VIII. In Glory and Dishonor. Taking Life as it Is.

Second Corinthians is indeed the heart of Paul, and this section, on which Dr. Robertson bases his studies, is the heart of Second Corinthians—warm, vigorous, and pulsating with the life and love of Christ. To read again this section in the light of Dr. Robertson's rich exposition, will mark an epoch in the ministerial career of any man. It is hard to distinguish in the midst of such splendid settings, but two chapters especially will doubtless appeal to most of the readers of the volume. The first is, "The Light in the Face of Jesus," or the attraction of Christ on the scripture, "The light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." The second is, the section with the caption "Well-pleasing unto Him"—the preacher's master passion on the verse, "Wherefore we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto Him. To feel the attraction of Christ, and to find in his face the image of the invisible God, is to have a message for men; and from henceforth the preacher's ambition is to fill out the measure of his consuming passion to please Christ in the presentation of his portrait to the world's sad waiting heart.

Several errors of print are noted in the volume. One serious mistake (which most readers will correct) is loading poor Schmiedel with the sins of *Schweitzer* (page 101)!

This volume is commended to every preacher who needs a glimpse of the glory of his calling, and who can respond to the inspiration of lofty ideals. THOMAS CARTER.

THE IDEAL OF JESUS.[1]

WHAT is Christianity? Ever anew, in this or that form, the question is asked. One might suppose that by this time it must have been satisfactorily answered for all candid inquirers. But not so. In the twentieth century, as in the first, each must somehow answer it for himself, if he would make the revelation of God in Jesus Christ a truly personal possession. There have indeed been whole centuries during which such a question would have been rebuked as simply unbelieving and sinful—the Mediæval Age; but we do not wish their return.

Let the inquiry still be repeated, then, from generation to generation, though not without increase of knowledge, reverence, and the enlightenment that comes through Christlike goodness and spiritual insight. Was it not approved by our Lord in his day? "Beware of false prophets," "By their fruits ye shall know them," "Who do men say that the Son of Man is? . . . But who say ye that I am?"

The title of Dr. Clarke's book indicates the direction in which he proposes to look for the knowledge of what Christianity is. He would ask the Founder of this religion. He would learn Jesus' own ideal of human life as it may be and ought to be—his vision of man in relation to God and the world. For is not this Christianity? And this ideal of Jesus has been so disclosed in the Gospels—in the first three, the author would say—that there can be no doubt of what it was. "There is no ambiguity about his [Jesus'] position . . . Various things about him we do not know and may never discover, but his dominant views of God and man and life are as well ascertained and known as anything in history."

Now the knowledge of these "views" (a truer word might have been chosen) is independent of any questions, critical or theological, that may be raised concerning the original text of the Gospels or the nature of their authority. True, no regular system of doctrine, or ethics, or institutional observances may be seen in the teaching of Jesus as we have it; but the great spiritual realities which are the essential truths of the Christian religion may be seen there, sun-clear, standing forth "in a splendid unity."

Unlike Harnack in his lectures on "What is Christianity?", Dr.

---

[1] *The Ideal of Jesus.* By William Newton Clarke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1911.

Clarke takes no account of Christian history anywhere from the Apostolic Age to the era of the Protestant Reformation. And unlike himself in his lectures before the Johns Hopkins University ("What Shall We Think of Christianity?"), he takes no account in the present treatise of either "the Christian people" or "the Christian power." He only seeks to know what is the Christian religion as shown in the Synoptic Gospels, by the words, and life, and personality of Jesus—a clearly attainable body of knowledge.

Are we, then, to ask simply for Jesus' ideal of Christianity, as it appears in the first three books of the New Testament, seeking no help from the others? Provisionally, perhaps, in order to meet certain needs of the mind, our own or some one else's. But to him who would know the whole truth as truth is in Jesus, it would be an undue limitation.

The author finds the embodiment of the ideal of Jesus in the kingdom of God. Of this Kingdom he gives a distinct and formal definition—the only one, if I remember rightly, in the book. "The kingdom of God," he says, "is a reign of mutual service and help, with an unselfish devotion to others for its impelling power." I can accept this as a truth, but not as a definition. In fact, the author himself does not seem so to accept it. For more than once he makes reference to the Christian's relation to God, and not his relation to man, as the innermost truth of the Kingdom—when he says, for example, that the "inner definition" of life in the Kingdom is "obedience to God," or that "the characteristic life of the Kingdom is a life above this world, lived in personal fellowship with God."

Surely we are under obligation to define New Testament terms, not according to some personal or some present-day use, but according to the New Testament use, of them. Otherwise, in any Scripture exposition or argument, confusion of thought must ensue. And how can there be a shadow of doubt as to what is meant by the kingdom of God in the teaching of him who has taught his disciples to say in prayer, "Our Father who art in heaven, . . . Thy kingdom come, *Thy will be done* on earth as it is in heaven"? Withal it no less remains a truth of truths that a large part of the heavenly Father's will is that we love our fellow-men as brothers and serve them continually in the name of the Son of Man.

Having shown that Christianity, the ideal of Jesus, is embodied in the kingdom of God, the author sets forth in successive chapters the eternal laws of the Kingdom under such titles as Righteousness, The Twofold Law of Love, The Filial Life, Deliverance from Evil, Liberty, Human Value, Justice, Wealth.

That this book contains much suggestive and satisfying religious truth and much luminous exposition of the teaching of Jesus, and that by its clarity of thought and expression it spares the reader the difficulty (and delight) of strenuous intellection—being in this respect almost faultily faultless—no reader of William Newton Clarke need be informed. Nor need such a reader be reminded of the principle and method of this author's "use of the Scriptures in theology."

J. A. KERN.

Vanderbilt University.

WORLD ATLAS OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.[1]

A GLANCE at the barest facts of Christian missions will astonish one with the extensiveness and importance of the great enterprise. A deeper study will reveal a wealth and variety of interest, a record of achievement, and a vastness of resources and of power, that are amazing. Within a century this tree, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, has struck its roots deep in the life of about every nation under the sun. This century of missions has witnessed the organization of a vast number of agencies in Christian lands for the dissemination of the gospel in the regions beyond. To scan the results of these agencies, and to trace the wandering and read the records of the heroic toils of the missionaries, is to study the facts and processes of the world's steady transformation. It is not strange, therefore, that there should be a demand for such a survey as will put the locations, organizations, and achievements of modern missions into convenient form for ready reference.

The list of missionary atlases published in the last ten or fifteen years to meet this demand is a long one. Some of these have been for particular missions or societies, others for the whole world of missions. Chief among these was one prepared by Rev. Harlan P. Beach, M.A., F.R.G.S., then Educational Secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement. The volume under review is in an important sense successor to that one, although the material used in the less complete Atlas, published as part of the report of Commission I of the Edinburgh Conference, has been by special arrangement embodied in this volume. The imprint of the Student Volunteer Movement is a guarantee of thoroughness and painstaking in the preparation of such a work. The editors are Dr. Beach, now of Yale University; Rev. James S. Dennis, D.D., so favorably known as the

[1] *World Atlas of Christian Missions.* Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions, 125 East Twenty-seventh Street, New York City, N. Y. Price, $4.

author of that great work on "Christian Missions and Social Progress"; and Mr. Charles H. Fahs, till recently editor of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, now one of the Secretaries of the Student Volunteer Movement. These men have done their work well, and the result is a volume of incalculable value to the student of missions.

The first part contains a directory of the mission boards and societies of all lands. This directory covers sixty-six pages. It gives not only the name and location of each board or society, but a list of its officers, its object and aim, its income, its origin, and the fields in which it operates. There are here listed nine hundred and ninety-five societies, with a total annual income of $30,378,489. It is no marvel that the editors say in their preface: "No one, we are convinced, can look carefully into this vast and complicated realm of service without being impressed with the consecration and loyal devotion it reveals even now on the part of Christ's followers."

The second part is given wholly to statistics. From the vast field indicated in part first have been gathered and arranged with much care the world's missionary statistics. They cover the various fields of missionary activity, such as evangelistic, educational, medical, and philanthropic. Statistics are said to be dry reading, but these are an exception to that rule. They reveal such a wealth of results, and represent such toil and sacrifice and heroic endurance, that they are eloquent to the imagination. They do not and cannot reveal the whole story of missionary triumph. "The untabulated results" are by far the greater. They alone measure the transforming influence of public opinion, the pervasive and unmeasured force that gets into language and literature, and the irresistible power of transformed lives. These are the most significant and far-reaching and permanent. But through these tables sounds the clash of moral battles and echoes the song of triumph. Through them shines the light that grows and widens toward the full moon. It is no small thing to know that there are 21,307 foreign missionaries in the world, and that through their labors three and a half millions of members have been enrolled and twice as many adherents won. Missions of Roman Catholics in non-Christian lands are included in these tables, as are also those of the Russian Orthodox Church, though these occupy only small space and are in separate tables.

Part third is given to "Missions Atlas and Stations Index." The maps are works of art. The exquisite coloring, the plain lettering, the clean outlining and markings, are a joy to the eye. In these and other commendable respects they are a delightful contrast to the

jumble of color and indistinguishable mixture of lines and letters which so often perplex and weary. One has here at hand not only modern maps of the various countries of the world, but maps that show where Christianity is being planted and by whom. All Protestant mission stations are underlined with red, so that one can see at a glance the extent of Protestant occupation. There are twenty-three plates of these maps, each plate covering two pages. The maps are followed by an alphabetical index of mission stations, with reference to the maps and key by means of which they may be easily located. Opposite each station in the index are the initials indicating the society.

Thus we have here, as far as it may be put in the compass of one volume of seventy-two printed pages and forty-six pages of maps, the whole modern missionary enterprise. In this age, when so much is being said for and against missions, it is a comfort to have the facts at hand, facts on whose accuracy you can rely. In this volume the Student Volunteer Movement has furnished such a treasury of facts, on which he who will may draw. W. W. PINSON.

Nashville, Tenn.

BISHOP WARD'S SERMONS.[1]

THE Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will long lament the untimely death of Bishop Ward. His superb ability as an administrator, as a preacher, and as a thinker had only begun to gain recognition, even from those who knew him best. His well-poised judgment, his solid piety, his open-mindedness toward truth, his clear-cut conceptions of Christian doctrines, stand out to-day with great clearness since his fellow-laborers have examined more thoroughly his labors, his religious influence, and his utterances. The tremendous effect of his first visit to the Orient, the phenomenal impression which he made in his first Conference in Georgia, and the lingering power of his personailty in Texas, have convinced the Church that Bishop Seth Ward was a man of unusual ability and of splendid undeveloped possibilities.

Many of his most intimate friends will be surprised that he left such well-written, thought-bearing and thought-producing, forcible and stimulating sermons as the fourteen which have been embodied in this volume. These will be read with increasing interest and en-

[1] *Conquering Forces of the Kingdom, and Other Sermons.* By Bishop Seth Ward, D.D. With an Appreciation of his Character and Ministry, by Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon, D.D., LL.D. Nashville and Dallas: Smith and Lamar. Price, $1.

larging profit by the ministry and laity of Southern Methodism, and many will be the wishes that another such volume might be given to the public. That he has written well will be the common verdict of those who read these fourteen sermons.

"Conquering Forces of the Kingdom" (text, Rev. xii. 11) exhibits the unfaltering faith of the great preacher in the final victory of the gospel of Jesus Christ. The conquering elements are Jesus the Lamb of God, the atoning Christ, the testimony of men to the adequacy of the gospel to save them, and the unselfish sacrificial living of Christians. Truth, experience, and character are the conquering forces of Christianity. "The kingdoms of evil are doomed. All Babylons shall fall."

"The Kingdom to Come" (Matt. vi. 10) reveals Bishop Ward's confidence in the gospel as a prevailing force. He said: "Love and truth are the only forces employed for its extension." The view that the kingdom would be established only by the personal, visible advent of Jesus seemed to him a sort of confession of unbelief in the power of the gospel, and it denied the power of the cross to conquer the world. He believed that the kingdom is to come in a purer, stronger social life than the world has yet seen, and that the world will yet see Christian cities, Christian states, and Christian nations. He believed also that the kingdom is to come in a wider sphere of Christian life than the world has yet seen.

"The Good Samaritan in the Twentieth Century" (Luke x. 36, 37) is a great missionary sermon. "The needs of our fellow-men constitute their strongest claim on us." The parable shows Christ's ideal of man's attitude and action toward his fellow-man. "The Christian religion ministers to man's social, industrial, intellectual, and moral well-being," and consequently it is the world's greatest need. The really valuable elements of our civilization, such as value of the individual life, the supremacy of righteousness, the divinity of love, the brotherhood of man, the fatherhood of God, are essentially Christian. In the heathen world lives are going to waste. Only Christianity, of all the forces that have been introduced from the Anglo-Saxon civilization, goes to the East to serve. All others go for gain. "The Christian religion is man's greatest need, most of all, because it meets in fullest measure the needs of his spiritual nature." "Sin is the world's greatest evil." Only the gospel saves. "I do not mean to assert that the multitudes who have not heard our gospel are necessarily under condemnation. That were to inflict on them the penalties due to our negligence." The insidious materialism that magnifies the physical man at the expense of the spiritual

is a most subtle and dangerous antagonist of our faith. "The world must ultimately be Christian in its faith, or come to an age when all faith will perish from the heart of our race." The religious beliefs of the non-Christian world are being undermined and destroyed day by day, not only by the work of the Christian Churches, but by all the outgoing forces of our modern life, and we cannot mistake the call that comes in the cry of a needy world. Such are some of the suggestive thoughts of this great sermon.

"The Armor of Light" (Rom. xiii. 12) shows the mental attitude of Bishop Ward toward modern conditions. "Christian men and Christian Churches must recognize the changed situation, and intelligently address themselves to it." The Church must do her work in new social conditions. The intellectual problems are of a kind that she has not been called to deal with in the past. "Research in the realm of physical science, the study of comparative religions, and the application of the historical method to Bible study, have made it necessary to rewrite Christian apologetics, and to write them from a different point of view." Our gospel "must be preached to all men, and preached in terms that will command the intellect, arouse the conscience, and move the heart of the twentieth century." Our work "must be adapted to the conditions that prevail about us." John Wesley preached to his age and adopted methods suited to existing conditions. "Our message must be boldly addressed to the people, the customs, the conditions, of to-day." If the Church is to do its work of to-day, there is need for a more intelligent Christianity, a more vital and robust faith, a deeper and more practical consecration. This sermon marks Bishop Ward as a thinker of the modern type, with a keen appreciation of the social and intellectual conditions of the present day.

"The Temptation of Jesus" has been treated largely in sermonic literature, but the salient features have not been brought out by any one clearer than by our author. He did not believe that Jesus knew fully his mission in the world prior to his experience at the Jordan; but from that hour he knew himself and his mission. His fast is explained by his state of mind. Mighty problems pressed his spirit. He was "not tempted to do anything that was wrong in itself." He was above the reach of many temptations. The temptation was to make bread of stones, leap from high places, and to rule great kingdoms, from selfish motives, rather than enter upon other and higher work required by the will of God. The essence of the temptation was the misuse of power of which he was the conscious possessor. "Use it for yourself" was Satan's suggestion. Satan's programme of

a great life is what he rejected. The world's greatest temptation to-day is the "temptation that comes from the consciousness of power."

The sermon on "A Divine View of Human Life" (Matt. xxv. 14-30) is presented in four words—Investment, Responsibility, Fidelity, Reward. That on "The Christian Ministry" (2 Cor. v. 20) emphasizes the truth that the ministry is divinely called, that its divinely appointed object is the reconciliation of the world to the living God, and that this object can be accomplished only by the delivery of a divinely given message. "The Greatness of Service" (Mark x. 37) is the expression of his personal attitude toward life. The motive of service is love, its measure is life, its end is life given. "Never did the ministry have less need for sluggards and dullards than it has to-day. Never was there greater need for strong, cultured, consecrated, courageous men." "The position occupied is of minor importance." "The World's Epochal Hour," "The Bread of Life," "The Value of Faith," and "The Rest that Jesus Gives," are all excellent sermons; but space is too limited to allow any further reference, except to say that the last was his sermon delivered at the commencement of Vanderbilt University.

Bishop Mouzon has rendered the Church a most valuable service in giving to the public these splendid sermons from the pen of our lamented Bishop Ward. Not only so, but his appreciation of him whom he calls "that friend of mine who lives in God," covering as it does some fifty pages of the volume, is worthy, in every way, of the two distinguished leaders of the Church. The sketch which is given, the account of the rising of the young Texan from a farmer's home to the Bishop's chair, the story of his faithful and devoted service in the ministry, and the portrayal of his last days, will give the readers a keener appreciation of the noble character of the ascended Bishop. This work is done so sympathetically, so intelligently, so skillfully, that it will have the heartiest commendation of the friends of both men.

This book will evidently have wide reading, not only because of the high position of the two men, but also because of the superior merit of the sermons and the biography. JOHN M. MOORE.

Nashville, Tenn.

A DRAMATIST OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.[1]

ELKANAH SETTLE was an English playwright who lived from 1648 to 1724. He studied at Trinity College, Oxford, but left before gradu-

[1] *Elkanah Settle: His Life and Works.* By F. C. Brown. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Octavo; pp. x+170. Price, $1.39, postpaid.

ating and went to London to earn a living by his pen. He was a contemporary and rival of Dryden. His last years were spent as a "poor brother" in the Charterhouse.

This scholarly and interesting, but hardly well-written, work examines Settle biographically and critically, and presents a review also of the several quarrels and controversies in which that strenuous poet and pamphleteer engaged. There is a full Bibliography and a carefully-made Index, which add much to the working value of the volume for the student of Restoration and Augustan literature.

The chief value of Settle's work lies less in the dramatic or political worth of its content than in the illuminating glimpses it gives us of the characters and acts of several of the public men engaged in statecraft or letters, or both, during his day. Settle himself was a very human seeker after his own welfare, a man after the Vicar of Bray's own heart,—now Whig, now Tory. But his transitions, after all, were not more harlequin-like than those of Dryden and lesser contemporaries. Although Settle was in his personal sympathies a Whig, he published in 1684 a full Tory refutation—*The Present State of England*—of the strong pamphlet he had written earlier for the other side—*The Character of a Popish Successor.* Similarly, in his plays he consulted the prevailing fashion, as to both form and subject-matter. He was not among the great interpreters of life, to whose art sincerity is as natural as is breath to the body. In a word, Settle was for long, and sought constantly to be, a favorite and fashionable writer, and it is therefore natural enough that he engaged in vigorous self-advertising quarrels (which were not without the connivance of politicians in high places) with Dryden, Shadwell, Crowne, and others.

His most important drama is *The Empress of Morocco,* which was presented at the court of Whitehall by the lords and ladies of the court. "It gives us the most exact information we possess concerning the interior of a Restoration theater." Otherwise, it is merely a lavishly spectacular play, having some exciting moments, but unconvincing in point of art. Settle wrote this and other plays in the heroic couplet, but later adopted blank verse and prose. He produced over a score of plays, of various types, ranging from heroic tragedy to satiric comedy, masque, and droll. In his operas he handled the scenic very deftly and attractively, scoring a success on the side of "machinery." Indeed, herein he was an acknowledged master, and was rewarded with the post of "City Poet," that is, poet laureate of the city of London, and contrived not a few splendid pageants and symbolic political displays. In much of his work he

was an adapter and imitator of Elizabethan drama. One of the plays most directly influenced in this respect is *Distress'd Innocence,* which Mr. Brown finds the best of Settle's tragedies.

The writer of this volume has done patient and honest work, but seems to lack that sense of proportion and humor which creative criticism finds indispensable. His treatment of Settle and his works is of no slight informational value, but of criticism as animated by the literary spirit he is hardly an exemplar. His style is decorous, but impresses the reader as the utterance of a mind conscious of task-work. Propriety is not a synonym for power. It is noticeable, also, that the work contains certain errors in punctuation and spelling, for which perhaps the author ought not to be held responsible; and still others in syntax, which appear to be justly chargeable to him.

GROSS ALEXANDER.

Nashville, Tenn.

STILL ANOTHER LIFE OF JOHN WESLEY.[1]

Juan Wesley, su Vida y su Obra is the title of a work just issued by our Publishing House which has a somewhat unique history. In 1868 a young minister of the French Wesleyan Conference, himself the son of a minister and missionary, in a prize contest inaugurated by the Conference, wrote in French a sketch of the life of John Wesley. It was the first introduction of the great English scholar and evangelist to French readers. The work was so admirably done, and the subject so interesting, that from the first the book attracted much attention. M. Carlos de Remusat, a French Academician, made it the basis of an extended essay in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* (January 25, 1870), the leading French literary journal. Several French editions were sold. It was translated into English, and fifteen thousand copies were called for in Great Britain and America.

Thus encouraged, the author, M. Mathieu Lelievre, D.D., some thirty years later set himself to rewrite and enlarge the work. The life of Wesley by Tyerman had appeared meantime, and other valuable sources had become accessible. The new edition was issued in 1900, along with an English version by the brother of the author, published by the Wesleyan Book Steward. This revised edition is a book of more than five hundred pages. In its French version it fell into the hands of our Spanish translator, Professor Primitivo Rodriguez, who was so captivated by it that he requested the Com-

[1] *Juan Wesley, su Vida y su Obra.* By M. Mathieu Lelievre, D.D., of the French Wesleyan Conference. Translated into Spanish by Professor Andres Osuna. 1911. Nashville, Tenn.: Smith and Lamar.

mittee on Translations of the Board of Missions and the Publishing Agents to authorize him to bring it out in Spanish. Authority was given, and he had put about one hundred pages into his native language when death stayed his hand.

Professor Osuna later took up the task where it had been laid down. Though less proficient in French than Mr. Rodriguez, he was yet able to avail himself of the original text, referring at times to the English version. So we have now in the completed book a French life of Wesley rendered into Spanish. Two circumstances give the work a unique quality. First, it is an outside view of the man, marked by that masterful detachment and objectivity which characterizes the Gallic mind at its best, but which does not quench the Gallic enthusiasm. Second, rendering from one Romance language into another is so easy, comparatively speaking, that much of the vivacity and *timbre* of the original French is now transferred to the Spanish version.

Both of these circumstances will commend it to readers in Spanish-speaking countries. It is, of course, the first of them which appeals to the Anglo-Saxon student, who may have read, as I have, many lives and estimates of the many-sided Wesley, but all of them Anglo-Saxon in point of view, and all in English. Dr. Fitchett, as from Australasia, and Professor Winchester, as from New England, have recently shown us that even territorial separation is of value in furnishing a viewpoint. Yet Fitchett and Winchester are both essentially English Methodists, if one degree removed by descent.

Dr. Lelievre comes with a really striking story, because he really comes from without. Wesley is here seen in perspective. His training, his temperament, his work, the setting in which he moved, are drawn by a foreign hand for the foreign eye. Here we "see ourselves as others see us." The book becomes thereby compellingly interesting. It is also suggestive and instructive. There is nothing exactly new in it, for the writer follows beaten paths. But the author is new, and the readers he had in mind are new. So all is fresh, and much is significant.

The translation into Spanish has been vigorously and eloquently done. It is free of *sajonismos,* that usual pitfall of the translator from English. The work is being acclaimed in Mexico and elsewhere as no other book issued by us in Spanish has been. Mr. Osuna will now share in the fame and popularity of the brilliant author.

I have not space here to enter upon a study of those phases of Wesley's personality and work upon which his French biographer

seems to me to throw new light. Perhaps the Editor of the REVIEW may allow me to do this later and at some length.

As the work of Mr. Lelievre is now accessible in French, English, and Spanish, all my readers will be able to secure it in a form available to them. I think that if they do obtain it, they will enjoy the reading.

G. B. WINTON.

Nashville, Tenn.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW.[1]

THIS is a new volume in the series of commentaries gotten out under the general editorship of Dr. Shailer Mathews, the object of which is to make the modern knowledge of the Bible more available for home use, and more accessible for people of student age and experience. The work of each single volume has been done, so far as my knowledge goes, by one of the front-rank scholars of America; though, of course, the necessary limitations of space and the restricted sphere of these handy commentaries make it practically impossible to discuss satisfactorily all the problems involved—even from the standpoint of the editor himself; and when *he* is dissatisfied with his work, he can hardly blame others for being so too! Still it is wonderful how ripe scholarship can pack itself; here as elsewhere, conciseness is the mark of maturity, and diffuseness betrays the tyro. Those competent to judge have not yet ceased to marvel at the skill, for example, which Dr. Alexander—the Editor of the REVIEW—has shown in putting well-nigh the learning of a lifetime in the volume on *Colossians and Ephesians,* which he contributed to this same series. The volume now presented is like unto that in the scope and conciseness of introductory matter and the clearness and insight that characterize the comments.

In the present volume fifty pages are given to the Introduction, covering such topics as Text; Canonicity; What is Known of the Apostle Matthew; The Origin, Sources, and Unity of the Book; Its Date, Historical Value, Purpose, and General Characteristics. A full Analysis of the Gospel and a brief Bibliography conclude this section of Dr. Robertson's work. Needless to say that while all of these topics are exceedingly interesting and fairly bristle with problems hitherto unsolved, the editor dodges nothing of moment, but marshals the facts and states his conclusions, sometimes not convin-

---

[1] *The Bible for Home and School.* The Gospel According to Matthew. A Commentary by A. T. Robertson, A.M., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. New York: The Macmillan Company. Pages xiii+294. Price, 60 cents net.

cingly, but always clearly. Possibly the most important sections of this Introduction are those on the Origin, the Sources, the Purpose, and the Characteristics of Matthew's Gospel. As to the origin of *our* Matthew, the three views are stated: (1) The Greek Matthew is a translation of the Aramaic, either by Matthew himself, as some hold, or by an unknown hand (Zahn). (2) The Gospel as we have it is a free composition in Greek more or less independent of the Aramaic. In other words, like Blass supposes Luke did, the writer of the first Gospel sent forth two Gospels, one in Aramaic and the other in Greek. (3) The Greek Matthew is the work of another. This is the view of most modern scholars, and the one Dr. Robertson adopts.

The section devoted to the Sources of the Gospel will doubtless prove most interesting of all to the general reader who has never taken time or trouble to ask whence came the material out of which our Gospels are made? Such a one will, under Dr. Robertson's guidance, get at least a glimpse into the way modern scholarship is trying to solve the Synoptic Problem. The two basal sources underlying Matthew are found to be Mark's Gospel and the famous Q document whose resurrection from the grave into which Matthew and Luke put it is the chief miracle of literary criticism—for, to-day, unless we believe in the resurrection of Q, of all men we are most miserable, having no hope for mercy at the hands of the critics! But there are other "sources." There is more in Matthew's Gospel than Mark plus Q. The birth story, for example, and many other details—whence came they? The conclusion is frankly stated that in all probability "it will never be possible to label every section of the Greek Matthew with the name of its source." The whole question is still largely in the dark. Scholars are still working, and working industriously—but the thing that vexes them is that the ancient writer does not assume their attitude; the bane of most of us moderns is the fallacy that our work is worthful in proportion to the "authorities" that bristle on the side lines.

The fault of the ancient writer—especially the Gospel writer—from our standpoint, is that he has a tendency to subordinate source to purpose; he slights his authorities in order that he may help his readers. The Tübingen theory of Tendencies—as horrid as the thing may sound to some—had a basal truth. The New Testament writings are dominated by a *purpose!* Why all the stir? Where are we to look for any book so cold and colorless as the critic tried to imagine the man of the first century ought to have written? Does not the critic himself have a purpose? And, furthermore, does he not manipulate his manuscripts in such a way as to buttress his posi-

tion? And so long as he simply *manipulates* and does not *fabricate,* do we not give him all due courtesy? Is not a like fairness to be accorded to the gospel teacher or writer? Could a man tell the story of Jesus in the first century, or in any century, without a *purpose?* If he told it as a missionary, it was certainly to *win* men's faith in Jesus as Lord; if he told it as a Gospel writer, it was to *strengthen* men's faith, and show that the Lord that lives is the same Jesus that labored and died. It has remained for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to "discover" by the laborious processes of critical skill what the first-century writer would have told him in a breath, had the question been put. The third and fourth Gospels tell us outright, and for the first and second the dominant note is so potent that it would have been a superfluity to mention it—according to Dr. Robertson, it is "to prove that Jesus of Nazareth, though rejected and crucified by the Jewish people, is in reality the Messias of Promise, the true Son of David, the long-looked-for hope of Israel." It is this purpose, then, that determines Matthew's use of materials and gives to his Gospel its striking Characteristics. These are set forth succinctly in Section X. of the Introduction, under the following heads: (1) Jewish—but not Judaizing; (2) Anti-Pharasaic; (3) Catholic in Sympathy; (4) Many Discourses; (5) Topical Arrangement; (6) Quotations from the Old Testament; (7) Christology; and (8) Kingdom of Heaven. The reading of this section alone will put the ordinary student in the possession of much helpful material, and really make the first Gospel a new book to him.

To Sunday-school teachers, laymen, and such as have not access to larger commentaries, I commend this handy volume on what Renan called "the most important book of Christendom."

THOMAS CARTER.

Vanderbilt University.

THE LOVE STORY OF A MAIDEN OF CATHAY.[1]

I SPEAK the truth, the simple, sober truth, when I say that on Sunday morning, October 29, 1911, standing at my desk, I picked up this little book just to take a peep into it and see what it was like. Nothing is incredible or remarkable in that! But about an hour afterwards I came to myself and discovered that I had read almost to the last page without knowing that I was still standing. I sat down to finish it; and when I got to the end, my eyes were full of tears and

[1] *The Love Story of a Maiden of Cathay.* A Romance of Real Life. Told in Letters from Yang Ping Yu. New York, Chicago, Toronto, London, Edinburgh: Fleming H. Revell Company.

my heart was full of——well, if any one wants to know what my heart was full of, he can find it out only by reading the book and getting his or her heart full of it too. For I declare I can't tell it. I thought *The Lady of the Decoration* was inimitable, unapproachable, in its way. But it seems I shall have to revise my creed. This story got closer to my heart, went deeper into it, than any romance that I have read in many and many a day.

I am wondering and wondering whether there was in reality a sure-enough, dainty, darling of a maiden named Yang Ping Yu, and whether she really did write these perfectly exquisite letters, or whether Mrs. Nance, the wife of my old pupil, W. B. Nance, Professor of English in Soochow University, who sent it to me, created the situation and herself "made up" the letters. In either case, there is a wonder to be accounted for—the wonder of that Chinese maiden, or of Mrs. Nance's creative genius. But the title says "A Romance of Real Life." However, titles of that sort are flexible, and so I am still wondering.

The letters were written by a highly gifted Chinese maiden of the highest class, who has been highly educated in a Christian school but is not herself a Christian. They are written to her cousin, another Chinese maiden who was educated in the same mission school, and who did become a Christian and was at the time in Edinburgh studying to prepare herself to be a physician among her people. They give incidentally most vivid and accurate views of Chinese life, customs, and character, as well as of the problems, sometimes most pathetic, which are created by the Christian education of Chinese youth.

The style of the letters is the very perfection of English, though written by a Chinese young woman. But Professor Nance sends me an actual letter written him by a student who graduated at the last commencement of Soochow University, and the English of it is as *correct* as that of Yang Ping Yu's letters—but the flavor of those letters! I know nobody in this country who has surpassed it.

GROSS ALEXANDER.

Nashville, Tenn.

THE PERSON AND PLACE OF JESUS CHRIST.[1]

The Person and Place of Jesus Christ is the substance of the course of lectures for 1909 delivered on the Congregational Union Foundation at Congregational Hall, London, by P. T. Forsythe, Principal of Hackney College, Hampstead, England.

---

[1] *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ.* The Congregational Union Lectures for 1909. By P. T. Forsythe, M.A., D.D., Principal of Hackney College, Hampshead. Boston, New York, Chicago: The Pilgrim Press.

The negative purpose of the book is to answer modern criticism—originating in Germany—in its attack upon the belief and teaching that the personality of Jesus occupies the central place in Christianity. This religious-historical school of critics eliminates the doctrines of the atonement, repentance, forgiveness of sins; and depreciates the Epistles as sources of Christian doctrine, as well as those portions of the Synoptic Gospels not yielding their interpretation. They attempt to remove from Christ his superhuman character, making him only a man, though "what a man!"—placing emphasis on his words rather than his works, his sayings rather than his personality.

The positive purpose is to show that Christ is an essential part of his gospel, his works are more important than his words, his most important deed being his death on the cross, and his posthumous ministry, in which he revived the disciples' faith, inspired the authors of the Gospels and Epistles, and directed the establishment of the Church. The chief Christological subjects discussed are the preexistence of Christ, the blending of the Divine and human personalities into one, the Kenosis or self-emptying, and the plerosis or self-fulfillment of Christ.

Our conception of Christ depends upon our experience of him. If he is to us only an ideal character, only a messenger from God, only the most perfect type of Christian living, then he need not be God's only Son. But if he is our Saviour from sin, our Redeemer from eternal loss, then he is God, for only God can forgive sins and redeem souls. The evangelical experience, therefore, is an essential condition for the correct interpretation of Christ's personality.

Our author (Dr. Forsythe) says we cannot repeat the religious experience of Jesus in the first place, because we have not the data. We have no information whatever about the form taken by the communion of Father and Son. It is a mystery what took place on the nightly mountain tops, in the far interior of his soul, where his strength was perpetually renewed, his vision cleared, and his decisions made. The religion of Jesus in that sense was absolutely his own. What he was for God it was not for man intimately to know. We are blessed in what he *did*.

In the second place, the data we have places Christ's experience beyond us. For an example, Matt. xi. 27: "No man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son wills to reveal him." His inmost experience was not a thing transferable in itself. In so far as sonship should come to us at all, it could only come by appropriating the Son, and not by cultivating sonship, not by repeating the Son's ex-

perience. Jesus had direct, immediate association with the Father, while our association is mediate, through the Son. "No man cometh unto the Father but by me" (John xiv. 6). The secret of the Father was with the Son alone. No man knew why the Father had chosen Jesus of Nazareth. And Jesus believed in his sonship for reasons entirely between his Father and himself, for reasons quite past us. *We* believe in the Father because of Christ; why and in what way *he* believed in the Father, he has not told us.

To imitate the religion of Jesus is to cultivate an order of piety absolutely different from the entire tradition of the Christendom created by the gospel of Christ, the effect of which was to lay a stress unprecedented upon what had always been a central affair in Christianity—a religion of repentance and forgiveness. Roman, Greek, and Protestant Christianity are here at one. And the declaration now that Christianity consists in imitating at a reverent distance the religion of Jesus, *only shows that we are in the midst of a movement and an apostasy more serious than anything that has occurred in the Church's history since Gnosticism was overcome.*

What does Christ's own self-consciousness reveal with reference to his relation to his gospel? The answer to the question does not lie on the surface, if we confine ourselves to the Synoptics. But there is no doubt about it, if we go by the whole apostolic teaching. From Paul to John it is declared that Jesus *was* the gospel, and he offered himself as such, and that none came to the Father but by him and in him. For the New Testament, taken as a whole, the historical Christ is the Messiah who was coming through the Old Testament; who appeared in Jesus as the Word made flesh, full of grace, and truth, and power, and signs and wonders; who was crucified and rose, making atonement for the sins of the whole world; who ascended up to heaven, where he now and forever represents us with the Father, sends his Spirit, and rules his Church. He was not a mere Rabbi of the law, but the Messiah of the final promise and, since his death, the Saviour of the whole world.

That is the New Testament Christ; and if we repudiate that, we are making a choice between the New Testament and the modern critical school. It is not as if the whole New Testament, when critically handled, were on their side. They do not now claim that. What they claim is that the history *behind the New Testament* is on their side! They claim that apostolic Christianity, being what we have stated, misunderstood Jesus. Hence they go back of the apostolic interpretation of Jesus, and even back of the Synoptics, to discover the simple, human, historic Jesus, whose mission, ministry, and

personality have been so perverted by sacred writers and the Christian Church!

The objection is made that we do not see in Christ either omnipotence or omniscience, which is an attribute of the Godhead. We do not claim that for him. The omnipotence of Jesus consisted in his underived power to do all that was necessary to redeem man from sin. The same may be said of his omniscience.

Theories of incarnation which make all turn on natural omnipotence or omniscience of the Redeemer, are beside the mark. It was his moral value as the Holy One that gave him power, both with God and man, to prevail. It was his holiness with which the Holy Father was perpetually pleased and satisfied. That is the only Christian doctrine of satisfaction.

The preëxistence of Christ is essential to the doctrine of Eternal Fatherhood. Also the work of redeeming the soul could only be accomplished by its Creator. The whole New Testament conception of him as a worshiped being is that of an end and not a means, for whom God's judgment is his judgment, God's kingdom his own, and on personal relation to whom turns our eternal relation to God.

The doctrine of preëxistence forces us into some doctrine of Kenosis or self-emptying. Christ chose the process of limiting himself in order to live under human conditions. We are at once confronted with the question of limitations of knowledge and power not essential to redemption. He did not have to partake of sin in order to share man's lot, but only of temptation. Could he have sinned? Our author holds that he could not sin, but he was not himself conscious of this power of sinlessness.

Jesus worked himself back from a limited to an unlimited being, and hence enriched his nature. If the finite is excluded from the infinite, the infinite becomes only a larger finite. Infinitude must include finitude in order to preserve itself. Thus the Kenosis or self-emptying is followed naturally by plerosis or self-fulfillment.

L. D. Lowe.

Cape Girardeau, Mo.

THE

Approach to the Social Question

By FRANCIS Y. PEABODY

Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. Philosophy and the Social Question
CHAPTER II. Social Science, Sociology, and the Social Question
CHAPTER III. Economics and the Social Question
CHAPTER IV. Ethics and the Social Question
CHAPTER V. Ethical Idealism and the Social Question
CHAPTER VI. Religion and the Social Question

The author's approaches to the Social Question are through the avenues of Philosophy, Social Science and Sociology, Economics, Ethics, Ethical Idealism, and Religion. His treatment is scientific and progressive, reaching, as it does, its climax in social religion. He says: "We began with works; we end with faith. We began with our own plans of social redemption; we end by casting them all into the great movement of the Divine Will."

The American Academy of Social and Religious Science says: "The book cannot fail to be of great value, especially to that large group of persons who have the zeal of God for social betterment, and who lack only the knowledge to make them efficient workmen in the field of social reform."

Strong, commendatory reviews of this timely book have been given in *American Journal of Theology, Atlantic Monthly, Economic Bulletin, Catholic World, Independent, New York Times, The Survey,* and *Yale Record.* It is also recommended by the American Library Association.

12mo. Cloth. 210 pages. Large, clear type. Net, postpaid, $1.25

Smith & Lamar, Nashville, Tenn., and Dallas, Tex.

ROYAL



BAKING POWDER

Absolutely Pure

The only baking powder made from Royal Grape Cream of Tartar

NO ALUM, NO LIME PHOSPHATE

A NEW SONG BOOK

Revival Praises No. 2.

COMPILED BY

GEO. R. STUART
E. B. CHAPPELL
JOHN R. NELSON
W. W. PINSON
D. SULLINS

MUSICAL EDITOR

WM. J. KIRKPATRICK

Published in Both Round and Shaped Notes

PRICES

FULL CLOTH BOARD BINDING

30 cents each, $3.50 per dozen, postpaid
$25.00 per hundred, $3.00 per dozen; not prepaid

LEATHERETTE BINDING

25 cents each, $3.00 per dozon, postpaid
$15.00 per hundred, $2.50 per dozen, not prepaid

SMITH & LAMAR

Nashville, Tenn. Dallas, Tex.

THAT BOY O' MINE

By Nina Hill Robinson

AN ADMIRABLE GIFT FOR ALL SEASONS

A CHARMING and exceedingly well-written story of a Tennessee village lad's intellectual and spiritual awakening. The story of a fine, manly boy and his career through college time from early youth. How he reached the topmost rung of the ladder of success after overcoming many difficulties is told by the author in a most interesting manner. This is a first-class book for the young people and for the old alike. The book is neatly printed and beautifully bound in cloth. 143 pages. **Price, postpaid, 75 cents.**

Order from

Smith & Lamar

NASHVILLE, TENN. DALLAS, TEX.

The Men of Sapio Ranch

BY HORACE M. DU BOSE

A strong, well-written story of Western life, full of interest and thrilling chapters, neatly bound and beautifully illustrated. 221 pages. Sent, postpaid, upon receipt of $1.

SMITH & LAMAR, Nashville, Tenn., and Dallas, Tex.