
A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

APRIL, 1901.
No. CXC.

NEW SERIES,
No. 10.

The London Quarterly Review.

CONTENTS.

London:
CHARLES H. KELLY,
2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD., E.C.; and 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

PRICE HALF-A-CROWN.

THE

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1901.

THE LOWER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes.* Von CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY. Erster Band. (Leipzig. 1900.)
2. *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament.* Von EBERHARD NESTLE. Zweite Auflage. (Göttingen. 1899.)
3. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament.* Translation of the foregoing by Rev. W. EDIE, B.D. (London : Williams & Norgate. 1901.)
4. *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts in the British Museum.* Edited by FREDERIC G. KENYON, M.A., D.Litt., Assistant Keeper of Manuscripts. (London. 1900.)

THE Higher Criticism has become familiar by name, if not altogether by its methods and results, to most intelligent students of Scripture. The expression dates from the eighteenth century, but it is the critical and

theological controversies of the last quarter of a century that have given it the currency it now enjoys. The Lower Criticism, though there has been no little romance connected with the acquisition of some of its materials, has not excited the same amount of popular interest and attention. It is in their application to Holy Scripture that both terms have come to be popularly understood, but their leading principles are applicable to the classics and to all writings whatsoever. They must not be supposed to be antagonistic processes, they do not range their adherents into opposite camps; the one is really the complement and the correlative of the other.

Confining ourselves to Holy Scripture, whenever we endeavour by attention to the indications contained in any book of the Old or New Testament to determine its authorship and date and the circumstances of its composition, we are Higher Critics. When we discuss the integrity and the sources of a writing, when we note its literary features, and come to a finding as to its historical trustworthiness, we are employing the methods of the Higher Criticism. But before we can be efficient Higher Critics we must be Lower Critics. We must settle the correct text of the book we are studying. Classical philology concerns itself with the text of Homer, Theocritus, or Cicero, and seeks by scientific methods to make sure of the correctness of every word; and modern philology is as anxious to obtain from existing materials the best text of Shakespeare or Goethe. We cannot surely be less solicitous to ascertain the very words of the Book of Life as they came from the pen of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, and the other sacred writers. It is accordingly the high function of the Lower Criticism, or, as it is more frequently called from its subject-matter, Textual Criticism, to bring us, by the examination of the MSS. in which it has been transmitted to us, and of the other available authorities, as nearly as possible to the actual language of the sacred autographs. We cannot suppose that any of these autographs are now in existence.

"No work of early literature," says Professor Blass of Halle,[1] "which has been spared by time and has survived to this day —with a few exceptions not worth being mentioned here— subsists in the original writing of the author but in the writing of others, derived through a long series of successive copies from that original writing. Moreover, we do not ordinarily read it even in those written copies, but in a printed book which has been made from the copies, either directly or more often indirectly, being the last in another long series of successive printed editions."

The Lower Criticism concerns itself with the history of the text of such a work of early literature and the changes it has undergone in its transmission through many copies and editions from the time it left the author's hands to the present day. If the Lower Criticism, as its name implies, is occupied with the foundations upon which the Higher Criticism rears its imposing and sometimes fantastic superstructure, it is not less important in its own sphere, and it has of recent years so widened its scope and perfected its methods that it is well entitled, as Professor Gregory insists in the volume named above, to be regarded as a department of study by itself.

In this article we are to confine ourselves to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament and some of its most recent developments. The volumes we have named at the head of the present article may be said to register the high-water mark attained in this department of biblical research. The two treatises of Dr. Gregory and Dr. Nestle furnish a very complete presentation of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament at the present time. It is true we have before us as yet only the first volume of Professor Gregory's encyclopædic work. His publishers had expressed the hope that the first volume would be succeeded by the second and concluding volume before 1900 was out. But the task of seeing a work of this kind through the press, involving the verification of thousands of references, not to

[1] *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 53.

speak of the insertion of additional entries received up to the last moment, is a veritable labour of Hercules. We understand that a large portion of the second volume is printed off, and that the completion of the task may be expected without undue delay. The volume still to appear will contain Dr. Gregory's treatment of the earliest Versions of the New Testament, and of the Quotations from the early ecclesiastical writers, in their bearing upon the text of the New Testament books. The volume now under review, after a lucid and instructive account of the palæography of the New Testament,—the materials, the instruments, the different styles of the writing, and the arrangement of it in the volume and in the page,—proceeds to deal with the manuscript authorities under two general heads: first, the Greek MSS. of the New Testament pure and simple; and secondly, the Greek MSS. of the ancient Church Service books containing the daily, or special, or occasional lessons from the gospels and the epistles. Over and above lists and descriptions of the great Uncial MSS. there are detailed and exhaustive catalogues of the Cursive MSS. and of the Lectionaries or Service books. Professor Gregory adds very considerably to the lists of MSS. enumerated in his well known *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf's Greek New Testament (eighth edition), and even in the latest edition of Scrivener, many of his recent additions having been derived from Egyptian papyri obtained from the Fayoum and elsewhere. One can only admire the industry and patience of the indefatigable scholar who has visited most of the great libraries of Europe, and Turkey beyond Europe, and examined on the spot an immense number of the MSS., whose characteristics he registers and notes. It goes without saying that the Catalogues are not for consecutive perusal but for reference by scholars. But the introductory pages, giving general discussions and summaries, are written with admirable lucidity and point; and if anyone would care to see how charmingly Dr. Gregory can write in his native English on this somewhat recondite and technical subject, we would refer them to the chapters on the

MSS. of the New Testament which he contributed a few years ago to *The People's Bible History*.[1] To some particulars from this marvellous treasury of textual materials we shall call attention as we proceed.

The work of Dr. Nestle, while scholarly and accurate, is in popular form, and is meant to serve the purpose of a Manual of Textual Criticism. When it first appeared in Germany, the rapid sale showed that there was a demand for a work of the kind on the part not only of professional students but also of intelligent readers of the New Testament, and the accomplished author has in the second edition considerably enlarged his treatise without detracting in any measure from its popular characteristics. Professor Nestle and Professor Haussleiter who is named in this volume are both representatives of the sound scholarship and devout learning that have always, even amid other elements, found a home in Tübingen and South Germany since the days of Bengel. Dr. Nestle is peculiarly strong in those Syriac studies which have within the last decade done so much to elucidate and almost to revolutionise established theories of the New Testament text, and it is to him as one of our foremost living Septuagint scholars that Professor Swete of Cambridge dedicates his valuable *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, noticed briefly in the last number of this REVIEW. Accordingly, the part of Dr. Nestle's *Introduction* which deals with the *Theory and Praxis of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, demanding such knowledge and involving the application of critical principles to the superabundant materials, is specially valuable. His work is happily accessible to the English reader in a translation which is enhanced by corrections and additions by the author. It is a pleasure to recognise the skill and readableness of Mr. Edie's translation, which we have compared with the original and which does credit to

[1] Edited by the Rev. G. C. Lorimer, LL.D., with an Introduction by the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone. (London: The Christian Commonwealth Company.)

the scholarly repute of the younger ministers of the Church of Scotland.

Those who think of studying the Lower Criticism in its most recent developments with the help of the two standard works already noticed should by all means possess themselves also of the volume of *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts* recently issued by the Trustees of the British Museum, under the competent editorship of Dr. Kenyon. The volume contains twenty-five excellent reproductions of as many interesting MSS., Greek, Latin, and English, previous to the invention of printing, with accompanying descriptions of their character and contents.

It may be useful to those readers who are not professional students, but who are nevertheless intelligently interested in everything that helps to elucidate the volume wherein are the Words of Eternal Life, if we give them a glimpse here and there of the field covered by the Lower or Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

From what has been already said our readers will perhaps be prepared to hear that for no literary monument of antiquity have we such an abundance of manuscript authorities as for the New Testament. It is truly an embarrassment of riches. Classical scholars envy the New Testament student the wealth of materials at his disposal. It is true that classical literature has benefited considerably by those discoveries of Egyptian papyri which within the last decade or two have added to the MSS. enumerated in Dr. Gregory's catalogues. More than fifty years ago a large portion of the Eighteeenth Book of Homer's *Iliad*, probably belonging to the first century B.C., was discovered, and since then portions of other books dating from the fourth or fifth century A.D. have been found. From the sands of the Fayoum in Egypt Professor Flinders Petrie has recovered a large number of documents in the form of papyri belonging to the third century B.C. Among them are fragments of the lost play of Euripides, the *Antiope*, and fragments also of the *Phædo* of Plato, copied, there is every reason to believe, within a hundred years of the philosopher's

death, and not differing in any material degree from the work as it was published in his lifetime. More remarkable and precious still, to classical scholars, was the discovery in 1890 of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*, which had fallen quite out of sight for a thousand years. The writing bears a date which seems to fix it in the last year of the reign of the Emperor Vespasian, A.D. 78–79. Fragments of Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Isocrates, dating from the second or first century of our era, have also been recovered, and the lost poems of Herondas have been added within the last few years to the literature of classical antiquity. Some of these fragments go back to a high antiquity, as antiquity in Greek and Latin literature is reckoned, and every line of them is precious. But after all they are very few. There is no complete MS. of Homer earlier than the thirteenth century of our era. All that is preserved of Sophocles is found in a single MS. of the eighth or ninth century. The only complete MS. of the *Phædo* was copied in the Middle Ages.

Of the New Testament the number of MSS. examined and catalogued by such careful and trustworthy scholars as Scrivener and Gregory is very great. The fourth edition of Scrivener's great *Introduction*, edited and brought up to date (1894) by Prebendary Miller, gives 3,791 as the total; Professor Nestle (1898) says 3,829; and Dr. Gregory (1900) accounts in his careful catalogues for 4,126. "A systematic search," says Dr. Nestle, "in the libraries of Europe might add still more to the list; a search in those of Asia and Egypt would certainly do so. Gregory believes that there are probably some two or three thousand MSS. which have not yet been collected, and every year additional MSS. are brought to light." Of the four thousand or more MSS. already catalogued by far the greater number are of late date, and many of them contain only the merest fragments. Two at least of the great Uncial MSS. (Codex ℵ and Codex B) containing the New Testament complete or almost complete—they are in fact Bibles, for they contain the Old Testament as well—belong to the fourth century. A fragment

of the first chapter of Matthew, consisting of little more than scattered letters belonging to the Oxyrhynchus Papyri discovered and published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, is assigned by these scholars to the third century; but Dr. Gregory places it rather in the fourth century, judging from the book form of the papyrus. Other two Uncial MSS. fairly complete, and three portions of the New Testament, reach up to the fifth century. From the sixth century, not counting recent papyrus fragments, we have at least nine large Uncial MSS. According to Scrivener there are eighty-eight large MSS., and according to Von Gebhardt one hundred and fourteen, available for the study of Textual Criticism as old as the tenth century. It is not surprising to learn that there is a decided preponderance of MSS. available for the Gospels, which have been most frequently copied; next to them come the Pauline Epistles, if we treat them not simply as independent MSS., since they are attached sometimes to the Gospels, sometimes to the Acts, and sometimes to the Catholic Epistles. The Apocalypse was most seldom copied, and it is found sometimes among extra-canonical writings. The Cursive MSS., which are vastly more numerous than the Uncials, are all the more welcome for the Apocalypse, and the Acts, and the Epistles, because for them the large MSS. are fewer. It does not follow that a late MS., a Codex copied say in the eleventh or twelfth century, is less valuable or trustworthy, although the presumption from the probability of more frequent transcription lies that way. It might have been copied from a comparatively early MS., and so bear an authority, saving possible errors of transcription, equal to its exemplar.

We have said that some of the MSS. contain the merest fragments of the New Testament. One precious morsel of the sixth century (T^{κ} of Scrivener and Gregory) contains only four verses, Matthew iii. 13–16. From the Archduke Rainer Collection of Papyri at Vienna there is a fragment of the seventh century containing four verses of St. John's Gospel (i. 29–32) considerably mutilated; another of the fourth or fifth century giving bits of two columns with broken

verses of Matthew xviii. 18–29; and still another of the fourth century containing ten verses of St. Mark (xv. 29–38). These fragments are as carefully described in Dr. Gregory's lists as MSS. of larger dimensions, and the tiniest morsel, if it is of early date, may help to decide a reading when the authorities are evenly balanced.

The additions to the number of old and valuable MSS. from time to time are often, as we have indicated, full of romance. It is an old and oft-told story how Constantine Tischendorf on a first visit to the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai in 1844 rescued from the waste-paper basket some sheets of a MS. of the Old Testament; on a second visit in 1853 found no trace of any more; and on a third visit in 1859 discovered, just as he was about to give up all hope, the entire remaining portion of the MS. comprising great part of the Old Testament and the whole of the New. It was all so romantic that notable scholars, even after the Codex Sinaiticus had established itself as one of the very weightiest authorities for the New Testament text, shook their heads, and in connexion with Tischendorf's account of its discovery recalled the forger Simonides. Tischendorf's reputation we had imagined had outlived all these insinuations and even baseless accusations that had been openly made against him. Dr. Gregory, who has been Tischendorf's literary executor, and prepared the *Prolegomena* to his eighth edition of the New Testament with infinite labour and pains, returns to the controversies of those days and warmly vindicates his master.

"Tischendorf," he says, "I never saw, and I never even exchanged letters with him. An American by birth I left America for good five days after the stroke which ended Tischendorf's literary activity. Even since his death I have had no other relationship with his family than that of ordinary friendship. I have endeavoured to look at this affair from all sides. From friend and foe, from traducers and admirers, even beyond the bounds of Germany, I have made careful inquiry so as to ascertain what people had to tell. And still I pick the brains of every new acquaintance likely to give me information.

With the weaknesses of Tischendorf (who hasn't his weakness?) I have been well acquainted all along. Tischendorf's papers and letters from the earlier and the more recent periods of his life, the MSS. of his printed books, his collections and notes of every sort, his drafts of letters, even his private letters to his family, have all passed through my hands and have been repeatedly arranged and rearranged by me. Finally, I have had those first sheets, the Codex Frederico-Augustanus, more than once in my hands. After all this, it affords me pleasure to be able to say that I have not in connexion with the Codex Sinaiticus nor anywhere discovered a scrap of evidence that Tischendorf ever acted dishonourably. Infamous charges are interesting and piquant, detraction is infectious, slanders that have got a start are never perfectly wiped out by correction, but I beg every Christian scholar who reads these lines to do his part that justice may be done in this matter, and that the honour of the dead who performed such notable service for the Bible and for science may be preserved untarnished."

That the age of discovery is not yet past in connexion with MSS. of the New Testament has been conspicuously shown in the course of the last decade by a special instance. In the *Facsimiles of Biblical Manuscripts in the British Museum* the fourth place is occupied by a page of the MS. known as Codex N in the lists. It is a MS. of the gospels written on purple vellum in gold and silver letters, probably in the sixth century, from which we have three other illuminated MSS. Apart from its luxurious character, to which it owed its name of the Codex Purpureus, this MS. had the peculiarity attaching to its history that it had been dismembered at some stage of its existence and that parts of it were already in four different libraries. Thirty-three leaves were in a library on the island of Patmos, six in the Vatican Library at Rome, four in the British Museum (one of which is given in facsimile), and two in the Imperial Library at Vienna. These forty-five leaves of course represented among them but a moiety of the whole; whether the rest were in existence, and where, no one could say. Professor Demetriades saw leaves corresponding to the description in 1883 in the village church of

Sarumsak or Sarumsahly in the neighbourhood of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, and told Dr. Gregory of the circumstance some time later. In 1892 a young Greek brought in an envelope a sample leaf of the MS. to Dr. Long, Vice-President of the well known Robert College on the Bosphorus. The news soon went abroad of the existence of a treasure, and the question was how to secure it. The owners would not name a price to Dr. Long, but after smaller proposals he made the tempting offer of £1,000 and the sum was verbally accepted. Meanwhile Russia became aware of the negotiation, and with the help of the Greek Patriarch the trustees of the village church were induced to sell to the Czar, and the venerable collection amounting to 182 leaves is now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. When they were carefully examined they were found to be the largest portion of the already known Purpureus. There are now, therefore, 227 leaves of the original total of 466 extant, and they have been carefully edited by the Rev. H. S. Cronin, M.A., Dean of Trinity Hall, Cambridge,[1] who believes the Codex to have been written probably at Constantinople, certainly before the end of the first quarter of the seventh century and most probably half a century earlier. That those scattered fragments, the dispersion of which Mr. Cronin thinks may have been due to Crusaders in the twelfth century, should now be collected in one volume is surely a triumph of critical scholarship, and who can tell where the other and larger half may yet be found? As regards its critical value, Dr. Kenyon tells us that it along with the other three extant purple MSS. are the earliest thoroughgoing representatives of the type of text which is found in the great majority of MSS. and is familiar to us in the Textus Receptus and Authorised Version.

One of the most notable discoveries of recent years, the results of which are already materially affecting critical theories, is the discovery of the Sinaitic Palimpsest MS. of the Four Gospels in Syriac by Mrs. Agnes Smith

[1] *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, Vol. V.

Lewis and her sister, Mrs. Margaret Dunlop Gibson. The story of *How the Codex was Found*, detailed by Mrs. Gibson from her sister's Journals, recalls Tischendorf's experiences even in detail; but around the Codex itself, which has been transcribed and issued under the editorial care of the late Professor Bensly of Cambridge, Mr. J. Rendel Harris, and Mr. F. C. Burkitt, there is growing up quite a literature. The text has been translated into German by Adelbert Merx, a well known oriental scholar, who has added a brief but valuable critical discussion. Of course the Four Gospels in Syriac is a subject which belongs to the second of the three great sources of materials for the reconstruction of the text of the New Testament, and before estimating the value of the Sinaitic Syriac MS. a word or two on the versions in general may be helpful. The claim of the religion of Jesus to be the true religion, to have the one full and heart-satisfying revelation of God to man, and to set forth Him who tasted death for every man, carried with it the obligation to make the gospel known to all mankind. This was felt from the beginning, and in these last days it has been felt to such purpose that now there are over four hundred tongues of human speech in which men may read the wonderful works of God. Syria was in close proximity to the Holy Land; Antioch, its great and voluptuous capital, was the starting-point of the first Christian mission to the Gentiles; and moreover its language had close affinities with the Aramaic commonly spoken in Palestine. It is not wonderful, then, that the Syriac version should be, in all probability, the very first of those translations into the vernacular of Gentile nations. As Christianity spread Latin and Egyptian versions were made, and very early Armenian and Ethiopic versions were required. When Christianity spread northwards the Gothic bishop Ulphilas gave his warlike countrymen a translation of the Bible, from which, however, he omitted the Books of Samuel and Kings lest they should tend to irritate the fierce and sanguinary spirit of the barbarians. But to return to the Syriac Versions. There were very early versions made for the Syriac-

speaking Christians of the Euphrates Valley. Gregory[1] regards it as possible that many of the books of the New Testament were translated before the end of the first century. One of these versions has long been known as the Peshitto, "the simple," and has attained also the honourable appellation of "the Queen of the Versions." But the Peshitto is now believed to be not one of the earliest translations, but a later revision of it made to conform more closely to the Greek, just as Jerome's Latin Vulgate is a revision of the older Latin texts. Westcott and Hort believe, and so far as I can gather Dr. Gregory agrees with them, though Dr. Salmon of Dublin and others consider there is no evidence for this view, that the Greek text was found to need revision and was actually revised at the same time. A copy of the more ancient Syriac translation of the Four Gospels was brought from the Nitrian desert in 1842, and has been known from its editor, Canon Cureton, who published it in 1858, as the Curetonian Syriac. It proved to contain in its text many of the readings which are characteristic of the MSS. of Western Europe. This Curetonian MS., as Mr. F. C. Burkitt reminds us,[2]

> was very imperfect, not more than half the contents of the gospels being preserved in it, and moreover (as we now know) it does not give a very pure form of the Old Syriac Version, as it shows signs of having been corrected in places by later Greek MSS. The discovery of another MS. of the same version in 1892 at the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai was therefore a great gain. The new MS. was a palimpsest, and often very hard to decipher, but not more than one-eighth of the whole is actually lost or quite illegible, and the text is incomparably better than that of the Curetonian.

The Sinai Syriac is thus an unrevised text, and there is an old Latin text, also unrevised, from before the days of Jerome. Representing the eastern and western limits of Christianity, these two sources go themselves very near the

---

[1] *People's Bible History*, p. 582.

[2] *Two Lectures on the Gospels*, p. 13.

common fountain-head, and their agreement makes them a strong witness for the ancient reading in any particular case. We should have liked to give illustrations of the textual advantages we have gained by our possession of the Sinai-Syriac or Lewis-Syriac MS., but space forbids. Those who wish to see the new readings it brings into the field will find a detailed and annotated list in the *Expository Times* (November, December, 1900, and February, 1901). We may give one or two judgments of its value by competent authorities. Professor Harnack of Berlin pronounces it to be "one of the most important, yes, probably altogether the most important, of witnesses for our gospels." Dr. Rendel Harris, shortly after the discovery was made, said :[1]

> A text has been recovered, superior in antiquity to anything yet known, and one that often agrees with all that is most ancient in Greek MSS.; a text which the advanced critics will acknowledge to be, after allowance has been made for a few serious blemishes, superior in printing to all extant copies, with a very few exceptions.

When we remember that we are indebted to these two Scotch ladies for a discovery so valuable and far reaching we need not be surprised that the Universities are fain to have their names placed on their rolls of honour. The University of Halle has already bestowed its honorary degree of Phil.Dr. upon Mrs. Lewis; and St. Andrew's University, more generous still, is about to decorate both of them together with its LL.D. degree. Dr. Gregory says of their services up till now :

> We hope this will not be the last discovery made by these learned women, so unusually endowed by nature, education, and fortune for investigation in the recluse libraries of Eastern Churches and for fructifying the results of their investigations.

It will not be difficult to understand that the possession of such a multitude of MSS. and other authorities brings with

[1] *Contemporary Review* for November, 1894.

it peculiar embarrassment. In process of transcription by copyists omissions, additions, interpolations, varieties of spelling and other alterations were inevitable, and thus we have an immense number of Various Readings. Blass[1] says these are estimated now to be about 150,000, and this, we take it, is not over the mark but under it. But no one needs to take alarm at such a statement, as if all certainty regarding the real text of Scripture were impossible. The words of Bentley, the great scholar and critic early in the eighteenth century, have often been quoted, and their truth and relevance are the same to-day:

> The real text of the sacred writers does not now lie in any one MS. or edition, but is dispersed in them all. 'Tis competently exact indeed in the worst MS. now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them, choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design out of the whole lump of readings.

And again, looking forward to a multiplication of various readings which seemed little likely in his day, but has actually taken place, he says:

> Make your 30,000 variations many times more if numbers of copies can ever reach that sum; all the better to a knowing and serious reader who is thereby more richly furnished to select what he sees to be genuine. But even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool, and yet with the most sinistrous and absurd choice he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter nor so disguise Christianity but that every feature of it will be still the same.

When we speak of variations we naturally imply a standard; and the standard from the days of Erasmus, the first editor of the Greek New Testament, down to the fourth decade of the century just closed was what is known as the Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus was based upon very few MSS., and these both late and defective. It is well known that Erasmus, having absolutely no Greek MS. authority for the closing verses of Revelation, himself boldly

[1] *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 60.

constructed a Greek text by translating from the Vulgate, and thus supplied what was lacking. Yet it was the Textus Receptus which was the foundation of our English New Testament, from which William Tyndale translated his version completed in 1525, and from which King James's Translators in 1611 gave their version to so many generations of English-speaking people. The Textus Receptus could not always satisfy the requirements of scholarship and sacred learning, and the English-speaking world could not rest content with a translation, however beautiful, however readable, based upon a text which was at first admittedly defective and which discoveries of MSS. in the course of years showed to be in many places erroneous. The wonder is that the Textus Receptus held the field so long. It was the German philologist, Lachmann, who led the way with a text constructed without regard to the Textus Receptus from the earliest MSS. then available to him—the Vatican MS. (B) of the fourth century, and the Alexandrian MS. (A) and the palimpsest Codex Ephræmi (C) of the fifth century. His aim was to reconstruct the text as it was in the fourth century. After him followed Tischendorf, whose text naturally made great use of his great Sinaitic Codex (ℵ) of the fourth century very closely; Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, one of the most laborious, and learned, and devout of New Testament scholars; and then Westcott and Hort, the great duumvirate of English New Testament scholars, the principles of whose text lie at the foundation of the text constructed by the English Revisers in preparation for the Revised Translation of 1881. The text of Westcott and Hort has come almost to be the Textus Receptus of our time, so eminent were these scholars and so convincing the arguments by which they supported their case. Without entering in any detail into their treatment of the MSS. and other authorities before them, we may say that they depend mainly upon the two earliest and complete Uncial MSS. B and ℵ, dating from the fourth century, and seek corroborative evidence from later Uncials in varying degrees, from the earliest versions, and from the quotations of the earliest Fathers, especially

Origen of Alexandria, whose literary activity as "the Father of Biblical Criticism" falls into the first half of the third century. These authorities take us back, according to Dr. Hort, generations behind the actual date of B and bring us within reasonable proximity of the autographs, which is the goal he and his colleague sought to reach. The theory of Westcott and Hort, able and well supported as it was, had some vulnerable points from the first, and fresh discoveries of early materials and further investigations, especially into the old Latin Versions and other representatives of the Western text, show that these great scholars have by no means reached finality. The surviving editor, the Bishop of Durham, in an editorial note to the edition of 1896, admits that

> the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. of the Old Syriac (Mrs. Lewis's MS.) raises the question whether the combination of the oldest types of the Syriac and Latin texts can outweigh the combination of the primary Greek texts. A careful examination of the passages in which Syr Sin, and k (a well known and important old Latin MS.) are arrayed against ℵ B would point to this conclusion.

As Dr. Nestle points out, this admission does not seem entirely consistent with a remark in the Preface of Westcott and Hort's 1896 edition, where Dr. Westcott says:

> I may perhaps be allowed to say that no arguments have been advanced against the general principles maintained in the Introduction and illustrated in the Notes since the publication of the first edition which were not fully considered by Dr. Hort and myself in the long course of our work, and in our judgment dealt with accurately.

No scholars of modern times are more worthy of reverence for exact scholarship and sane judgment and loyal devotion to Christian truth, but not even by them has the last word been spoken on the many intricate and delicate questions raised by the progress of investigation. Some of the problems that have to be considered and dealt with will be seen in some account, with which we shall draw this article

to a close, of the remarkable Codex Bezæ (D) of the sixth century, now the possession of the University of Cambridge and the greatest treasure of its library. It is a Græco-Latin MS. having the Greek on the left and the Latin on the right as the Codex is opened. It was presented to the University of Cambridge by the Reformer Beza in 1581, having formerly been in the Monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons in France. "It now contains with certain lacunæ," says Dr. Nestle, "the gospels (in the order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark), the concluding verses of the Latin text of 3 John, followed immediately by the Acts, showing that in this manuscript the Epistle of Jude either stood somewhere else or was absent altogether." D, as it may shortly be called, has long been regarded as a kind of monstrosity among the MSS. of the New Testament. In many passages, especially in St. Luke's Gospel and the Acts, the text varies in the most remarkable manner from all other Greek MSS. "What man of sound mind," asked Matthaei long ago, "would use Codex D." "The Codex Bezæ sets criticism at defiance," says Bishop Middleton. "It would have been strange," says Dr. Hort in the Introduction to Westcott and Hort's *New Testament in Greek*, "if this text as a whole had found much favour."

Before seeking any explanation of its peculiarities, let us mention some of its readings. To Matthew xx. 28, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many," D adds, "*But seek ye to grow up from little and from greater to be less.*" In John vi. 56 there is a remarkable addition: "He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me, and I in him: *even as the Father is in Me and I in the Father. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Unless ye receive the body of the Son of man as the bread of life ye have not life in Him.*" It is, however, in St. Luke's Gospel, and particularly in the Acts of the Apostles, that these various readings are most numerous and most marked. To St. Luke's account of our Lord's vindication of His disciples when they walked through the cornfields and plucked the ears of corn (Luke

vi. 1–4), D adds: "*The same day seeing a man working on the Sabbath He said to him, Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, happy art thou; but if thou dost not know, cursed art thou and a transgressor of the law.*" A very interesting addition is made in Luke xxiii. 53, where it is said, when Joseph of Arimathæa had placed the body of Jesus in his own new tomb, "*he placed upon the sepulchre a stone which twenty men moved with difficulty.*" In the Acts of the Apostles we find the peculiarities of D still further exaggerated, and about 600 additions, ornamental additions they used to be called, have been counted. Some of these additions betray the special knowledge of an eye-witness. For example, in Acts xii. 11, where we read of St. Peter's deliverance from prison in Jerusalem by an angel, it is added, "*They went forth and descended the seven steps,*" which leaves upon us the impression that the writer knew the spot well by personal observation. Several additions connect themselves with a well known scene, the release of Paul and Silas from prison at Philippi, where there had been a great earthquake leading to the conversion of the jailor (Acts xvi. 19 ff.). They are more significant when we recall that St. Luke, judging by the use of "we" in the narrative, was St. Paul's companion as far as Philippi and during his abode in that city. D adds a very happy touch to the appearance of the jailor in prison. The common text reads, "Having brought Paul and Silas out, he said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" D expands this. "Having brought them out, *and having placed the other prisoners in safety*, he said," etc. The narrative according to the common text goes on to say that "when it was day the prætors sent the lictors with the message to the jailor, Release those men." D explains how it came that they were moved to take this new step, reading, "When it was day the prætors *assembled together in the market-place, and remembering the earthquake that had taken place they were afraid* and sent the lictors." On that occasion St. Paul stood on his dignity and his rights as a Roman citizen, and he and Silas declined to go free unless the prætors should come

themselves and take them out. D mentions in addition that the magistrates came *with many friends* into the prison, and tells at greater length than the common text how the magistrates, being afraid lest there should be another conspiracy against Paul and distrusting their own ability to keep order, said, "*Go forth from the city lest they again make a riot and inveigh loudly against you to us.*" Upon this account Professor Ramsay says :[1]

> The weakness of municipal government in the cities of the Ægean lands was always a danger to order, and the Bezan text hits off admirably the situation and brings out with much skill the naïve desire of the magistrates to avoid an unpleasant case by inducing the innocent and weaker parties to submit to injustice and withdraw from the city.

Still another of these remarkable readings may be noticed because it gives us a new "we" section—that is, adds to the passages which indicate the historian's presence in the circumstances he describes. In Acts xi. 27, 28 the common text reads, "In those days prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch, and there arose up one of them named Agabus." D reads after "Antioch," "*And there was great rejoicing. And when we had been assembled together* there arose up one of them named Agabus." Besides the interest already noted as belonging to the reading, there is this further, that it gives some colour to the early tradition that St. Luke himself belonged to Antioch. These are examples of the various readings with which the text of Codex D abounds.[2]

What is the explanation of these expansions and additions? There is too much evidence of purpose and design in the readings to ascribe them to the blundering or the

---

[1] *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 224.

[2] They are all to be found in Codex Bezæ, carefully edited by Scrivener; and Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire* and *St. Paul the Traveller* have many references to the various readings in Acts. Blass's *Acta Apostolorum* gives in a connected and reconstructed text all the readings of D and its relations.

caprice of a copyist. It was believed that the possessor of the MS. lying at the foundation of D had filled the margin with notes and glosses chiefly from the Latin, being a Christian of the Western Church. By-and-by the whole collection of those Latin glosses was translated into Greek and inserted in the text by one who valued them highly. This explanation is unlikely for various reasons, but especially because such a copyist could scarcely have always preserved the diction and vocabulary of St. Luke as is done by the expansions in D. It was left to Professor Blass of Halle to suggest the explanation, which, whatever its absolute truth, offers by far the completest solution yet proposed of the questions raised by these remarkable readings. Blass's theory, in short, is that both the common text, as we have called it, and the text of which D is the leading representative (for it is not alone as we have now learned in these readings) are both from the hand of St. Luke himself—the Western text with its diffuse and expanded readings being descended from the rough draft first made by St. Luke, and the common text with its terse and smoother readings from the finished copy which St. Luke sent to his friend Theophilus. In working out his theory Blass has to draw a distinction between the Gospel and the Acts.

"The conditions of the Gospel and that of the Acts," he says,[1] "similar as they are, are still different in one essential point. The similarity, to speak of the first, extends to this, that, of the two different copies of each, one has been written (as we supposed) for the Romans and was consequently propagated chiefly in the West, and the other was written for Theophilus, whom we suppose to have lived in the East, and propagated there. But here at once this difference comes in (which was found out, I think, by Professor Nestle earlier than by myself), that the Romans got the later copy of the Gospel and the earlier copy of the Acts."

There is less certainty regarding the application of Blass's

[1] *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 102.

theory to the Gospel, but it does seem to meet the conditions of the problem suggested by the Bezan text of the Acts of the Apostles. He has found in Dr. Zahn of Leipzig, our greatest living authority on patristic literature now that Lightfoot has gone, a warm supporter. In his *Introduction to the New Testament* Zahn recalls how, in the winter of 1885–6, he gave out as the subject of a prize essay, "An Investigation of the Materially Important Peculiarities of Codex D in the Acts," and made a note at the time of the result he hoped to attain, *viz.* that was either the author's rough draft before publication or his own personal copy with the marginal notes inserted afterwards. Since Blass came forward with his clearly defined and thoroughly elaborated hypothesis, Zahn has given it his cordial adhesion, as far as it concerns the Acts; Nestle, while not disposed to fall foul of the system to which Westcott and Hort devoted the labours of a lifetime, and in the building up of which, as he says, they had at their command such an apparatus as is far beyond the reach of a German, is firmly persuaded that Blass's theory is nearer the mark than the previous estimate of the Western text. Dr. Salmon of Dublin, who brings a clear head and a ready wit to the discussion of all these intricate problems, says :[1]

> I own that having found evidence that two texts of the Acts were in circulation in very early times, having convinced myself that the difference between the two could not have resulted from licentious transcription, but must have come from editorial revision, and that the reviser must have been not only very early but very well informed, I find no solution so satisfactory as Blass's, *viz.* that the reviser was Luke himself.

The theory has not obtained the adhesion of Gregory, and scholars like Professor Ramsay and Dr. Chase are opposed to it; but it has raised one of the most interesting questions in connexion with Textual Criticism, and whether ultimately accepted or not it is bound to have an important

[1] *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 601.

influence alike upon the Lower and the Higher Criticism of the New Testament. Whatever be its ultimate fate we have now to reckon with the Western text as a witness whose testimony can no longer be disparaged or set aside.

The whole tendency of the Lower Criticism, we may surely say in concluding this article, is not, when rightly conceived and pursued, calculated to unsettle but to confirm the faith of the Christian. The labours of the workmen in this field have already resulted in valuable elucidations of Scripture truth and have shown on what a solid basis the historical character of the New Testament rests.

"May every reader," says Dr. Gregory, "seek work for himself somewhere in this great and only slightly cultivated field. He has wide scope. Every taste, every special endowment may find here employment. The man of means may travel and collect Manuscripts, the scholar tied to his desk may in retirement sift the materials obtained and classify them into groups. Only with united forces, only through years of unceasing toil, can a clear survey of the history of the text be obtained and a right judgment as to the proper conclusions regarding the final decision of disputed readings be pronounced."

THOMAS NICOL.

FIRST ON THE ANTARCTIC CONTINENT.

First on the Antarctic Continent. Being an Account of the British Antarctic Expedition, 1898–1900. By C. E. BORCHGREVINK, F.R.G.S., Commander of the Expedition. With Portraits, Maps, and Illustrations. (London: George Newnes, Limited. 1901.)

THIS delightful book is the story of a magnificent achievement. Mr. C. E. Borchgrevink has "forced the Antarctic ice and reached the glittering gates where eternity rules in stern silence." To prepare the way for this expedition, which the munificence of Sir George Newnes made possible, something had been done by previous explorers. Captain James Cook sighted the great ice barrier of Antarctica in 1772; from which year onward to 1840 such names as Smith, Weddell, Powell, Biscoe, D'Urville, Balleny, and Wilkes appear in the annals of Antarctic research. Numerous islands were discovered; South Shetlands, for instance, South Orkneys, Balleny Island with its soaring volcano, 12,000 feet high, and Wilkes' Land. But the Antarctic continent remained hidden till 1841, when Sir James Ross, forcing the *Erebus* and *Terror* through the pack-ice and entering open water beyond, discovered South Victoria Land with its stupendous volcanoes, and sailed five hundred miles southward along its coast, to find, in latitude 78° S., a sheer wall of ice from one hundred and eighty to two hundred feet high absolutely barring farther progress. This was a noteworthy piece of work, displaying great capacity and pluck; for Sir James Ross's ships were only sailing vessels, and his general equipment was much inferior to that of later explorers. Little was done

between 1841 and 1898. An occasional whaler sighted the ice-mailed continent, or some of the inhospitable islands that stud its treacherous seas. Mr. Borchgrevink, during a preliminary voyage in 1894, in which he was a subordinate, crossed the Antarctic circle and landed on the peninsula of Cape Adair, in South Victoria Land, near the spot which he afterwards selected as the site of his pioneer camp and the centre of his operations, during his successful scientific expedition in the *Southern Cross*,—an expedition which has opened up a new era in geographical science, and will make the name of its leader famous among dauntless men.

The *Southern Cross*, the vessel in which Mr. Borchgrevink was to reach the great white continent and explore its seas, was a steamship of five hundred tons, gross tonnage, designed by Colin Archer, the draughtsman of Nansen's *Fram*, and scientifically built, in Norway, of the strongest materials, to cope with the perils of navigation in ice-laden seas. The officers and crew were selected with special reference to fitness for the grave tasks that lay before them. Like Mr. Borchgrevink himself, they were chiefly Norwegians of the old Viking stock, intelligent, and brave as lions. In the commander's staff of practical scientists were two young Englishmen and a Tasmanian, the remaining three being Norwegians,—all of whom, without exception, proved themselves right worthy comrades of an able and heroic leader. The captain of the *Southern Cross*, Mr. Jensen, was a man of "courage, carefulness, and tact," qualities which never deserted him during the expedition. There were also on board two resourceful and faithful Lapps, who in many an hour of trial rendered priceless service. Such were the men who helped their intrepid leader to success.

The *Southern Cross*, "gay as a lady-bird, graceful as a swan," with thirty-one persons aboard, with an equipment as perfect as experience in Arctic seas could suggest, left the Thames, flying the Union Jack, presented by the Duke of York, amid the cheers and good wishes of a multitude of sympathisers, on August 23, 1898. Mr. Borchgrevink took as his watchword Nelson's famous signal, "England ex-

pects every man to do his duty." After a passage of ninety-eight days, they arrived at Hobart, where the commander placed a large wreath at the foot of the statue of Sir John Franklin, with a card bearing the following inscription :

A tribute to the memory of Sir John Franklin, Kt., R.N., K.C.H., Lieut.-Governor of Tasmania, 1837–43, from the Commander and Members of the British Antarctic Expedition, 1898.

"Not here: the white North has thy bones; and thou,
Heroic sailor-soul,
Art passing on thine happier voyage now
Towards no earthly Pole."

After staying a fortnight, they steamed away, on December 19, for the far South, towards their work and their fate. Many birds were observed on the voyage; among them, the great wandering albatross (*Diomeda exulans*), the sooty albatross (*D. fulginosa*), the mutton bird, several species of petrels,—the white-bellied petrel (*Cymodroma grallaria*), the blue-billed petrel (*Prion vittatus*), the giant petrel (*Ossifraga gigantea*), and Wilson's petrel (*Oceanites oceanicus*),—and numerous penguins.

The Antarctic ice-pack was struck in lat. 61° 56′ S. and long. 153° 53′ E. This was regarded as a promising sign of an early Antarctic spring. Cautiously, and with some anxiety, the *Southern Cross* was handled as she fought her way through the ice; for she was now entering upon her trial. Mr. Borchgrevink and Captain Jensen took entire charge of the navigation, dividing between them long stretches of as much as ten successive hours, in the bitter cold, in the crow's nest at the head of the mainmast, from which, by telegraph, to the engine-room and the steersman they directed the course of the vessel. From this lofty perch there was a fine view of the wide sweep of Antarctic ocean scenery. The ice reached to the dim horizon, opening into wide lagoons of steel-coloured water, and closing again into narrow ribbons of deeper blue. Icebergs flashed crimson and pink, or caught and shattered the sunlight on their huge prisms into rainbow loveliness. Here was a safe

channel for the ship; there it was blocked by a glittering isthmus of silver. The *Southern Cross*, with her steel-covered bows, behind which are eleven feet of solid oak, crashed through the barriers. Her weight, her shape, her powerful engines—all helped her through.

Great blocks of ice rear on end, overturn, and plunge against her fortified sides, while the entire crew watch the magnificent spectacle from the forecastle. The ship shivers, and the shock is felt tremendously in the crow's nest.

The air is full of the thud and grind of the close-pack as she passes through it, and the human voice is lost in the deafening roar. A different order of avians is met with after entering the ice. Some birds the zoologist on board is not able to name. The giant petrel and Wilson's petrel are again occasionally seen, as well as the Cape petrel (*Daption Capensis*); but more common are the elegant snowy petrel (*Pagodroma nivea*), and the silver-grey petrel (*Thalassoica glacialoides*). On January 8, 1899, the first specimen of the king penguin (*Aptenodytes pennanti*) is observed. This is a proud bird, whose pure white breast is touched with gold. A whale now and then flops among the ice. Seals make their appearance, perfectly tame, "ignorant of the bloodthirstiness of civilisation." On January 14, at midnight, in lat. 65° 42′ S. and long. 163° E., Mr. Borchgrevink sighted, from the crow's nest, snow-clad hills to the south.

The land stood out sharply in a haze of crimson and gold, which grew more brilliant as the sun rose, until the contours of peaks and crevasses suddenly caught the beauty of the young day, and reflected it over the immense ice-pack, where the dark water-pools between the floes changed suddenly from deepest azure to blood-red, while the new snow on the ice blushed in delicate crimson, and the snow-crystals glittered like diamonds on the white bosom of the Antarctic Ocean.

This land was the volcanic Balleny Island. The *Southern Cross* was now held fast in the heavy pack, and for many days they were not free from anxiety respecting her. The

ice screwed violently, and the pressure upon the ship caused her to strain and complain in every timber, and lifted her bodily four feet out of the water. The voyagers went so far as to make preparations for abandoning her in case she should not survive the terrible ordeal. For weeks, while the summer was rapidly advancing, the explorers were detained in lat. 66° S. and long. 164° approximately; their stout vessel well nigh buried in snow and ice. The commander, fearing that it would not be possible to proceed farther south with the *Southern Cross*, had begun to land on the ice instruments and provisions, hoping, with a dog-team and one companion, to reach Victoria Land, when there was a sudden loosening of the pack. He at once turned the head of his vessel seaward, and, after a fierce struggle with the ice, lasting for forty-eight days, struck open water in lat. 70° S. and long. 174° E. Proceeding eastward in fog and blinding snow, accompanied by gales that compelled him to lie to for days together, he at length, on February 17, entered Robertson Bay in Victoria Land; and saw, as he steamed towards the shore, the dark rocks of Cape Adair stand out conspicuously. When the low spit of land reaching into the sea from the frowning cape came into view, it appeared so utterly desolate and inhospitable that some of Mr. Borchgrevink's staff remarked that if it was here it was proposed to live for a year (and it was here), "they had better send letters of farewell back with the vessel." It was a moment, the leader tells us,

> which will always remain in the memory of my staff and self as we slowly moved towards the low beach whereon men had never ventured to live before, and where we were to live or perish, under conditions which were as an unopened book to ourselves and the world.

An anchor falls here for the first time in the world's history; and a salute of four guns, and the cheers of men who feel that they are in the path to conquest, break the primeval silence and, echoing afar, die away among the virgin peaks of this lonely land, which is the last in the globe

to yield up its secrets to the explorer. Landing with two companions, Mr. Borchgrevink finds the peninsula much as he left it in 1895—dark and bare; its beaches strewn with ice-blocks, its higher ground the haunt of innumerable penguins. Next day, all hands are busy getting stores, etc., ashore. No time is to be lost. Robertson Bay is now free from ice, but any moment it may fill again. The men have to wade to land from the whale boats with boxes and bales on their heads, up to the armpits in the breakers, the temperature of the water being 28° Fahr. Huts to live in and workrooms and storehouses are built without delay, of sufficient strength to resist the strain of savage cyclonic storms, and with some regard to comfort during the dreary months of darkness that await them. This pioneer settlement is named Camp Ridley. Camp Ridley stands back about three hundred yards from the beach. About three hundred yards farther inland is the meteorological observatory in a large Finn tent. From February 23 to 26 their work is interrupted by a series of gales, accompanied with a blizzard. It was but the earnest of many terrible storms. They were ignorant of the fact that Cape Adair was within the area of abnormally low pressure, and was subject to appalling tempests. Such was the velocity of the wind on this occasion that the safety of the *Southern Cross* was seriously imperilled. She lost her anchors on the night of the 23rd, was driven among rocks and icebergs, and it was only by keeping the engines at full speed that she escaped shipwreck. The two Lapps, prevented by the storm on this day from returning on board, were the first to spend a night on this wild shore. Natives of corresponding latitudes in the northern hemisphere, there appears to be something fitting in the circumstance that they are the earliest to inhabit the southern continent. The weather moderating, and the surf still being too heavy to allow of landing stores, Mr. Borchgrevink, to make the best of his time, steamed to the head of Robertson Bay, discovering several magnificent glaciers running down to the sea. The central of these, which sloped at an angle of about 50° from a height of

2,000 feet, was riven by many crevasses. It was flanked on the west by a bold cape, which rose up about 3,500 feet, and descended into a cove terminating the bay. Mr. Borchgrevink named it the Sir George Newnes glacier. The cape he called Cape Klövstad, after the medical officer of his staff. From the upper part of the bay, four of the party made an ascent. After a toilsome struggle over glaciers and precipitous crags, they reached the height of 3,000 feet; and returned at midnight, reporting the existence of vegetation, and bringing back a rich collection of rocks and mosses.

On March 4, the camp being completed, Mr. Borchgrevink hoisted at Cape Adair, in the presence of his staff and crew, the Union Jack, and said, "I have the honour of hoisting the first flag on the Great Antarctic Continent. It is the Union Jack of Great Britain." The same evening the *Southern Cross* sailed for New Zealand, leaving behind the Commander and nine comrades to winter in these stern solitudes, in complete isolation, 2,500 miles south of Australia. She was to return again as early as possible in the new year. Mr. Borchgrevink voices impressively, in few words, the emotions of the brave men who watched from the shore as the steamer faded away in the grey distance. They asked—what would happen to the *Southern Cross*, and to themselves in the coming year? Would it be possible for human beings to exist there? The conditions they should live under, and the natural forces they were destined to fight—would they be too strong for human energy and endurance? Should the *Southern Cross* be crushed, how long then in all probability would they remain in Victoria Land?

"All this passed through my mind," he says, "and no doubt through the minds of all ten of us, as we silently returned to the hut when the vessel had been swallowed up in darkness. However, were we destined to fall in our fight, we would not have given our lives in vain, for our sacrifice would, perchance, lead future expeditions on to success without further sacrifice."

The note of the true hero is here. The day after the *Southern Cross* departed, Robertson Bay was filled with

pack-ice, and the tidal currents raged. She had only just got away in time.

Of the ten explorers left at Cape Adair, seven are educated and highly trained men, one is the indispensable cook, and two are Lapps. Of the latter, the commander speaks in the highest praise. They are frank, devoted, delightful companions on the sledge journeys, and so clever that they can turn their hands to anything. Each member of the party is designated to the particular branch of work for which he is professionally, or by experience, qualified. Zoology, magnetic observation, astronomy, photography, the care of instruments, and medicine, have, respectively, their zealous and capable representatives, amongst whom existed an honourable rivalry in striving to make their own special departments as perfect as possible; while they are united in enthusiasm for the success of a common enterprise.

We can but give the barest outline of what follows. As soon as the task of bringing up the goods from the beach is ended, they settle down to their regular duties. Meteorological observations are taken every second hour. Astronomical and magnetic work receive attention whenever the conditions of sky and atmosphere are propitious. Marine fauna, fished up by net or washed ashore during gales, are carefully studied, and preserved in formaline and spirit. Geological specimens are collected and examined. Sledges and clothing are kept in good order, dogs are fed and doctored. Their brief leisure out-of-doors is employed in target-shooting, ski-running, hunting seals, and collecting birds' eggs in season, and in photography; indoors, it consists in reading, arguing, card-playing, and chess—not a very extensive programme; but when these fail they pleasantly quarrel, for a change. To the life of these shores they give much attention. Seals abound, chiefly the *Weddelli*, but the *Rossii* and the leopard seal are also found. The explorers find the seals useful in a variety of ways. The skins make fur suits, warm coverings, mats, etc., and the flesh provides food alike for men and dogs. During the long winter the party owed its excellent health to being able to live largely

on seal beef. This is a paradise of penguins. Now at the close of the summer they are few, but in spring they will appear in vast flocks. Skuagulls hunt in the bay, and are so bold that they attack the men. Other birds will visit the coast in due time, in their spotless white plumage and sharp contrasts of ebon black, or in their silky browns and silver-greys.

On March 12 Mr. Borchgrevink, and Bernacchi, the astronomer and photographer of the expedition, climbed Cape Adair to the height of 3,670 feet. After scaling steep rocks up to eight hundred feet, the ascent was not difficult. The summit proved to be an undulating snow-clad plateau strewn with huge boulders. Some scanty vegetation was observed, but the rocks above 1,000 feet bore no trace of life. This continent is everywhere a land of death. Neither bear, nor fox, nor musk-ox, nor reindeer, roams over its sterile wastes. Not a tree, not a bush, not a blade of grass, breaks the monotony of frowning cliff and barren snow-field. The strange delight of the explorers on finding a handful of draggled moss, or a patch of hardy lichen—the only flora—is the measure of the sterility of this region. The hoarse scream of the penguin, the shrill cry of the cruel skuagull, and the gambols of seals, alone lighten the burden of silence and death that strangles this snow-shrouded land.

A few days later a second ascent was made. Mr. Borchgrevink hoped to reach the inner part of Robertson Bay by passing along the high mountain ridge and then descending; but he was driven back by a fierce hurricane, accompanied with snow. He narrowly escaped being blown, with his two comrades, over the cliffs into the sea. The velocity of the wind was eighty-seven miles an hour at Camp Ridley. It rose in later storms to ninety miles. Nothing was more frightful in this clime than these gales of wind, which are its most remarkable feature. Early April was very stormy. The heavy snow-fall often wrapped the camp in a dense whirl of snow-drift. The bay was a seething, weltering mass of grinding ice, and the flying spray from the beach was carried clean over the huts; the roofs of which they were obliged to

protect with additional seal-skins and strong canvas, and to weight down with bags of coal and boulders. With improvement in the weather, they took to fishing, and found the small collapsible canvas boats useful for work with the net. Fish was plentiful, and several new species were caught, but as there was some doubt in reference to their edible quality, lots were drawn to determine who should run the risk of first eating. However, when the fish appeared well cooked on the table, they all started at once, and "some of us," says the leader, "will not forget how refreshing a change this meal of fresh fish became to us who for months had been living on tinned food." The dredge brought up some exquisite Medusæ. Among the jelly-fish caught was one in which was a blue cross. This they named the *Southern Cross* jelly-fish. Another was secured with arms twelve yards long and weighing ninety pounds. A beautiful coral, shells, sponges, and a variety of crustacea were among the prizes of the trawl.

The first attempt to penetrate Robertson Bay on the ice might have had a tragic ending. Leaving Camp Ridley, on April 22, by dog-sledge, with a collapsible boat, provisions for twenty days, and three companions,—Fougner, Bernacchi, and the Lapp Savio,—Mr. Borchgrevink proceeded with great caution over thin ice. Darkness coming on, he camped the first night on a small crescent of sloping beach formed by a gravel-rush from the rocks above. Here they rested under the perpendicular sea-wall of Victoria Land which rose round them about five hundred feet, overhanging the little beach, and completely "isolating them from everywhere except by way of the bay." The wind rose to a violent gale during the night, breaking up the ice. They had barely time to save their provisions by carrying them up the gravel slope to where the drift-snow and ice had formed a six-feet wide shelf against the sheer wall of rock. Here, on this insecure gallery, they passed the night, the furious breakers lashing the beach and sending the spray over the explorers, until they were literally incased in ice. How they lived through the night seems miraculous. Next morning the

wind dropped, and the bay was comparatively free from ice. Mr. Borchgrevink sent Fougner and the Lapp in the canvas boat towards Camp Ridley with the hope that they might get there safely. They met with heavy drifting ice, and were prevented from reaching their destination. For two days Mr. Borchgrevink and Bernacchi remained on the snow-shelf without any means of escape; the sea in front of them, the mountain wall behind. And as they watched the ice drifting rapidly into the bay, they were naturally anxious about the fate of the occupants of the frail craft sent to the camp. On the third day Fougner and the Lapp were seen high above cutting footholds in the steep ice-swell, and clambering down to the place where the leader and Bernacchi were entrapped. They reached it in a very exhausted state. They stated that they had been compelled by the ice to seek the shore, and had spent two nights under the boat. Resting a day, the four intrepid men attempted to scale the heights which frowned up 5,000 feet behind to the ridge of Victoria Land. Roped together and cutting footholds in the ice, they set out, and at length found the only chance of escape. It was a kind of rough groove in the perpendicular cliff, partly covered with snow and ice. After having had a good meal of seal beef they began the ascent. Some of the poor sledge-dogs following them came to grief in the awful abysses which yawned below. All night they continued to climb, the cold intensifying as they got higher, until they gained the ridge and proceeded to Camp Ridley.

During May Camp Ridley was in danger of being overwhelmed by a gigantic moving wall of ice-blocks that formed along the line of the beach, and ever crept nearer. It rose to the height of thirty feet. The pressure behind it was tremendous, and the roar of the screwing ice-fields was appalling. The explorers began to think that the whole peninsula would be buried beneath the living undulating on-coming barrier. Great was their relief when the direction of the pressure changed, and the danger passed away. The cold now became more severe and frost-bites were

common. On May 15 the sun set not to reappear till July 27. His departure was celebrated by a natural pageant of great glory. "Departing day seemed to revel in a triumph of colours, growing more in splendour as the sun sank, when the colours grew more dainty, and surpassed themselves in beauty." It impressed itself upon the minds of the explorers so strongly that, so we are told, "it made life possible for them through those dark days and nights that were to come." The temperature was now $-25°$ Fahr. It was to sink much lower.

As in the Arctic so in the Antarctic, Nature invests herself in rare majesty. The mirage effects here were wonderful. Gigantic bergs and fields of broken ice with their strange contortions of snow-wreath and wind-worn blocks, and dark lagoons of open water—far below the horizon—were visible, through this phenomena, in the north-western sky in the early spring. In the dreary months of winter, the heavens were all alive with the magnificence of the aurora. The icebergs were often of stupendous size, square solid masses, or crowned with stately towers and delicate minarets. To see flashing palaces of many-hued ice plough their way through the pack, often in face of wind and tide, spurning the lesser ice-blocks that drift under their mighty prows, and sailing toward summer seas, where they will dwindle and die, is a most imposing sight.

During May tremendous gales from the south-east occur. From the mountain the camp is pelted with falling stones. Their outdoor property is in danger of flying away on the wings of the wind. Snow buries the huts, and it is with difficulty that the tunnel leading to them is kept open. So strong is the wind that the anemometer is broken from its shaft; and one of the party in crossing to the thermometer screen is swept away and lost in the snow for hours. The days are dark and depressing. On the Queen's birthday they break the monotony by hoisting the Union Jack and raising three ringing cheers. June was worse than May. A gale on the 15th, attaining a force of eighty-five miles an hour, threatened to lift the camp bodily into the air, the

barometer going down to 27°. But the excitement of tempest was preferable to quiet days when silence weighed heavily on their minds, "roared in their ears, and was centuries of heaped up solitude." A careful observation of a total lunar eclipse was made on June 23. With the advent of July temperature began to rise, and sledge journeys were undertaken along the coast of Victoria land; at first short, but gradually more prolonged. The ice was often rough and hummocky, or viciously sharp, cutting into the sledges like lances. The snow-drifts were deep, the cold intense, the dogs almost unmanageable, and travelling very fatiguing. Danger was always at hand. Any hour the ice might break up or heavy screwing commence. Landward, where rose the sheer mountain coast, there was no harbour of safety. Only the icebergs offered a temporary shelter; and to lift instruments and provisions, to say nothing of sledges and dogs, on to these was no inconsiderable task.

A long sledge journey was made on July 21 and following days. M. Fougner and the Lapps accompanied Mr. Borchgrevink. They met with much difficulty. The temperature was − 17° Fahr. They slept on the snow in their sledges.

"There we four," says the leader, "were lying, thousands of miles to the southward of the great struggling world; vast, stern Victoria Land dark toward the west, while the peaks and icebergs caught the pale halo from the moon. We kept watch —two at a time sleeping as usual six hours."

The slides of the sledges being worn through, they were left behind, and the party proceeded on foot eastward, and were rewarded with a fine picture of the lofty pure white peaks of Victoria Land, roseate in the reflection of the returning sun, whose advent they hailed with infinite delight after the long darkness. They failed to reach Possession Island which was their goal; but, after a hard fight, got back to Camp Ridley without accident. On July 26 they go out far from the coast where no land could be sighted and are overtaken by terrific gales, the temperature varying from −40° to −52°. With 84 degrees of frost they suffer severely

from frost-bites. For three days and nights they are buried in the snow. To prevent being smothered by the pressure, they take turns at standing and bearing up the silk tent in which they are cooped. "Men, dogs, sledges, all disappeared, and the antarctic gale found nothing new as it raged over us, only cold white solitude." The dogs were frozen fast to the ice. The explorers were obliged to dig themselves out of the snow-drift when the storm moderated. Proceeding on August 1, they found better ice, and discovered an island which, later, they named the Duke of York's Island. Encamping on the western side of it in lat. 71° 35′ S., long. 170° 2¾′ E., they remained here until the middle of August investigating the coast of the island, securing a valuable geological collection, and replenishing their stores with seal beef for food and seal blubber for fuel. This camp they named Midsummer Camp. Here afterwards was erected a stone hut, as the place proved to be a good centre for geological work, and seemed a likely base for excursions farther inland. After Mr. Fougner and one of the Lapps had returned to Camp Ridley, Mr. Borchgrevink and the Lapp Savio toiled here for seven long weeks, exploring the coast and the glaciers, often in the greatest peril. Fortunately seal food and fuel were abundant. Savio had a miraculous escape from being killed. He fell headlong into a crevasse on one of the glaciers to a depth of sixty feet; and, after recovering consciousness, cut with a penknife steps in the blue ice of the perpendicular rift, and, with his back against one wall of the crevasse and his toes in the notches he carved in the opposite wall, forced himself to the surface and was saved. That he might be sure of the depth of the fall, Mr. Borchgrevink made a thorough investigation of the crevasse, and measured it with safety-ropes. It is questionable if there is a more extraordinary deliverance in the whole history of adventure.

Every great valley lying between these giant mountains, rising at least 12,000 feet, is filled with ancient ice. The glaciers are of enormous size. To explore them was a task that taxed to the uttermost all the resource and skill of these

brave men. Treacherous crevasses, interminable moraines, snow, gravel, and masses of savage rock, made travelling on them tremendously arduous. Sometimes the explorers were compelled to abandon their sledges, and, roped together, carry their provisions slowly up the heights, feeling their way in the gloom with their alpenstocks. The view from these elevations was often sublime. Glacier sea was linked to glacier sea, invaded by great medial moraines—grey headlands in a stainless main, and fortressed by awful glittering heights. Away southward was a high dark land in conspicuous contrast with the white world surrounding it. This Mr. Borchgrevink named Geikie Land. The attempt to reach it was a fine piece of climbing. Up the steep gradients, roped together, they cut their way in hard blue glacier, their only foothold the tiny notch, about the size of a hand, made by the pick of the alpenstock. On their left rose a black perpendicular wall; on the right the glacier precipitated itself into a crevasse at an angle of about 70°. A slip of the foot of one of them would have sent them both into eternity. Here the gradient became so steep that farther ascent was impossible, and they were reluctantly compelled to return.

Camp Ridley was filled with gloom in October by the death of Hansen, the zoologist of the expedition. He was buried, by his own choice, 1,000 feet up on Cape Adair, under him the rock, covering him the eternal snow, around him untamed Nature in her sternest forms. The first grave in Antarctica—consecrated by the simple prayers of brave comrades in sacrifice and duty!

Summer has come, and work on the ice is now practically at an end. The whole staff is at Camp Ridley. November is their finest month. Penguins arrive in countless numbers, waddling in between the floes "like a long endless black snake." They literally cover the peninsula with their nests. Roasted penguin and penguin's eggs form part of the daily food of the explorers. Thousands of eggs are collected and put into salt in view of next winter, in case the *Southern Cross* should not return. Open water is seen in some

directions, but there is no general break up of the ice; and the staff are not without fears that the ice-conditions of the season may be exceptionally unfavourable, and that the *Southern Cross* may be unable to reach them. Towards the close of December improved ice-conditions are reported from the top of Cape Adair. Christmas Day was celebrated with tinned plum-pudding. On New Year's Day their pursuits ranged from target-shooting to sedate musing on the fact that "the light of knowledge was illuminating the hidden mysteries of the last *terra incognita* on the globe," that "a young Antarctic Day was born," and that they "saw a vision of many bold bands of explorers in" their "wake struggling toward the goal of scientific certainty."

Daily the telescope sweeps the seas, perchance the masts of the long-expected vessel may be discovered above the horizon, but it is not till January 29 that she arrives. Great is the joy of men who have been isolated from civilisation for twelve months to receive letters from home, newspapers, etc.; but there is not an hour to be lost. Stores, dogs, sledges, instruments are speedily got on board the *Southern Cross*; and on the morning of February 2, 1900, the heroes are off to traverse unmapped and unfathomed seas to the south. They leave behind coals and some provisions, with a note from Mr. Borchgrevink to the commander of the next expedition that may arrive at Cape Adair.

Sailing towards the South Pole in clear weather, the mountains of Victoria Land, dressed in ermine, are portrayed with exquisite definiteness of outline on a dark blue sky. The voyagers map the coast as far as Coulman Island, on which four of the party land, the first men to tread its reef-guarded shores, now beaten by grey surf, but for nine-tenths of the year clad in mail of ice. Magnetic observations are taken, specimens of minerals and of its scanty flora are collected. Proceeding, they skirt the seaward edge of the great ice-sheet. They take observations which enable them to locate the present position of the South Magnetic Pole; survey to some extent, and give names to hitherto unknown mountains, capes, bays, and islands. At Washington Bay

they discover a fine winter harbour, which Mr. Borchgrevink commends to future explorers. Here Mount Melbourne, a volcano, rising twelve thousand feet, with its mighty, sky-piercing cone, its glaciers and crevasses, was perfectly reflected in the sea, while the midnight sun bathed in splendour the snow-clad landscape. Landing, they found huge blocks of basalt flung about in wild disorder. The base of the mountain was a gigantic "Vulcan's workshop," threaded with wonderful caves and awesome passages. Climbing, they were startled, at an elevation of seven hundred feet, as they came suddenly to the edge of a huge cauldron of sheer sides, the bottom of which was below the level of the sea, from which it was only separated by a wall of sulphur. Interesting geological phenomena were noted, and the ice of the cone where it was abruptly cleft revealed a thickness of fifty feet.

The promontory and country adjacent was named Sir George Newnes' Land. Here glaciers pierced by islands of serrated rock run down to the sea. Reaching Franklin Island, they go ashore, and find the same stunted mosses observed elsewhere in these arctic latitudes, and they are fortunate enough to light on, and collect, a rich shallow water fauna. Photos are taken here as wherever they go.

They now bring the *Southern Cross* into the immediate neighbourhood of the great volcanoes discovered by Sir John Ross, and named by him, after his ships, Erebus and Terror. Here Mr. Borchgrevink, who seems to have hitherto lived a charmed existence, and Captain Jensen, nearly lost their lives. They were on the beach collecting geological specimens, when an immense iceberg of millions of tons was flung off into the sea by a glacier, with a deafening roar, raising a huge, raging wave, from fifteen to twenty feet in height, which swept the narrow beach with awful force. The two men clung to the bare rocks till the blood rushed beneath their finger nails, while the wave, which carried before it loose stones, rose about fifteen feet above their heads. They had an icy bath and were a good

deal battered; "but," says the commander, "a splendid collection of specimens soon made us forget the incident which might have ended disastrously." Mount Erebus was in eruption, and a lurid smoke cloud waved from its cone over the white landscape.

Still trending to the south-east, the ice-barrier is followed for several days. No break appears in the glittering cliff, the average height of which is about seventy feet. The cold increases and the voyagers suffer severely. The ship grows heavy with a thick armour of ice. On February 16 they come to a low place in the coast, where there is a natural harbour, in lat. 74° 34′ S. and long. 195° 50′ E. The ice threatens to enclose them in the bay, but they resolve to risk landing, with sledges, dogs, instruments, etc. This is at once done, and they travel south over the level ice, reaching lat. 78° 50′, "the farthest south ever reached by men." They must not proceed farther, for the season is far advanced, and they are not prepared for a winter on board the *Southern Cross*, ice-bound in these seas. On February 19 the head of their vessel is turned towards civilisation, and immediately a contest with the ice begins. They have to plough their way through three inches of ice to get out of the harbour, and in the severe gales with which they met in making their way north, the spray which the vessel flung over her froze on spars and rigging, on deck and sides, decorating her with icicles and fantastic glittering ice-tapestry figured and fringed beyond the skill of mortals, till she looked like a fairy ship of glass, all glancing with rainbow hues. Soon she passed into warmer latitudes, and on March 22 entered Paterson's Inlet on Stewart Island, where the successful explorers once more feasted their eyes on the real trees and green grass which, in Antarctic sterility, they had often longed to see; and on the form of woman, whose ministering hand they had so sorely missed in their home life at Camp Ridley.

For the results of the expedition we must refer our readers to Mr. Borchgrevink's excellently written volume, which all lovers of brave men and their deeds should pro-

cure. The numerous illustrations, chiefly from photographs taken by Mr. Bernacchi, add not only to the interest and beauty of the book, but are highly educative, enabling us to realise for ourselves the nature of the lands where these brave men fought with savage Nature and won from her so significant a triumph.

ROBERT MCLEOD.

JOHN WYCLIF.[1]

"ON most of us the dim image of Wyclif looks down like the portrait of the first of a long line of kings, without personality or expression—he is the first of the reformers." This judgment of Shirley is unfortunately still too true, despite fifty years' efforts to make up for the neglect of centuries. Almost every particular in the life of Wyclif is the occasion of controversy; over his earlier years there hangs a more than mediæval obscurity; while the vague chronology is in marked contrast to our exact knowledge of his teaching. That he was a Yorkshireman is certain; born probably at Wyclif-on-Tees at a date unknown, but, in our opinion, nearer 1330 than 1320; a scion, perhaps the head, of a proud but poor family since extinct, that clung to the Roman Church in the years of triumph of the Reformer's doctrines. On entering Oxford Wyclif would attach himself to the college of the

---

[1] This abbreviated and condensed biography is founded on the study of the following:

(A) *Sources:* The *Works of Wyclif* (the more important Latin ones) edited by the Wyclif Society, and especially the English works edited by ARNOLD and MATTHEW. (The famous "Wicket" is too doubtful to be safely used.) Also the following contemporary Chronicles, etc.: *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, *Chronicon Angliae* (a most important work unknown to Lechler), *Walsingham*, *Knighton*, and the important *Eulog. Continuatio* (all the above in the Rolls' Series), Wilkins' *Concilia*, iii.; Rymer's *Foedera* (viii., ix.) and *Rot. Parl.* (iii., iv.) have also been consulted.

(B) *Modern Authors:* There is no satisfactory life of Wyclif. LEWIS, the earliest, is still in some respects the best. VAUGHAN adds little. LECHLER'S great pioneer work needs re-writing. TREVELYAN'S *England in the Age of Wycliffe* is a brilliant and most useful study; also RASHDALL'S able summary in the *D. Nat. Biog.* Of popular biographies POOLE'S *Wyclif and Movements for Reform*, SERGEANT'S *John Wyclif*, and WATKINSON'S *John Wicklif* may be mentioned. The readers will note that ' ' signifies a verbatim extract from Wyclif or some contemporary source.

Northern Nation founded half a century previously by the neighbouring family of Balliol of Barnard Castle. His life at Oxford is worse than a blank; it is a puzzle in identity. For there were at the University at that time at least two other John Wyclifs with whom, it would appear, the Reformer has been grievously confused. The first is an 'almonry boy' at Queen's, of whom all that we know is that in 1371 he was beginning his Latin grammar. His shadowy form has led many astray, and flits through the rooms at Queen's at various dates between 1363 and 1380. The second John Wyclif is more substantial, a postmaster of Merton, for whose confusion with the Reformer historians have less excuse. For in "Wyclif's time," as Dr. Poole has pointed out, "Balliol and Merton formed the opposite poles of the academical world," the headquarters respectively of the Northern and Southern Nations; and Merton "refused at that time and before to elect Northern scholars into their society." The third John Wyclif, a certain John Wyclif of Mayfield, is an even more troublesome double, not merely of the Reformer but of the postmaster of Merton, with whom it is true he may be one and the same.

In 1360 Wyclif was elected the Master of Balliol, not at that time the lucrative honour of later days. This position he resigned on being presented in 1361 to the college living of Fillingham in Lincolnshire, 'value thirty marks.' The next incident in his life is one of the ironies of history. In 1362 the University of Oxford petitioned Urban V. to exercise the papal power of "provision" by granting Wyclif 'a canonry and dignity of York, notwithstanding that he holds the church of Fillingham.' The Pope granted instead the prebend of Aust in the collegiate church of Westbury-on-Trym, near Bristol. For the next few years the Reformer disappears from sight, unless indeed he be the John Wyclif who, in December 1365, was nominated warden of Canterbury. This hall was founded by Archbishop Islip to repair the ravages of the Black Death among the clergy by preparing candidates of scanty learning and low social status. The identification has this much in its favour, that the work at

the new foundation would fit in exactly with what we know in later life to have been the views of the founder of the Biblemen. Unfortunately for the experiment, Islip had involved it in the endless conflict between seculars and regulars. After trying in vain to bring together priests and monks in one foundation Islip expelled the monks. His successor, Archbishop Langham (March, 1367), showed his different sympathies. He drove out the seculars with Wyclif at their head, and handed over the hall to the monks of Christ Church.

The identity of the Reformer with the warden of Canterbury is a matter of dispute, and should, we think, be rejected. For the warden was a fellow in the house at the time of the appointment, which Wyclif, ex-master of Balliol, could scarcely have been; while other evidence points to the warden being John Wyclif of Mayfield. In 1368 we are however once more on firm ground. In the registers of the see of Lincoln we find that licence was granted by Bishop Bokyngham to 'Master John de Wyclif that he might absent himself from his church for the space of two years to devote himself to the study of letters in the University.' Later on in the same year Wyclif exchanged his Lincolnshire rectory for that of Ludgershall in Buckinghamshire. Its nearness to Oxford compensated Wyclif for its lesser income. In 1372 Wyclif finished the sixteen years' course necessary for the degree in divinity (S.T.M.) and acquired the right of delivering lectures on theology. In 1373 we come across another curious incident. The Pope granted to Wyclif, his 'dilectissimo filio,' a canonry of Lincoln, 'while retaining the canonry and prebend of Aust.' The great quarrel had evidently not yet begun, while Wyclif's objection to pluralities would seem to have been of later growth. This benefice at Lincoln was afterwards, as Wyclif himself tells us, taken from him on his refusal, or delay, to pay the first-fruits of £45. In 1374 Wyclif at last definitely emerges into full public view, first as a commissioner at Bruges, and then as the leader of the nation in its struggle with Rome. For his services at Bruges the Crown rewarded him (1374) with the rectory of

Lutterworth, of the value of £26 per annum. There on the 31st of December, 1384, after ten years of life so full and stirring that history can find few parallels, the great Reformer entered into rest.[1]

If the details of the life of Wyclif are obscure, the source of his influence is clear. The importance of his attack upon the mediæval Church lay in the fact that for the first time the assault was conducted, not by an obscure fanatic, but by the foremost schoolman of his age, 'the flower,' even his enemies owned, 'of Oxford scholarship,' at a time when the decay of Paris had left Oxford without a rival. The first of the reformers was in fact the last of the schoolmen, 'in philosophy second to none, in the training of the schools without a rival.' An unrevised note-book of some of his lectures, evidently taken down by one of his pupils, has come down to us, and amazes the reader by its accumulated stores of learning from every field of human knowledge, and the mastery displayed of the entire Bible.

Equally clear with the source of his influence is the general development of his teaching. From subtle disputations Wyclif passed, like William of Ockham, into politics. He was the brains of the party who sought in Parliament and elsewhere to resist the papal claims. Hitherto reformers had attempted to accomplish their purposes from within, and would have resisted outside interference. Wyclif introduced a new thing into the mediæval world by calling upon the State to reform an unwilling clergy. Next he laboured to effect the revival of religious life by the restoration of simple preaching, and the distribution to the people of the word of God. Finally he felt that the souls of men

[1] The above chronology differs considerably from that of Lechler and the older historians. The new data are the date of his degree in theology (1372), the canonry of Lincoln (1373) (*Cal. Pap. Letters*, iv. 193, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, July, 1900), and Loserth's demonstration (*Eng. Hist. Rev.*, Ap., 1896) that the 'certain council' (see later) is not, as is invariably assumed, the Parliament of 1365 but that of 1374. The later date makes Wyclif's life a unity, the only difficulty being the extraordinary amount of work he must have compressed into ten years. But none of his theological writings are now dated earlier than 1375.

were being sacrificed to an overgrown sacramental system at the roots of which he struck by his attack on the doctrine of transubstantiation. In all these aspects—Schoolman, Politician, Reformer, and Theologian—Wyclif was the foremost man of his age, the range of whose activities is not less remarkable than the energy with which he pursued his aims.

We know little of the circumstances which led the great schoolman to throw himself into the struggle of politics. But Wyclif probably could not save himself. Church and State were too completely intertwined in mediæval life for the innovator in the one not to find himself the revolutionist in the other. On all sides there was a strange confusion of religious and political interests. For the questions of the day were chiefly ecclesiastical—at any rate before the Peasants' Revolt—and the parties of the State ranged themselves for the attack or defence of the Church. Even the war with France, in which the whole nation persisted with an infatuation blind to all disaster, had an ecclesiastical side. The people realised that the head of the Church was a 'French pope,' that aliens 'worse than Jews or Saracens, who neither see nor care to see their parishioners, convey away the treasure of the realm.' Parliament discovered that the taxes levied by the Pope amounted to five times the sum paid to the king, while the insufficiency of the revenue led all to insist that the Church which held a third part of the land should bear a third part of the taxation.

Even more important than the war in the confusion of politics and reform was the attitude of a party in the State led by the ablest and most unscrupulous Englishman of the age, John of Gaunt. The duke was at the head of a small but well organised band of nobles and knaves whose one object was their own aggrandisement. For statesmanship except as an instrument of selfishness they cared nothing. They allowed the national defences to rot while they made their "corners" in wool and victuals; they encouraged Edward III. in his intrigue with Alice Perrers that they might better keep the power in their own hands. When the fleets of France and Spain drove the commerce of

England from off the seas, they would do nothing for the salvation of their country without their price. By their lawless insolence they prepared the way for the deluge of the next century, when the Wars of the Roses laid liberty at the feet of a triumphant crown.

With this faction of designing schemers Wyclif first allied himself in his efforts for reform. We may deplore the fact, but in all ages politics makes strange bedfellows. There were, in fact, two features in the teaching of the Reformer the value of which as weapons of party John of Gaunt was not slow to perceive. Wyclif had demanded that the employment of the clergy in secular business should cease. The duke had determined that he would oust the bishops from their places as the chief officers of the Crown, and fill them with creatures of his own. Wyclif called on the 'king and witty lords' to take back 'by process of time' the endowments of a Church which 'habitually abused them' that 'the land might be stronger' and the pressure of taxation lessened. Above all, as Wyclif insisted with wearisome reiteration, by the restoration of the Church to its original poverty, when the priests should live on 'dimes and offerings' there would be a return to the primitive spirituality. The duke made this scheme of disendowment peculiarly his own, untrammelled by Wyclif's social aims or spiritual desires. He saw his chance of doubling the estates of the House of Lancaster and of gaining over a greedy baronage by the prospect of spoil. So for a few years John of Gaunt and his clique made use of the Reformer and his pen, while Wyclif, too high-souled to see the selfish aims of his allies, used their protection to push his doctrines.

But Wyclif's first appearance in politics was rather as the representative of a nation than as the associate of a faction. In 1374 he was sent to Bruges to treat with Gregory XI. concerning the non-observance of the Statute of Provisors. The mission was fruitless, the court did not intend that it should be otherwise. But the lessons that Wyclif learned at Bruges were not without their influence on the develop-

ment of his thought. In November, 1375, the Reformer began that controversy with the papal power which only ceased with life itself. The circumstances were as follows: In 1374 Gregory XI. renewed the demand of 1365 for the payment of the tribute imposed by the shame of John, and for the arrears of the same since 1333. The only result of this insolent claim was to force Wyclif, who had hitherto published nothing save works of scholastic philosophy, into the lists of controversy. In a tract entitled *Determinatio Quaedam de Dominio* Wyclif, who calls himself 'a government commissioner,'[1]—the reference is to Bruges,—puts into the mouth of seven lords 'in a certain council' the arguments which he would urge against the papal claim. The seven lords are all understudies of Wyclif, but the sixth represents the author's own views of 'lordship.'

'We must oppose,' he argues, 'the first beginnings of this mischief. Christ Himself is the Lord paramount, and the Pope is a fallible man who must lose his lordship in the event of his falling into mortal sin. . . . We hold our kingdom as of old immediately from Christ in fief.'

Within two years this tract was expanded by Wyclif into his important treatises *On the Lordship of God* and *On Civil Lordship*, the latter alone filling more than a thousand pages in the only manuscript known to exist. Like most schoolmen Wyclif starts from an ideal state of society; all authority is 'founded in grace.' Dominion rests with God alone, who as the suzerain of the world hath allotted dominion to popes and kings in fief and tenure of their obedience to Himself. Of this feudal tenure 'from the Lord in chief,' mortal sin is a breach, and in itself 'incurs forfeiture.' Herein the reader will note a danger upon which Gregory XI. in 1377 was not slow to fasten, for Wyclif's doctrine of breach by mortal sin would have led to anarchical consequences if Wyclif had applied his conclusions

[1] *Peculiaris regis clericus talis qualis*, which cannot well mean "a royal chaplain." For the date 1374 and not 1365 this title is part of the evidence. See especially *Eulog. Continuatio*, iii., 337–9.

to existing society. But he saved himself by a curious metaphysical juggle. He carefully distinguishes between dominion and power, dominion which belongs alone to the righteous man and power which the wicked may have by God's permission, in consequence of the Fall, but to which the Christian must submit as Christ submitted to be tempted by Satan. Thus 'God ought to obey the devil,' to quote the paradoxical and unhappy conclusion by which Wyclif saves his teaching from anarchy at the expense of reverence.

Another dangerous tenet of Wyclif was his defence of socialism. Wyclif's communism in fact was a logical deduction from his main thesis that 'every righteous man is lord over the whole sensible world.' But in weighing Wyclif's socialism we must not forget that in his scheme all lordship is linked with service, the two are corresponding terms. Nor was Wyclif blind to the fact that his ideal society is incapable of realisation in this present life. He is careful to insist that the righteous must in nowise attempt to acquire their inalienable rights by force. Wyclif had yet to learn that a smouldering fire and a powder magazine, however carefully guarded, are dangerous neighbours.

Wyclif's doctrine was not less revolutionary in religion than in the State. For the theory exalted the spiritual independence of the righteous man. For the 'righteous man' as the possessor of 'a dominion founded on grace' held his fief direct from God; 'God gives not any lordship to any of His servants except He first give Himself to them.' The reader must not be misled by the feudal phraseology into undervaluing the consequences of such teaching. For Wyclif every man had an equal place in the eyes of God; priests and laymen become one; each 'hold' of God and on the same terms of service. Thus Wyclif left no place for the mediating priesthood and the sacrificial masses of the mediæval Church. The personal relation between a man and God is everything; character the one basis of office. Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, and Wyclif's teaching of 'dominion founded in grace' both lead, though

by different ways, to the same result; both break down the mediæval barriers between the individual and God.

Before the publication of his matured speculations 'concerning dominion' Wyclif had already been drawn into the strife of parties. In 1371 the Lancastrians had made an attack upon the most illustrious of the 'Cæsarean' clergy, Wykeham, the Bishop of Winchester. They had succeeded in driving him from office. Emboldened by success they now put him on his trial for peculation, and 'hunted the said bishop from place to place.' To strengthen their cause they invited Wyclif to come up to London and preach in the city churches the doctrines of disendowment he had begun to profess in the schools. Wyclif gladly embraced the opportunity of forming in the capital a band of supporters. Convocation determined to return blow for blow. Courtenay, Bishop of London, forced Archbishop Sudbury to summon Wyclif to appear in the Lady Chapel of St. Paul's, there to answer for his heresies concerning the wealth of the Church. On February 19, 1377, Wyclif, attended by four friars from Oxford, each representing one of the four orders—with whom it will be noted the Reformer had not yet broken—appeared in defence of his doctrines. But no trial took place. For the duke had taken his stand at the prisoner's side and threatened that he 'would pull down the pride of all the bishops in England.' Hot words were passing when the London apprentices broke into the church and put an end to the trial. John of Gaunt, who had incurred the hatred of the citizens by his attempt in the same week to pass a bill for depriving London of its municipal government, narrowly escaped with his life; while Wyclif was carried off by his supporters.

Baffled in his first attempt to crush the Reformer, Courtenay had recourse to Rome. On May 22, 1377, Gregory XI. issued a series of bulls in which he directed the University and others to arrest John Wyclif, and 'keep the said John in prison, under safe custody, until you receive further commands from us.' It is important to note that the grounds of accusation were still political rather than theological. The

papal ban drove Wyclif into bolder defiance. For some months Wyclif was the leader, not merely of the Lancastrian faction, but of the nation itself. We find him consulted by the young king, Richard II., and his Parliament (1377) as to 'whether the realm might not legitimately stop the export of gold to Rome, considering the necessities of her defence.' Wyclif emphatically answered yes. 'The Pope,' he argued, 'cannot demand treasure except by way of alms and by the rule of charity. But all charity begins at home'; for our fathers endowed not the Church at large but the Church of England. He closed his state paper, as we may fairly call it, with his favourite proposition 'that the goods of the Church be prudently distributed to the glory of God, putting aside the avarice of prelates and princes.' 'At this point,' we read, 'silence was imposed upon him by the king and the council.' In a further pamphlet, which he subsequently explained away, Wyclif attacked the papal right of excommunication. 'No man,' he asserted, 'could be excommunicated to his hurt' 'unless he were first and principally excommunicated by himself.' Bold as the defiance was, bishops and Pope found that they were powerless. Wyclif was secure in the support of a Parliament that bitterly resented the papal extortions, and of a people upon whom the abuses of the Church weighed heavily. When summoned a second time before the bishops at Lambeth (February, 1848), the widow of the Black Prince bade them desist, while the mob broke in to his rescue. The bishops, 'shaken as reeds by the wind,' dismissed Wyclif with the injunction to abstain from publishing his opinions 'on account of the further scandal of the laity.' At Oxford the Reformer was supported by a powerful party in the schools, while even his enemies hesitated lest by imprisoning an English subject 'at the command of the Pope they should seem to give the Pope dominion in England.' So the Chancellor replied to the bishops that in the opinions of the masters of theology Wyclif's propositions 'were true though they sounded badly to the ear.'

Wyclif was still busy advocating his Erastian doctrines of

a Church strictly subordinate to the State, and in which the bishops should be the servants and nominees of the Crown, and the Pope himself 'subject to kings,' when the great insurrection of the peasants in 1381 put an end to his hopes of accomplishing reforms by means of political means. The causes of this rising and the means whereby it was stamped out do not here concern us, but its effects on the fortunes of Wyclif were immediate and disastrous. Wyclif's political alliance was ended, John of Gaunt's influence was gone, his policy of disendowment dead. Under the pressure of the common danger the seculars and regulars ceased their quarrels. The bishops 'who once hated the false friars like devils' patched up a truce; 'Herod and Pilate,' as Wyclif bitterly complained, became friends. The Church aided the State in its task of hanging and disembowelling some thousands of peasants, while Archbishop Courtenay, who had succeeded the murdered Sudbury, found that he could now rely on the assistance of the Government in crushing the heresiarch. Wyclif was no longer the popular champion of national rights, for his enemies had charged him with being 'a sower of strife, who by his serpent-like instigations has set his serf against his lord,' and published against him the dying confessions of John Ball and Jack Strawe.

These confessions, though either false or extorted by the rack, were part of a charge difficult to meet. Historians are now agreed that the great blaze of 1381 was not due in any appreciable degree to Wyclif's influence, and would assuredly have happened if the Reformer had never lived. John Ball, the noblest of agitators, had begun his work when Wyclif was still a lad at college; the great Society or Union of Peasants was not officered by University dons. The friars, as Langland and others tell us, had for years been preaching to the people 'that all things under heaven should be in common' long before Wyclif had published a line. The connexion, in fact, between the two movements was rather one of coincidence. In that age revolutions were naturally religious, while all reformation was of necessity a social revolution. Nevertheless, to some extent Courtenay

was right: Wyclif's communistic ideas reported second hand by poor priests, or distorted by men indifferent to their subtle and unworkable distinctions, had not been without their influence. The Peasants' Revolt, though far from being a communistic movement, was but the rude translation of a theory of 'dominion' that destroyed the 'lordship' of the wicked, and exalted communism into the inalienable right of the saint. 'The right to govern,' Wyclif had argued, 'depends upon good government; there is no moral constraint to pay tax or tithe to bad rulers either in the Church or the State.' The down-trodden serfs, ignoring Wyclif's pleas for caution, applied his doctrines to the corrupt government of Richard II., and the oppressive poll-tax of his selfish Parliaments. Despite the storm that burst upon him the Reformer refused to throw over the peasants in their hour of need. Fearless of all consequences, Wyclif, unlike Luther, dared in the hour of their defeat to avow his sympathy with the peasants' demand for freedom, his anger at their oppression, and to put in his plea for a policy of mercy.

But in his prosecution of Wyclif Courtenay was careful to proceed on other than political grounds. During the two years of comparative retirement at Lutterworth that preceded the outbreak of the rebellion Wyclif had taken the great step of his life. He had passed from an orthodox politician, eager for the reform of the existing international Roman Church, into a Protestant. Hitherto Wyclif had not disputed the spiritual primacy of the Papacy, though ready enough to lead the crusade against papal pretensions, and even to speak ill of individual popes. He had not scrupled, for instance, to call Gregory XI. 'a horrible fiend,' a most unfair verdict upon the last and most unfortunate of the popes of Avignon. Wyclif's general position hitherto would seem to have been this: we must obey the Pope as the vicar of Christ, only the vicar of Christ must be the holiest, the most God-enlightened man in Christendom. But the great Schism drove him from this untenable position. His spiritual earnestness was shocked, his theory destroyed, by

the spectacle of two popes, each claiming to be the sole head of the Church, each labelling the other as antichrist, 'like dogs quarreling for a bone,' 'like crows resting on their carrion,' each seeking to bring about a general Armageddon for the destruction of his rival. For Wyclif the year of the Schism (1378) was the crucial year of his life. He first urged that both popes should be set aside as 'having little in common with the Church of the Holy God.' From this position of neutrality he quickly passed into one of antagonism to the Papacy itself. He pours scorn on the idea that because Peter died at Rome therefore every Roman bishop is to be set above all Christendom. By the same reasoning the Muslim might conclude that 'their prelate at Jerusalem,' where Christ died, is greater than the Pope. Christ alone is the head of the Church, the primacy of Peter not proven, the infallibility of his successors a heresy. 'In a word,' as Wyclif daringly proclaims, 'the papal institution is full of poison,—Antichrist itself—'the man of sin' who 'exalteth himself above God.' The Pope is a 'limb of Lucifer,' 'the head vicar of the fiend,' 'a simple idiot who might be a damned devil in hell,' 'a more horrible idol than a painted log,' to whom it were 'detestable and blasphemous idolatry' to pay veneration. Christ is truth, the Pope is the principle of falsehood; Christ lived in poverty, the Pope labours for worldly magnificence; Christ refused temporal dominion, the Pope seeks it; Christ obeyed the temporal power, the Pope strives to weaken it; Christ chose as His apostles twelve simple men, the Pope chooses as cardinals many more than twelve, crafty, ambitious, and worldly; Christ despised gold, with the Pope everything is marketable; Christ sent His disciples out into the world, Antichrist lives in superb palaces, built with the money of the poor, and gives his disciples comfortable dwellings in the patrimony of the Crucified.

Wyclif's break with the Papacy was part of a new idea that he had formed of the Church. The politician had become a Presbyterian reformer for whom the whole ecclesiastical position was at fault, and who desired to leave

the parish priest as little fettered by ecclesiastical superiors or rival orders as he is in Scotland or Switzerland to-day. In our attempt to understand Wyclif's doctrine of the Church we are confronted with the same difficulties as in the study of his earlier political speculations 'concerning dominion.' The Reformer revels in scholastic and impossible abstractions, riddles of the schools on the squaring of a circle (God) whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere, and the like. We best get at his meaning by studying his views in their least elaborate forms. There we find that Wyclif begins by accepting the ancient division of the Church into three parts, 'one triumphant in heaven,' 'one militant here on earth,' and the third 'asleep in purgatory.' These are the 'queens, concubines, and virgins' of Solomon, that is Christ. The Church militant he defines as the whole number of the elect, containing 'only men that shall be saved.' So absolute is his predestinarianism that he adds that no man, not even a pope, 'wots whether he be of the Church, or whether he be a limb of the fiend,' nor will he allow that 'the Church can ever be called the whole body (*universitas*) of faithful travellers.' Nevertheless he guards his doctrine from some of its dangers by adding that 'as each man shall hope that he shall be safe in bliss, so he should suppose that he be a limb of holy Church,' and even maintains that 'each man that shall be damned shall be damned by his own guilt, and each man that is saved shall be saved by his own merit.' Wyclif was not slow in drawing the logical conclusion of his predestinarianism. The Church, as the mystical body of the predestinated, is a unity that knows nothing of papal primacies and hierarchies, and of the 'sects' of monks, friars, and priests; nor can the salvation of the elect be conditioned by masses, indulgences, penance, or other devices of sacerdotalism.

From this attack on the hierarchy and the 'six superfluous orders' the keen logic of Wyclif was driven into an attack upon the central position of the mediæval Church. In the summer of 1380 the Reformer published at Oxford

twelve theses against the current idea of transubstantiation. At first, as Dziewicki has shown, Wyclif's conclusions were practically the same as those of St. Thomas Aquinas. His objection was ot the nominalists who held that the bread was annihilated, a doctrine which seemed 'the abomination of desolation' to so thorough-going a realist as the Reformer.

But Wyclif's moral nature was too earnest to rest content with these dialectic refinements. Even in his earliest treatises on the subject we find him again and again breaking into his dry scholastic arguments to emphasise that the 'whole fitness to receive the host lies in sincere and grateful love of Christ and God.' Nor would his nominalist opponents allow him any rest. They drove him from position to position until finally he put forth a theory practically identical with that taken at a later date by Luther. In other words, Wyclif believed in consubstantiation. 'That Christ lies hidden in the elements' he regarded as beyond question, but this miracle of faith did not depend upon the words of a priest. The sacramental words 'make the occasion only' of Christ's sacramental presence. 'The truth and faith of the Church is that as Christ is at once God and man, so the Sacrament is at once the body of Christ and bread—bread and wine naturally, the body and blood sacramentally.' 'The consecrated host is neither Christ nor any part of Him, but the effectual sign of Him,' 'the sign and garment,' as he puts it elsewhere, 'of His body.' He will have nothing to do either with 'the heretics that trow and tell that this sacrament is God's body and no bread' or with 'the heretics that trow and tell that this sacrament may in no wise be God's body' for 'it is both together,' 'God's body in the form of bread.' Wyclif's arguments are as full of hair-splitting distinctions and figments as the theories which he sought to demolish, puzzles about 'maggots bred in the host,' 'whether the real body of Christ in the sacrament is standing or sitting,' and the like, while his inconsistencies show the shifts to which he was driven. Nevertheless the drift of his thinking is clear. 'His chief intention,' he said, 'was to call back the Church from idolatry,' for 'the

end of the Sacrament is the presence of Christ in the soul.' He would rescue the Eucharist from its prevailing materialism, and deliver the Christian from his bondage to the priest; while at the same time he quotes approvingly the words of John Damascenus: 'We must believe that the bread becomes the body of Christ, since the Truth has said it, not inquiring further.'

Wyclif's denial of transubstantiation, as yet however scarcely more than academic, gave Courtenay his opportunity. By his boldness Wyclif had cut himself off from all but a small minority of supporters; even those who had hitherto sympathised with him now withdrew their help. At Oxford, where for years his influence had been all-powerful, a council of twelve doctors condemned his doctrines. Wyclif appealed to the king (1381)—this appeal in a purely theological matter to the authority of the State is characteristic,—but John of Gaunt hurried down to the University and urged him to be silent. But instead of silence 'the heresiarch of execrable memory' laid a long memorial before Parliament, May 1382, in which he reaffirmed doctrines, 'which would make the ears of a faithful hearer tingle.' With a boldness indifferent to consequences Wyclif urged that members of religious orders might be allowed freely to leave them, the tithes should be diverted to the maintenance of the poor, the clergy supported by voluntary contributions, prelates be declared incapable of secular office, the statutes of Provisors and Premunire be enforced against the Pope, and that 'Christ's teaching' concerning the Eucharist 'may be taught openly in churches to Christian people.' Courtenay answered by summoning, May 21, 1382, 'at the house of the Blackfriars in London,' a Council—the Earthquake Council as it was afterwards called, from the earthquake which disturbed its proceedings,—which condemned Wyclif's doctrines as heretical. Armed with this condemnation the Archbishop struck a blow at the University which had hitherto been the head centre of free thinking. There the Wycliffite preachers were exhorting the authorities to exclude all friars and

monks, openly asserting the truth of the Master's doctrines. Town and gown were allied in their favour; the preachers were escorted from the church to their homes by 'twenty men with weapons under their gowns.' Dr. Rugge, the new chancellor, whose sympathies, if not with the Lollards, were at any rate against the regulars, as also were those of the majority of the 'regents in arts,' was summoned to Lambeth, and warned by the bishops and Privy Council that the heretics must be silenced. This attack on its liberties set Oxford on fire. The students and seculars armed in defence of their rights and threatened death to the friars, 'crying that they wished to destroy the University.' But within five months, by the help of the Crown—Richard had an old grudge to pay off against the undergraduates—Courtenay and the regulars had won. A Convocation 'for the suppression of heresy' made a triumphant entry into the conquered city. A royal writ ordained a monthly inquisition for the followers and books of Wyclif through the colleges and halls of Oxford; the heretics, unable to bear their terrible isolation, either recanted or were silenced. Oxford was won back to orthodoxy; the revolt of the seculars against the regulars crushed. But with the destruction of religious freedom and the triumph of the friars the great University ceased to be 'the second school of the Church.' Paris once more gained its lost pre-eminence, while Cambridge, hitherto insignificant, "came into fashion with cautious parents." The first of the Reformers was not only the last of the schoolmen, but the last outcome of the intellectual vigour of the great mediæval University.

Before his defeat at the University Wyclif had appealed for support to the people at large. He turned from the schools of Oxford to the weavers of Norwich and Leicester. The last of the schoolmen was transformed into the first of modern pamphleteers, as in tract after tract, written in the tongue of the people, Wyclif drove home the arguments hitherto buried in scholastic Latin. The daring of his logic took shelter in no half-way house of compromise. In terse, homely English, in stinging sarcasm and bold invective

Wyclif challenged the whole round of mediæval faith and practice. Pardons, indulgences, absolutions, pilgrimages, the worship of images, the adoration of the saints, the treasury of their merits laid up at the reserve of the Pope, fasting communion, the distinction between venial and mortal sins, were all successively denied. Purgatory and Extreme Unction he retained, though he owned that for the institution of the latter he looked in vain in the Bible. Confession he held to be useful, provided it was voluntary and made to a suitable person, best of all if it were made in public. Compulsory confession 'was the bondage of Antichrist.' The whole spirit of his revolt is seen in his incautious declaration that preaching 'is of more value than the administration of any sacrament.'

Not content with these attacks upon the outworks of the older dogmatism, Wyclif threatened the very citadel by his appeal to the Bible as the primary authority. 'Neither the testimony of Augustine nor Jerome, nor any other saint should be accepted except in so far as it was based upon Scripture.' He went even further by his assertion of the right of every man to examine the Bible for himself.

'The New Testament,' he claimed, 'is of full authority, and open to the understanding of simple men, as to the points that be most needful to salvation. . . . He that keepeth meekness and charity hath the true understanding of all Holy Writ.'

Wyclif's insistence on the supreme authority of Scripture was not less than that of Luther, and won for him, while still at Oxford, the proud title of 'Doctor Evangelicus.'

Wyclif's appeal to the Scriptures was followed up by the most abiding work of his life—the translation of the whole Bible into the language of the people.[1] Hitherto the Bible,

[1] For Wyclif and Purvey's Bible see the Preface to Forshall and Maddan's great edition. I have not thought it needful to refer to Dr. Gasquet's extraordinary theory (*Old Eng. Bible*) that the so-called Wyclif Bible is really a "Catholic Bible"; though welcomed and taught by some extreme Anglicans. It is sufficiently answered by Mr. Matthew, *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 1895, and Kenyon's *Our Bible*, and riddled through and through in the *Church Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 1901.

though fairly well known by the clergy and more spiritual laity, as the sermons and books of devotion that have come down to us show, was of necessity a sealed book to the masses. For the Anglo-Saxon versions, some manuscripts of which date as late as the twelfth century, had in the last two hundred years become unintelligible; while the French Scriptures, of which Wyclif speaks with envy, would be of service only to the upper classes. Partial translations, no doubt, had been made before his day, especially of the Psalms; but to Wyclif and his assistants belong the credit of first setting forth the whole Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. Prominent among his helpers must be reckoned Nicholas of Hereford, who seems to have translated the Old Testament up to *Baruch* iii. 20, when his work was interrupted. Wyclif, who had previously translated the Gospels, continued Nicholas' task, while other scholars assisted with the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse.

At a later date, probably about 1388, the whole version was revised and improved by Purvey, who had been Wyclif's fellow-worker from the first, and in later life his curate at Lutterworth. Purvey smoothed out the harsh literalness of the original, and substituted for its frequent glosses short comments in the margin, especially from Nicholas de Lyra. Thus, as the angry Knighton complains, 'this Master John Wyclif translated from Latin into English, the Scriptures, which Christ gave to the clergy and doctors of the Church. Thus the pearl of the gospel is scattered abroad and trodden under foot by swine . . . the jewel of clerics is turned to the sport of the laity.' The influence of Wyclif's or rather Purvey's version was far-reaching. "The new version was eagerly sought after and read. Copies passed into the hands of all classes of the people. Even the sovereign himself and princes of the royal blood did not disdain to possess them." The multiplication of copies must also have been rapid. Of the one hundred and seventy existing manuscripts the majority were written within forty years of its being finished. Purvey in fact was fortunate in that no formal condemnation of his English

Bible was ever issued, or, so far as we know, attempted. The nearest approach seems to have been a regulation of the Council of Oxford (1408), the effect, if not the design, of which was to save the version from glosses.

It is dangerous, as St. Jerome declares, to translate the text of Holy Scripture out of one idiom into another, since it is not easy in translations to preserve the same meaning in all things. . . . We therefore command and ordain that henceforth no one translate any text of Holy Scripture into English or any other language in a book, booklet or tract, and that no one read any book, booklet or tract of this kind lately made in the time of the said John Wyclif or since, or that hereafter may be made, either in part or wholly, either publicly or privately, under pain of excommunication, until such translation shall have been approved and allowed by the diocesan of the place, or if need be by the Provincial Council.

The fact that it was never completely printed until 1850 is significant of much. In his effort to substitute the Scriptures for tradition Wyclif's fatal foe was not the hostility of the Church so much as the lack of the press. Nor was its effect at all considerable upon the later versions. In spite of the dictum of Marsh that "Tyndale is merely a full-grown Wyclif," Tyndale was not really, as in fact he himself protests, 'holpen with English of any that had interpreted the same or such like thing in the Scripture beforehand.' Wyclif's Bible, like the majority of his work, stands like the pyramids isolated and lonely, not so much a living factor of continuity with some surviving present, as a pillar of witness testifying to one of God's kings who, against such odds, builded this monument to the glory of God.

The lack of the printing press had already driven Wyclif into another means for the spread of his teaching. He had unconsciously copied the methods of St. Francis, and fallen back upon the lost secret of the friars. From Oxford, as from Assisi two centuries before, Wyclif, like Wesley four centuries later, sent out his order of 'poor priests' who in the highways and byways and by the village greens should win the souls of the neglected. Some no doubt, like Wesley's Holy Club, were men of culture, students attracted

by his enthusiasm; the majority, especially after his expulsion from the University, were simple and unlettered men whom Wyclif's keen eye had detected among his parishioners at Lutterworth—'an unlettered man,' he said, 'with God's grace can do more for the Church than many graduates.' Clad in russet robes of undressed wool, without purse or scrip, a long staff in their hand, dependent for food and shelter on the goodwill of their neighbours, their only possession a few pages of Wyclif's Bible, his tracts and sermons, moving constantly from place to place—for Wyclif feared lest they should become 'possessioners'—not given 'to games or to chess,' but 'to the duties which befit the priesthood, studious acquaintance with God's law, plain preaching of the word of God, and devout thankfulness,' Wyclif's poor priests like the friars before them soon became a power in the land. How great must have been the influence of 'these wolves in sheep's clothing,' as Courtenay called them, is evident from the panic-stricken exaggeration of Knighton 'that every second man you met was a Lollard.'

Nothing more strongly marks the greatness of Wyclif's position than the reluctance of Courtenay to push matters to extremes against the head of this new sect. His followers were hunted down on every side, were expelled from the University, or forced to abjure; but Wyclif, though driven from Oxford, was left to close his days in peace at Lutterworth. He was neither declared a heretic nor threatened with excommunication, while the story of his recantation is but a blunder of Knighton. His health was already failing, a minor stroke had warned him of years of overwork. The consciousness that the end was near, the bitter isolation of his position, the suppression by persecution of his poor priests, the recantation of Repyngdon and other schoolmen, only made him devote himself with a feverish and almost incredible activity to the bringing out of tracts for the times, the editing of his sermons, and the publication of an orderly summary of his doctrines. Hope still shone in him like a pillar of fire: 'rest in the belief,' he writes, 'that the day shall come when the fiend's side shall

hide, and truth shall shine without let.' 'Now the prince of this world has spread his armies throughout the whole universe, but the King of kings has promised to assist His Church even unto the end of the world.' With tireless energy he once more repeated all his old attacks, especially holding up to ridicule the misdeeds of the friars and the claims of the Papacy. There are grounds for believing that the friars in their anger appealed to Rome, and that Urban replied by citing Wyclif to appear before his court. 'I have joyfully to tell to all men,' so ran the biting reply,

'the belief that I hold, and especially to the Pope, for I suppose that if my faith be rightful and given of God the Pope will gladly confirm it, and that if my faith be error, the Pope will wisely amend it. . . . Above this I suppose that the Pope is most obliged to the keeping of the gospel among all men that live here, for the Pope is highest vicar that Christ has here in earth. For the moreness (superiority) of Christ's vicar is not measured by earthly moreness, but by this that this vicar follows Christ more closely by virtuous living. . . . Now Christ during the time He walked here was the poorest of men, and put from Him all manner of worldly lordship. From this I take it as a wholesome counsel that the Pope should abandon his worldly lordship to worldly lords, and move speedily all his clerks to do the same. For thus did Christ, and thus He taught His disciples, until the fiend had blinded this world. And if I err in this sentence (opinion) I will meekly be amended, yea even by death, for that I hope would be a good to me.'

The 'good' was nearer than his enemies dreamed. The 'emaciated frame, spare and well nigh destitute of strength,' had for some years only been kept going by his indomitable will. A few weeks later, as Wyclif 'was hearing mass in his church at Lutterworth, at the time of the elevation of the host, he fell down, smitten by a severe paralysis, especially in the tongue, so that neither then nor afterwards could he speak.' On the third day (Saturday, December 31, 1384) the tired worker passed from the King's business into the King's presence.

HERBERT B. WORKMAN.

A PLEA FOR THE ANTHOLOGIST.

1. *The Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics.* Edited by FRANCIS TURNER PALGRAVE. First and Second Series. (London : Macmillan & Co.)

2. *The Oxford Book of English Verse.* Edited by A. T. QUILLER COUCH. (Oxford : The Clarendon Press.)

3. *The Golden Pomp.* Arranged by A. T. QUILLER COUCH. (London : Methuen & Co.)

4. *English Lyrics.* Selected and arranged by W. E. HENLEY. (London : Methuen & Co.)

5. *The Flower of the Mind.* Edited by ALICE MEYNELL. (London : Grant Richards.)

6. *A Little Book of English Lyrics.* (London: Methuen & Co.)

THE anthologist has a small reputation in literature. By many he would scarcely be admitted within the charmed circle. His work seems so slight and easy. By many it would be regarded as useless. And yet it may be contended that his work is by no means easy, and that it is far from being useless.

Anthology work has indeed been done by those who have made good their claim to a place in literature, and who could therefore compare original production with the task of selecting for an anthology. It is pretty certain that some at least of these would say that the search for and judgment upon the materials gathered for an anthology were even more difficult than original production. This is specially so in the case of judgment upon poetry, where mood counts for so much more than in the case of prose. A well known poet and critic might be cited who in one mood—was

it *before* dinner?—absolutely condemned poems, which in another mood—was this *after* dinner?—he praised to the full.

Then, too, it is difficult for the anthologist to free himself from the spirit of the age in which his lot is cast—to do this entirely is probably impossible—but even to preserve himself from being the slave thereto is to the last degree difficult. In literature as in dress, fashion is a powerful mistress. Her standard is based not upon unchanging principle but on fickle fancy. A glance over old portraits shows how dress once considered beautiful now seems almost hideous. Our successors looking over portraits of the present day will probably smile at what we now admire. And the literary standards of any one age are to a large extent fixed by the prevailing spirit. Fifty years ago poets were praised for perfection of detail—that their pictures of nature or life were almost photographic. To-day the opposite of this—impressionism, allusiveness, suggestiveness—is made ground of praise. Neither extreme reaches the final standard.

Any worthy record of poets and poetry would reveal the fact that many a poet neglected in his own time has in a later one been greatly sought after; and that many a poet whose works sold like hot rolls during his lifetime now lie forgotten on library shelves.

Beyond this, it is very difficult for any one mind to regard poetry with an all-round look. There is sure to be, save in the most exceptional cases, a too exclusive regard for either form or substance, or in other words for either ideas or melody in expression. To lean too much to mere ideas is to admit the philosopher into the ranks of poetry—to lay too much stress on melody of words is to crown the musician with the bays of the poet.

Our own age presents examples of error in both directions. The unduly exalted place assigned to Walt Whitman among the poets of America, so that some place him on the summit of the American Parnassus, is an example of regard for substance to the neglect of form; for

what can be more formless than the bulk of his verse—so formless that we may well think that we are reading prose rather than poetry.

The enthusiasm for Swinburne on the other hand is an example of the regard for the melody of words—for lyric beauty—to the almost neglect of ideas. It would indeed be a difficult task to turn Mr. Swinburne's poetry into prose, for the loss of form in many instances would be the loss of all.

In this connexion Rossetti's words to Mr. Hall Caine deserve remembrance: "Fundamental brain work, my boy, that is the great thing. Beat your gold as much as you like, but see that it is gold and worth the beating."

A reviewer of Mr. Stephen Phillips' "Herod" in the *Bookman* has said:

> In the work of the poets of an earlier generation, as of Wordsworth or Byron, it is true that we are ready to accept and to condone, for the sake of their best, much worse faults, and a much larger proportion of them, than we find in work like that of Mr. Phillips. But the intervening age and its influences have made for a heightened fastidiousness on all points of poetic execution; the influence of Tennyson above all; that, in another sense and from another side, of Mr. Swinburne; that of lesser writers who have caught from France the spirit and example of nice craftsmanship. Such fastidiousness is very desirable, on the whole, in a nation given over like ours to amateurishness in the arts as in other matters. Yet it may have its dangers in making us care more for the flower of verse than for its root; for the draping and jewelling of a poetic creation than for its body or the soul informing its body.

This has been better expressed by Edmond Scherer, who says:

> It is well known that in this respect there are two schools among contemporary poets. The one class has sincere and genuine feeling, which expresses itself in a fashion appropriate, and consequently original. Poetry, with them, goes from within to without, from thought to expression. With others, on the contrary, the first business is not profundity of sentiment or

truth of idea, but rather the picturesque effect possible to extract from the subject. This is so true that the latter class does not even recoil from the vulgar or the ignoble, provided that they find in either material for descriptive novelty. Poetry in their work goes from without to within; it is the expression which gives value to the thought.

He distinguishes "between legitimate art, which only speaks because it has something to say, and art become ostentatious, which says nothing except to show how well it can speak."[1]

It may, therefore, be questioned whether an ideal anthology can be the product of a single editor unaided by the balancing judgment of other minds. Certainly the nearest approach to this in modern times owes its crowning merits to the fact that it was the product of four selecting minds—its editor Mr. F. T. Palgrave, Mr. Thomas Woolner, an unnamed friend, and before and beyond all these, of Alfred Tennyson.[2] Certain is it that when the editor of this volume was deprived of such a peerless referee as Tennyson, his anthology work suddenly fell to the ranks of mediocrity. It may be that the surest way to produce a standard anthology would be to extract from the best already published the poems they have in common. That would give us not a large collection, but one that would have some claim to be considered standard.

But difficult as the work of the anthologist is, it is far from being useless. It is probably even more useful than that of men who employ themselves in gathering all the unconsidered trifles—the juvenilia, the rejected or neglected poems of writers both known and unknown. These have filled shelves by the yard, but it may be questioned whether all of them together have discovered fifty poems which the world will not willingly let die. Their search, save in a few very exceptional cases, has rather dimmed than brightened the fame of the poets whose works they have augmented.

---

[1] *Essays on English Literature*, translated by George Saintsbury.

[2] *The Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics.*

These sweepers up of the dust of the poets' house need to bear in mind the protest of Mr. Palgrave :

> But the imperfect thing, or thought,—
> The crudities and yeast of youth,
> The dubious doubt, the twilight truth,
> The work that for the passing day was wrought,
> The schemes that come to nought,
>
> The sketch half-way 'twixt verse and prose
> That mocks the finish'd picture true,
> The quarry whence the statue grew,
> The scaffolding 'neath which the palace rose,
> The vague abortive throes
>
> And fever-fits of joy or gloom :—
> In kind oblivion let them be !
> Nor has the dead worse foe than he
> Who rakes these sweepings of the artist's room,
> And piles them on his tomb.
>
> Ah, 'tis but little that the best,
> Frail children of a fleeting hour,
> Can leave of perfect fruit or flower !
> Ah, let all else be graciously supprest
> When man lies down to rest ![1]

This method might, perhaps, be extended with benefit even to parts of the published works of great poets. The fame of even Wordsworth and Browning would be greater than it is if the absolute prose were squeezed out of their works. Lord Melbourne's cynical joy at the death of any great author—"Now then I can complete his works"—expresses a widespread but not very wise desire. In poetry, perhaps even more than in prose, "the half is sometimes more than the whole." Many a one would read and be uplifted by Wordsworth were it not for the dreary wastes that lie between the marvellous oases of his poetry.

The *Publisher's Journal* once described certain well known editors as reprinters of useless literature. As the

[1] "Pro Mortuis," F. T. Palgrave.

greater part of their reprints lie unused and even uncut on book collectors' shelves, this is hard but true.

But to rescue from a heap of commonplace a shining jewel of verse that will flash its light on every beholder is a different work. To preserve the *all* of the greatest is a doubtful boon, but to rescue even a morsel that is really golden from the least known writer—the product of some moment of happy inspiration—is a service to all.

It may be that Meleager did us a greater service by arranging a Garland from the flowers of his own and nearly half a hundred poets besides than by preserving the whole produce of their gardens. The standard *Anthologia Græca* runs to thirteen volumes, and represents the work of three hundred Greek poets of all periods—the old Hellenic, Alexandrine and Byzantine, Heathen and Christian. This is too great a mass for all but classical experts, and so to ordinary readers the Greek Anthology is known by small selections. But had this verse never been extracted from the works of the small army of writers, it would have had about as much chance of being read as Egyptian hieroglyphics.

So great is the mass of verse accumulated in England, and which is being added to every day, that the only possibility of the best being known is through the labours of the anthologist. It may be safely asserted that a work like *The English Poets*,[1] in four volumes, edited by Mr. T. H. Ward, has done more to make the poetry of England known than any of the great series of Poets edited by Gilfillan or Bell, or that known as the "Aldine." Life is not long enough, most people have not leisure enough, to grapple with these, and as a rule they lie unread on shelves or referred to only to verify a quotation.

For after all poetry should be taken in small doses—a large dose is fatal. Poetry does not exert its full spell till it is familiar, and—save in the cases of vast memories like those of Macaulay, or Morell who said that his mind was like a

[1] Macmillan & Co.

butcher's shop, all hooks, where everything caught—only a little can be absorbed at a time. Most minds get more good from a single well chosen selection, which becomes a veritable *vade mecum*, and bears the mark of frequent usage, than from shelves full of completed works.

And he does no small service who, out of the vast stores of English verse, selects and puts at the disposal of the public the poems best worthy of a place in the chamber of memory. Amongst these some of the most precious will not bear the names of the greatest. In the judgment of many, and those not the least qualified to judge, the supremest lines in English poetry are not from one of the great masters of song—not from Shakespeare, or Milton, or Wordsworth, but from a man whose name is unknown to the world at large. Miss Louise Imogen Guiney, regarded by some as the most distinctive living poetess of America, has placed her wreath on the head of Lovelace as the writer of the two lines:

> I could not love thee, dear, so much,
> Loved I not honour more.

Here are her words:

> True love's own talisman, which here
> Shakespeare and Sidney failed to teach,
> A steel-and-velvet Cavalier
> Gave to our Saxon speech:
>
> Chief miracle of theme and touch
> That upstart enviers adore:
> *I could not love thee, dear, so much,*
> *Loved I not honour more.*
>
> No critic born since Charles was king
> But sighed in smiling, as he read:
> "Here's theft of the supremest thing
> A poet might have said!"
>
> Young knight and wit and beau, who won,
> 'Mid war's adventure, ladies' praise,
> Was't well of you, ere you had done,
> To blight our modern bays?

O yet to you, whose random hand
  Struck from the dark whole gems like these,
Archaic beauty, never planned
  Nor reared by wan degrees,

Which leaves an artist poor, and art
  An earldom richer all her years;
To you, dead on your shield apart,
  Be "Ave!" passed in tears.

How shall this singing era spurn
  Her master, and in lauds be loath?
Your worth, your work, bid us discern
  Light exquisite in both.

'Twas virtue's breath inflamed your lyre,
  Heroic from the heart it ran;
Nor for the shedding of such fire
  Lives since a manlier man.

And till your strophe sweet and bold
  So lovely aye, so lonely long,
Love's self outdo, dear Lovelace! hold
  The pinnacles of song.

The sonnet declared by Coleridge to be "the finest and most grandly conceived in our language," and by Leigh Hunt to "stand supreme, perhaps, above all in any language," and of which he said "nor can we ponder it too deeply or with too hopeful a reverence," is from a writer known only to a few, not for poetic work but for theological and ecclesiastical controversy. But this one sonnet is all of poetic that we owe to him, and will carry his name down the ages. It would have been an unspeakable loss if the editor of *The Bijou* (Pickering, 1828), in which it first appeared, had not discerned its merits. This peerless sonnet by Joseph Blanco White cannot be too often presented:

Mysterious night! when our first parent knew
Thee from report divine, and heard thy name,
Did he not tremble for this lovely frame,
This glorious canopy of light and blue?

Yet 'neath a curtain of translucent dew,
Bathed in the rays of the great setting flame,
Hesperus, with the host of heaven came,
And lo! Creation widened in man's view.
Who could have thought such darkness lay concealed
Within thy beams, O Sun! or who could find,
Whilst flower and leaf and insect stood revealed,
That to such countless orbs thou mad'st us blind!
Why do we, then, shun Death with anxious strife?
If Light can thus deceive, wherefore not Life?

Mrs. Barbauld presents another illustration of this. Her short poem "Life," of which Wordsworth said that he wished he had written it, is one of those happy inspirations which sometimes come even to writers whose ordinary work is merely didactic. Here is the last and finest portion :

Life! I know not what thou art,
But know that thou and I must part;
And when, or how, or where we met,
I own to me's a secret yet.

Life! we have been long together
Through pleasant and through cloudy weather;
'Tis hard to part when friends are dear;
Perhaps 'twill cost a sigh, a tear;—
Then steal away, give little warning,
Choose thine own time;
Say not Good-night, but in some brighter clime
Bid me Good-morning!

Illustrations of this kind might be multiplied to almost any extent.

Anthologists are often profuse in their apologies for omissions from a poem or for presenting only extracts. But in many a case this is the only way to secure them from oblivion or causing them to be read. It is open to doubt whether long poems are read unless they be narrative ones and so are novels in metre. If they are, it is probably only by students for examination or critics for discourse. Indeed, it is most likely that very few poets who have written much are read through. Milton is more talked about than read.

Wordsworth is widely known only through a few of his great sonnets, about half a dozen of his poems, and those sentences of his which have become almost proverbial. Tennyson is read through more frequently than any other poet, and that because he never attempted a long poem without a narrative to keep up both his own interest and that of his readers. It may be that Browning, who is guilty of more long poems than any modern writer of note, and has the distinction of writing the longest poem in the English language "The Ring and the Book," is read; but it is not so much for delight as for a mental discipline—he is studied rather as a psychologist than as a poet.

When these considerations are taken into account and the ever-increasing mass of English poetry is realised, it must be evident that only through the labours of the anthologist can ordinary lovers of poetry know even that of their native land. But then the question arises, Where shall the standard be found for such anthology—by what rod shall poems be measured for introduction to the canon of English verse? That is a question of supreme difficulty.

Matthew Arnold exhorts us in our judgment of poetry to beware of the historic estimate, and the personal estimate, both of which are fallacious. He urges us to judge by classic standards, and that he may not leave us in the dark he presents a few brief examples of such classic poetry. He says, "The best poetry is what we want; the best poetry will be found to have a power of forming, sustaining, and delighting us as nothing else can." True; but that leaves the question unanswered, What is the best? No absolute and unchallenged answer can be given to that question. Each age, each person would give a different one. Much of the homage paid to certain great poets is paid because it is thought to be the correct thing—a mark of culture to do so. Dante, for example, has been the stay and solace of many a great mind, as in the case of Mr. Gladstone; but there is a multitude of persons with a genuine love for poetry, and it may be with no little insight into it, who if they were quite frank would confess that they do not

find in Dante the solace and inspiration they find in other poets. And therefore to set up certain fixed standards for poetry as absolute is to lead to a kind of sycophancy or unreality in praise. Samuel Taylor Coleridge's proof of the inspiration of the Bible, that it *found* him, may well be applied to poetry. That which finds a man is the best poetry, at all events for him. Some of the passages quoted by Matthew Arnold as supreme examples of classic poetry seem to the present writer little more than prose. As an example of this take the following quoted by him :

> And courage never to submit or yield,
> And what is else, not to be overcome.

The second line seems to us only a reproduction of the first in another form. Probably these lines struck Mr. Arnold at another angle, or came to him in some mood when they met his need, and hence his high praise. In judgment of poetry the subjective mood cannot be excluded. It is probably as true of this realm as of that of nature—

> Oh Lady, we receive but what we give,
> And in our life alone doth Nature live.

Or take another example. Ben Jonson figures largely in anthologies; but Tennyson said, "I can't read Ben Jonson, especially his comedies. To me he appears to move in a sea of glue." The only thing of Jonson's that he liked was "It is not growing like a tree," which is not included in the selection from Jonson by Mrs. Meynell, or by Mr. W. E. Henley. Here, then, are three poets who do not agree; but as there can be no manner of doubt which of the three is the greatest, so it may be that the greatest poet is the best critic. It is pretty clear from this and other examples that Tennyson found no objection to a poem because it had a touch of what may be called the moral didactic, as in the two lines,

> In small proportions we just beauties see;
> And in short measures life may perfect be,

provided the poem had sufficient afflatus to carry it; and, on the other hand, that the conceits which have so great an

attraction for some anthologists had none for him, as in another poem of Ben Jonson's, "To Celia," which ends thus:

> But thou thereon didst only breathe,
> And sent'st it back to me;
> Since when it grows, and smells, I swear
> Not of itself, but thee!

If we may judge from the recorded judgments of Tennyson, he desired more than conceits; he desired worthy ideas on which the sane mind could linger and find delight. This is always present in his own poetry, and so it not only delights the ear but gives food for the mind. It is sometimes said that Shelley, like Spenser, is a poet for poets; but Tennyson said, "There was a great wind of words in a good deal of Shelley, but that as a writer of blank verse he was perhaps the most skilful of the moderns." And he added, "Nobody admires Shelley more than once I did, and I still admire him. I think I like his 'Epipsychidian' as much as anything by him."

It may be questioned whether we have ever had a saner judge on matters poetic than our late lamented laureate. How evenly he held the balance and permitted both substance and form to enter into his estimates. How independent were his judgments! He did not lean to this faction or that. He was not caught up and borne away by the passing spirit of the age. There was none of the superior person attitude which is the bane of so much of our present-day criticism of poetry. From his lofty place he did not look disdainfully on the feelings of the multitude. Probably the deepest joy of his life came to him when he found that simple, unlettered folk found delight and help in his poems.

This last sentence suggests another question—as to whether and how far the anthologist should be influenced by popular judgments of poetry. There are instances, indeed, in which the popularity of a poem seems to have formed the ground for its exclusion. Surely this is the modern analogue to that ancient attitude of the Jewish rulers of our Lord's time,

"This people that knoweth not the law are cursed." But, as the verdict of history has shown, they erred through pride, so probably the anthologist who entirely disregards the appreciation of poems by the people is equally in error. It is easy to exaggerate the value of the *vox populi*, but it is an error wholly to disregard it as of no value. The people may err—who does not?—but they are not always in error. There are musicians who sneer at the music heard on barrel organs; but usually there is some melody to justify it, and it may be that if their own music was heard from such lowly instruments their hearts would not be quite unmoved. Surely most right-minded folk would respond to the sentiment of Mr. Lowell in his poem, "An Incident on a Railway Car":

Never did poesy appear
  So full of Heaven to me, as when
I saw how it would pierce through pride and fear
  To the lives of coarsest men.

It may be glorious to write
  Thoughts that shall glad the two or three
High souls, like those far stars that come in sight
  Once in a century;—

But better far it is to speak
  One simple word, which now and then
Shall waken their free nature in the weak
  And friendless sons of men;

To write some earnest verse or line,
  Which, seeking not the praise of art,
Shall make a clearer faith and manhood shine
  In the untutor'd heart.

He who doth this, in verse or prose,
  May be forgotten in his day,
But surely shall be crown'd at last with those
  Who live and speak for aye.

Probably an ideal collection of English poetry is beyond human skill; but if it is to be reached, it would be by due

observance of the need both for ideas and loveliness of expression, together with a due respect for all that has impressed the people at large and woven itself into their common speech.

Meantime an anthology approaching the ideal might be produced by gathering the poems common to a number of careful collections. Such an anthology would probably dispel a good many current ideas as to what constitutes the highest poetry. It would certainly dispel that widely spread idea that a touch of the didactic is fatal to fine poetry. Of this a single example may be given. Sir Henry Wotton's poem, "The Character of a Happy Life," is included in the following collections—all of which deserve to be regarded as worthy specimens of anthological work—*The Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*, edited by F. T. Palgrave; *The Oxford Book of English Verse*, edited by A. Quiller Couch; *The Golden Pomp*, by the same editor; *The Lyra Sacra*, edited by H. C. Beeching; and *A Little Book of English Lyrics*, published by Methuen & Co.

Now, there is little or no play of imagination in this poem. It may almost be called a piece of morality, but it is lifted into the realm of poetry by the sanity and balance of its view of life and by the happy and compact way in which it is phrased. That readers may judge for themselves the poem is here appended:

How happy is he born and taught
  That serveth not another's will;
Whose armour is his honest thought,
  And simple truth his utmost skill!

Whose passions not his masters are;
  Whose soul is still prepared for death,
Untied unto the world with care
  Of public fame or private breath;

Who envies none that chance doth raise
  Or vice; who never understood
How deepest wounds are given by praise;
  Nor rules of state, but rules of good;

Who hath his life from rumours freed,
Whose conscience is his strong retreat;
Whose state can neither flatterers feed,
Nor ruin make oppressors great.

Who God doth late and early pray
More of His grace than gifts to lend;
And entertains the harmless day
With a religious book or friend;

This man is freed from servile bands
Of hope to rise, or fear to fall;
Lord of himself, though not of lands;
And having nothing, yet hath all.

Any wide study of the poetry that has been accepted as the best would therefore disclose the fact that no one definition of poetry covers the whole ground, that even those of the greatest critics need to be enlarged, and that the charmed circle of the poets may be entered not only by the door of imagination, but by those of profound thought, of compact expression, of insight into life, and even by the door of the heart purified and uplifted by the power of religious faith.

Some general characterisation may be permitted of recent anthologies. *The Golden Treasury* of Professor Palgrave has been mentioned already.

Mr. Quiller Couch has given us two anthologies. *The Oxford Book of English Verse*, the largest collection of all, extending to over a thousand pages, is full of interest, but contains too many long poems and does not do justice to the men of small repute who yet have given us memorable lines—which should be a special object of the anthologist. The great names will take care of themselves, but the fine work of lesser men may easily pass into oblivion. In *The Golden Pomp* he deals with a smaller period, from Surrey to Shirley, and the plot being smaller is more thoroughly searched.

In *English Lyrics* Mr. W. E. Henley's keen and vigorous mind is clearly displayed. Mrs. Meynell's book is true to

its title, *The Flower of the Mind*; but poetry is not wholly the child of the mind. Her selection strikes us as a trifle austere. The anonymous editor of *A Little Book of English Lyrics* has made a brave attempt to present in small compass, and at an almost nominal price to reach a large public, a representative collection of verse of the lyric order. Mr. Beeching's *Lyra Sacra* is full of interest. If it has a fault, it is that it leans too much to sacred verse marked by quaintness. Though not distinctly a collection of sacred verse, we know of no volume so calculated to deepen the religious life in the largest sense as *Poems of the Inner Life*. It fills its own department as finely as does that of Mr. Palgrave the more secular lyric one. It has deservedly reached a twelfth edition.

In anthologies for children, Mr. E. V. Lucas (*A Book of Verse for Children*) gives us the most original selection, based upon the deepest knowledge of a child's nature; whilst Mr. Andrew Lang (*The Blue Poetry Book*) gives what he thinks children *should* learn, and Mr. Langbridge (*Ballads of the Brave*) what they will *like* to learn.

Mr. Laurie Magnus and Mr. Cecil Headlam (*Flowers of the Cave, Prayers from the Poets*) cultivate special departments. In one collection they give us extracts in both prose and verse concerning Death, and in the other poems which have shaped themselves into prayers. Mr. E. V. Lucas's little book, *The Open Road*, is not for indoor but outdoor use, and is full of the breeziness of nature.

Within our space it is impossible to deal critically with these anthologies; but it may be said that within their own limits, and of course with the personal preferences of their editors, they all more or less present to us some of the chief treasures of that great storehouse of poetry which is one of the chief glories of the nation to which we belong, and of the language it is our privilege to speak.

W. GARRETT HORDER.

CHRIST AND MODERN CRITICISM.

Encyclopædia Biblica. Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D. Vol. II., E to K. (A. & C. Black. 1901.)

A DICTIONARY of the Bible should be judged as a whole. Alphabetical as it is in arrangement, apparently fragmentary as it is in its character, and many as are the names of its writers, a true Bible Dictionary will possess, under the direction of a strong and capable editor, a character of its own. The contributors will be carefully chosen, the articles will supplement one another, various aspects of one great theme will be presented from various points of view, and even a thing so apparently amorphous as a dictionary is seen to be highly and delicately organic. Bayle's Dictionary and the *Encyclopédie* of D'Alembert and Diderot are classics of "free thought." The last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* helped to mark and make an epoch. And if we mistake not, the publication of the two standard Dictionaries of the Bible which coincides with the close of one century and the opening of another will be found later on to possess great historical and religious significance.

It is in no violation of this general canon that we propose to devote this article to one particular feature in the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, published a few weeks ago. When we were called to notice the first volume at the beginning of last year, we expressed some hesitation in giving a verdict, because one volume only of an elaborately planned work had appeared. The issue of a second—even though two more volumes are yet to come—largely relieves us of this hesitancy. It is quite possible to see now what the scope and purpose of the whole work is: he would be

blind indeed who could not perceive it. The principles on which it will deal with the whole Bible, Old and New Testaments alike, are plainly manifested in the three thousand closely printed columns which have now been given to the world. There can be no danger of misjudging the spirit and temper of the editors and their associates in relation to the cardinal questions on which their Dictionary is to pronounce its judgment. Any careful reader might have been tolerably sure of this when he had studied the first volume, but the second leaves no room for doubt.

Especially is this the case with regard to what may be called the central verities of Christianity. It is these, after all, which furnish the most searching tests and criteria of the biblical critic and interpreter. "What think ye of Christ?" is a question which has proved a touchstone from the beginning; and the child whom Simeon took in his arms has been set "for the falling and rising up of many in Israel" and outside its boundaries. There may be a thousand differences of opinion about historical and literary questions in the case of so many-sided a book as the Bible—differences of importance in their place, yet sinking into comparative insignificance when the great themes of religion come into view. The appearance of this second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* has shed a flood of light upon the attitude of its promoters towards these central and vital themes of Christianity. We propose, for reasons which will appear, to confine our attention to the article "Jesus," by the late Professor A. B. Bruce, the articles on "Gospels," by Dr. E. A. Abbott and Professor Schmiedel, and the article "John, son of Zebedee," also by Professor Schmiedel. Some other subsidiary articles will be referred to; but whoever has mastered these has possessed himself of the main message concerning Christian origins which this new Encyclopædia desires to give to the English-reading public. The editor, Dr. Cheyne, has chosen his contributors, fitted the articles so as to cover the ground requisite, and we may take it that now we know what he and those associated with them judge to be the fine flower and best results of research

regarding the most important subjects of all to the Christian mind. Canon Cheyne has often spoken of what is known as "moderate" criticism in the superior and patronising tone of one who is wise enough to leave all that kind of unworthy compromise behind him. Now we are shown in the plainest way whither the "advanced" criticism which he favours tends, and unless we are mistaken the results will be found sufficiently startling. The perusal of these articles will produce keen and deep pain in all devout Christian minds, and it is with something like dismay that we contemplate the effect they are only too likely to produce in certain quarters. Whether this impression is just and sound our readers will have opportunity to judge, if they have the patience to follow this article to the end.

We should not like, however, to enter upon the subject proper without paying a fresh tribute to the many excellences which this Encyclopædia possesses. The erudition of Dr. Cheyne, its editor-in-chief and the writer of a large proportion of the articles, is something phenomenal. Hardly anything within the scope of his subject seems to escape him, and he and Dr. Sutherland Black have shown great skill in the way in which the articles are planned, in the arrangement of the subject-matter, the facilities given for reference, and all that pertains to the editorial province. The list of contributors is imposing. They represent, it will be understood, scholars mainly of one type of thinking on biblical subjects, but all are men of mark whose words carry weight. A large proportion are continental scholars, as will be seen when we mention the names of Benzinger, Budde, Deissmann, Gauthier, Guthe, Jülicher, Kautzsch, Kosters, Marti, Nöldeke, Schmiedel, Tiele, and Wellhausen. But English scholarship is represented by the names of the late W. Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith, A. R. S. Kennedy, R. H. Charles, A. B. Bruce, and S. R. Driver—the last-mentioned contributing but little, in comparatively unimportant articles; while America is well represented by Professors F. Brown, Cone, Moore, Jastrow, Toy, Müller, Schmidt, and Gould. It is impossible even to name the

chief articles which distinguish the volume, each of them learned, able, and instructive, though marked as of course by that extremely "advanced" tone of criticism which characterises the work as a whole. But when we say that Wellhausen writes on the Hexateuch, Guthe on Israel, Cheyne on Isaiah and Job, Müller on Egypt, Toy on Ezekiel and Ecclesiasticus, Moore on Genesis, Exodus and Historical Literature, Charles on Eschatology, F. Brown on Geography, Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith and Conder on Jerusalem, and that these are only specimens of elaborate articles on great biblical themes, each one of which deserves thorough and careful study—whether or no the conclusions reached commend themselves in each case—it will be seen what a mine of biblical information is here presented. It does not surpass in interest or value the treatment of the same subjects to be found in Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, published by Messrs. Clark, which is marked by at least equal learning and much greater sobriety of judgment. But these two monumental works may be mentioned together as bringing within the reach of everyone for a few guineas a mass of biblical knowledge, furnished by the finest international scholarship of the day, the importance of which cannot well be exaggerated.

All the more, therefore, is it to be regretted that the tone of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* on the Gospels and the life and work of our Lord Jesus Christ should be what here we find it. Dr. Abbott's article on the Gospels in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* will be remembered, and his analysis of "sources" may be anticipated by those familiar with his published works. Dr. P. W. Schmiedel, Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Zürich, has been hitherto best known to scholars in this country by his commentary on Thessalonians and Corinthians in Holtzmann's *Hand-Kommentar*. He was more fully introduced to English readers by his articles on "Acts" and kindred subjects in the first volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. He undertakes to deal with the "credibility of the Synoptics" under the heading "Gospels"; and under "John, son of Zebedee," discusses the authorship,

date, and credibility of the "Johannine" writings. Professor A. B. Bruce needs no introduction to readers of this REVIEW, and the sense of loss occasioned by his death is still fresh amongst us. But most who remember the excellence of much of his work—especially his earlier work—as an interpreter of the New Testament will, we think, feel not a little troubled that he could write an article on "Jesus" which, partly by what it says and more by what it does not say, confirms the general impression produced by all the references to Christ and the Gospels which this volume contains.

It is the influence likely to be exerted by the articles as an organic whole, forming part of a standard English encyclopædia and arranged by an editor who is Canon of Rochester and Professor of Exegesis at Oxford, which forms the most serious feature in the case. When Dr. Abbott published on his own account *The Kernel and the Husk*, he spoke for himself, and neither the Church nor the world was greatly moved. What Dr. Schmiedel, as a learned and ingenious professor at Zürich, may think personally on these great themes is not profoundly important to anyone in this country. But when the views of these writers, emphasised by the eloquent silence of Dr. Bruce, are put forward as the only utterance on the cardinal questions of Christianity and the ripest and best conclusions of modern scholarship, in what claims to be a standard English Dictionary of the Bible, they acquire an importance which in themselves they would not severally possess. Let us see what these conclusions are, and what are the principles and methods by which they are reached.

It forms no part of our purpose to plunge into the intricacies of the "Synoptic problem," or to discuss in detail the evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. It is well understood that these are, within limits, still open questions of criticism. There is a growing consensus of opinion in favour of the "two-document-hypothesis," to account for the phenomena of agreement and disagreement in the Synoptists; that is, that two authorities, one the

original of our "Mark," the other a collection of "Logia," were used by the authors both of "Matthew" and "Luke," the latter having access to other sources of his own. The long Johannine controversy, moreover, has resulted in a thrusting back of the date of the Gospel from the late period to which it was fashionable in "advanced" circles to assign it some decades ago, and the prevailing view at present would accept the authorship more than suggested by John xix. 35 and xxi. 20, that the disciple whom Jesus loved and whose name was from the beginning associated with this Gospel, was he who "bore witness of these things," and that "his witness is true." [1]

But these questions are not settled, and perhaps never will be settled beyond the reach of controversy. The relations of the Synoptic narratives to one another are far from being as yet determined. There are difficulties in the way of accepting John the Apostle as the author of the Fourth Gospel, which no candid inquirer will ignore. Whilst many features of the Gospel point distinctly to Johannine authorship and authority, the late date at which it must have been written, the apparent discrepancies with the Synoptists, the subjectivity of the representation, and the style in which both the narrative and the discourses of Jesus are cast, seem to demand further explanation, and it cannot be matter for surprise that hypotheses of various kinds have been devised to account for these anomalies. So far as the writers in the Encyclopædia put forward their own views, more or less in accordance with, more or less differing from their predecessors, we welcome all that they have to say, whether we agree with them or not.

Dr. Abbott places St. Luke later than appears to us reasonable and disparages him as an accurate historian. He minimises the external evidence for the genuineness of St. John's Gospel—the treatment of Papias, Justin, Irenæus,

[1] Even Harnack, who ascribes this Gospel to the shadowy "presbyter John," admits that "in some way John, son of Zebedee, stands behind the Fourth Gospel cannot be denied" (*Chronol. der Altchr. Lit.*, Vol. I., pt. 2, p. 677).

and Tatian being one-sided—while he recognises "its historical value in correcting impressions derived from the Synoptic Gospels," and admits that while no Gospel soars so high, none stands more firmly, more practically, below." Professor Schmiedel, as regards the Synoptists, seeks to discover "sources of sources." He holds that no existing hypothesis is of itself a sufficient clue to guide us among the complexities of the facts; that the "original Mark" and the "Logia" document, supposed to have immediately preceded our canonical Gospels, were not the earliest written compositions giving an account of the life of Christ, and therefore, even if the problem be removed further from solution than ever, criticism must take account of this earlier stage and devise some still more complicated hypothesis to account for the books of the three evangelists, since a simpler one will not serve. Professor Schmiedel holds further, that in the primitive Church there were at least two Johns of importance, the Apostle and the Elder; that John the Elder, resident in Asia Minor, is—not the author—but a kind of redactor of the Apocalypse; that the Gospel is not the work of the son of Zebedee, nor of an eye-witness or contemporary of the events described, but of a late writer (probably after A.D. 132), who was "easily accessible to Alexandrian and Gnostic ideas." Even the First Epistle of John he will not assign to the author of the Gospel, closely related though these books seem to be; the two writings are by different authors, though they "belong to the same school of thought."

All these questions are capable of discussion, and it is the business of criticism to argue them out. We think it would not be difficult to show in detail that there is another side to the case ably drawn up by such accomplished advocates as Dr. Abbott and Professor Schmiedel —who, by the way, differ from one another upon several points of considerable importance. But the truth can only be arrived at by the fullest and most thorough investigation of rival hypotheses, and in the long run nothing but good can come of the freest possible discussion. In

the end truth will prevail. The whole work of literary criticism is concerned with the historical interpretation of literary documents, and biblical criticism has its *raison d'être* in the necessity for such an interpretation of biblical documents. Dogmatical exegesis is not enough, and our ground of complaint with regard to the writers in the Encyclopædia is not that they are thoroughgoing biblical critics, and have put forward theories with which we happen not to agree. If we do not propose to discuss these theories in detail, it is not because we think them incontrovertible, nor because such a discussion would transgress the limits of a review article. If our ability and the available space were greater, it would still be impossible to *demonstrate* conclusions concerning the date and authorship of the Gospels. Much more serious issues lie behind untouched, which do not really belong to literary criticism, but which form the actually determining elements in the case. We are glad that Professor Schmiedel is candid enough to acknowledge this. He says (§ 154):

> The chronological question is in this instance a very subordinate one. Indeed, if our Gospels could be shown to have been written from A.D. 50 onwards, or even earlier, we should not be under any necessity to withdraw our conclusions as to their contents; we should, on the contrary, only have to say that the indubitable transformation in the original tradition had taken place much more rapidly than one might have been ready to suppose. The credibility of the gospel history cannot be established by an earlier dating of the Gospels," etc.

It is the trustworthiness of the narratives, at least in their main outlines, which forms the chief practical issue for most Christians, and it has long been made clear to careful observers that much current "criticism," whilst professedly busy with its own work of determining date and authorship, had virtually prejudged the whole question of credibility, and would not accept the gospel story at any price. It is well that this should be frankly acknowledged. Let us see on what principles and by what methods such a result is reached.

Professor Schmiedel lays it down in one place (§ 137) that it would be wrong "to start from any such postulate or axiom as that 'miracles' are impossible." He contents himself with starting from the axiom that they are incredible. The reasons that he gives for questioning the "historical precision" of the evangelists are almost childish. They are said to contradict one another, because while Mark says all the sick were brought to Jesus and He healed some, Matthew says they brought many and He healed all; or because, on the journey to Jerusalem, Mark says that Jesus taught the multitude, Matthew that He healed them. Differences of detail concerning the curing of the blind and the cursing of the fig-tree are naturally made the most of. The fact that one evangelist has recorded more events of a supernatural kind than another does not warrant our believing the story containing fewer miracles; it only shows that he who records least has probably inserted more supernatural incidents than narrators who preceded him.

But these are not the real reasons for rejecting the historicity of these narratives. Professor Schmiedel shows plainly the principles on which he proceeds. He begins (§ 131) by laying it down that as all the Gospels were written by "worshippers" of the "hero" Jesus, the first importance is to be attached to "features which cannot be deduced merely from the fact of this worship," and in this case first and foremost he recognises as true "the two great facts that Jesus had compassion for the multitude and that He preached with power, not as the scribes." After a close examination of details, in which all incidents implying the miraculous are contemptuously rejected, Professor Schmiedel naïvely says, "The foregoing sections may have sometimes seemed to raise a doubt whether any credible elements were to be found in the Gospels at all," and he therefore desires to lay "emphatic stress" upon certain passages which form "the foundation-pillars for a truly scientific life of Jesus." They are—let all votaries of "science" listen carefully to this—the question, "Why callest thou Me good?" the statement that blasphemy against the Son of man may be

forgiven, the fact that the relations of Jesus thought Him to be beside Himself, the statement that "of that day and hour knoweth no one—neither the Son but the Father," and the cry upon the cross, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" These passages, showing as they do that Jesus was "completely a man," prove His real existence and satisfy us that the Gospels contain a few absolutely trustworthy facts concerning Him. It is not a question of testimony, of priority of evidence, whether a statement "comes from original Mark, from Logia, from oral tradition, or from any other quarter that may be alleged. The relative priority becomes a matter of indifference, because the absolute priority—that is, the origin in real tradition—is certain."

This is frank, and we now know where we are. We venture to think that if we had put such assertions as the above into the mouth of a rationalist critic, pointing out five such "foundation-pillars" for a trustworthy life of Jesus and declaring that early evidence was in the critic's view of no value, his mind being previously made up as to what the order of tradition must be, the statement would have been denounced as an unworthy caricature. The writer, however, who has been chosen by Canon Cheyne to tell Englishmen "the true truth" concerning the Gospels is found declaring that the main fabric of those narratives is utterly untrustworthy, and that to a few statements, embedded in the mass of myths, we owe it that there is any foundation for the existence of Jesus at all. Also, that this conclusion is independent of the evidence—the date, earlier or later, which may be assigned to the documents or their sources—that to bring our narratives within a few years of the death of Jesus would make no difference, except that "the *indubitable* transformation"[1] would then have taken place more rapidly than might have been expected. Consequently, all evidence tending to bring the dates of our Gospels as late as possible, is naturally welcomed and dwelt upon, not to say exaggerated in importance.

[1] *Italics* ours.

It may be urged, however, that this is only the utterance of one extreme, or, as he has been called, "fanatically rationalist" writer. Even so, it is strange that to him should have been entrusted the sacred charge of dealing with the credibility of the Gospels. But Professor Schmiedel does not stand alone. Dr. Abbott's views about miracles are well known, though the part of the subject entrusted to him does not bring them into prominence. Dr. A. B. Bruce writes the article on "Jesus"—the name is significant. We naturally wonder what he will say concerning the birth of our Lord. His words are very few, and we find amongst them a cross-reference to the article "Joseph, husband of Mary," written by Canon Cheyne. He tells us that

> the evidence that primitive Christian tradition knew anything about the father of Jesus is very slight, and considering the high probability that the narratives respecting the birth of Jesus in Matthew i., Luke i., ii., iii., are partly Haggadic or edifying tales like those in the *Protevangelium Jacobi* . . . . it becomes the historical student to confess that the name of the father of Jesus is, to say the least, extremely uncertain.

The description "Haggadic or edifying tales" is of course a euphemism for fables, and it is easy to see from the whole article that "the historical student" is to be quite sure that Jesus was born in the ordinary course of an earthly father, though it is very doubtful whether his name was Joseph.

Of course we do not hold Dr. Bruce responsible for the words of Canon Cheyne. But there is nothing in his article in any way to contradict them. He tells us that the books which bear the name of Gospels are "of varying value from a historical point of view." He judges Mark to come nearest to the primitive tradition, Matthew comes next by one or two removes, Luke is less trustworthy, John is ignored. On the story of the Passion of Jesus he says that "even in its most historic version, it is not pure truth, but truth mixed with doubtful legend." As to the Resurrection, Dr. Bruce has hardly a word to say except that "Christianity could not have entered on its victorious career unless the followers of

the Crucified had believed that He not only died but also rose again." How little they were justified in this belief, readers may gather from the very unsatisfactory paragraph in which Dr. Bruce deals with Christ's words about the future (§ 32) and his silence concerning the evidence for the resurrection. On the contrary, in another paragraph (§ 19), he does not conceal his distaste for the whole subject of miracles, and with regard to Christ's works of healing says "the *miraculousness* of the healing ministry is not the point in question." Supposing certain "reports" of healing acts are fairly established, it still remains to inquire whether they imply any corresponding facts, whether, *e.g.*, "the leper was cured or only pronounced clean," whether the bread that fed the thousands was miraculously produced, or "drawn forth by the bearing of Jesus from the stores in possession of the crowd." After some discussion of this kind Dr. Bruce goes on to say that "there is one thing"—and apparently only one thing—"about which we may have comfortable certainty. Whether miraculous or not, whether the works of a mere man, or of one who is a man and more, these healing acts are a revelation of the love of Jesus, a manifestation of His 'enthusiasm of humanity.' . . . He was minded to do all the good in the world he could." And the main lesson to be learned is that in Jesus we have one who is "in a large, grand, human way the friend of men, bearing by sympathy their sicknesses as well as their sorrows and sins as a burden in His heart."

We are probably not justified in viewing this article as adequately representing the whole of the late Professor Bruce's personal belief. We have no desire to do so; nor is it any part of our business to judge a man so able, so learned, and so devout. What we are concerned with is the fact that we have in this Encyclopædia an article from his pen in which there is nothing inconsistent with the view of a purely human Jesus, born of a human father, who did not rise from the dead, who may or may not have worked some rather remarkable cures, who was (§ 33) in many respects "the child of His time and people," but whose

"spiritual intuitions are pure truth, valid for all ages." The teaching of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels—the Fourth Gospel being studiously ignored—when carefully purged of supernatural elements and sifted by "modern criticism" remains as *the* contribution of Jesus to religious truth, teaching of great value, in which "God, man, and the moral ideal" are most "truly and happily conceived." Far be it from us to undervalue the value of this teaching taken by itself. As Dr. Bruce says, we are only now beginning to perceive the full significance of much of the teaching of Jesus, and it will doubtless be long before "full effect shall be given to His radical doctrine of the dignity of man." What we are anxious, however, at the moment to point out is that this article harmonises with the others we have quoted in its general conceptions of the untrustworthiness of the canonical Gospels and the slender residuum of fact concerning the man Jesus which is left to us, when "modern criticism" has done its work. That the author of *The Training of the Twelve* should be the author of an article so significant as this in its utterances and still more ominous in its silence, is to our thinking greatly to be regretted, even though the later work of the lamented writer had somewhat prepared our minds for a change in his doctrinal position.

This attitude on the part of the rationalistic school of critics towards the Christ of the Gospels is of course nothing new. But now that it is being forced upon the attention of Englishmen as the only one that is "truly scientific," it is time that such a tremendous assumption should be fully faced and thoroughly examined. Of course "science," properly speaking, has little to do with the matter. The science of biblical criticism is concerned with the dates, authorship, and mutual relations of literary documents. It is not that conclusive evidence on these points leads to unbelief in miracles, but rather that incredulity concerning the miraculous leads to a post-dating of documents. It is not a question of learning. Scholars in many respects far more able than the acute critics whom we have been quoting, have come to very different con-

clusions, with all the evidence before them which Abbott, Bruce, and Schmiedel adduce. One has only to turn to the masterly article on "Jesus Christ" by Professor Sanday in Hastings' Bible Dictionary, or his article "Gospels" in the later edition of Smith's Dictionary, to see what a different complexion may be put upon the same facts by one who is no dogmatist or votary of tradition, but an eminently broad, fair, and open-minded theologian. Zahn in Germany, and Lightfoot, Westcott, and Hort in England—whom sundry restless critics are already declaring out of date—are names of men at least as eminent and quite as candid as any rationalists in either country. We do not plead for any diminution in the freedom of criticism proper. The truth concerning the Bible viewed as literature can only be reached by free discussion, and we are eager for truth at all costs. Coleridge's dictum is constantly applicable: "He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth, will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all."

That of which we complain is not science, it is dogma. With certain documents, the dates of which may be approximately ascertained, before us, the problem is to get at the facts behind them. But the school of writers in question have not sufficiently open minds to entertain one conceivable hypothesis—that of supernatural intervention. They do not say—Huxley would not allow it to be said—that miracles are impossible. But all their reasoning implies that miracles are incredible, or at least that the general "distaste" for the miraculous should lead to its being disregarded. The "worshippers of a hero" are sure to exaggerate, the followers of an oriental hero two thousand years ago were sure to attribute miracle to him; and this in the view of these critics of to-day is conclusive that the mythopœic faculty must have been at work, however short the time for it to operate—aye, even if contemporaries can be proved to testify to the supernatural they are of course not to be believed. The age was credulous, research (it is said)

is revealing the gradual growth and accretion of tradition, it is questionable whether we can penetrate to the earliest stage in the case of Jesus, hence criticism will disregard all "Haggadic or edifying tales" and leave a few "foundation-pillars" only for the "truly scientific" student. But anyone who closely examines such reasoning as this will see that biblical criticism proper plays a very small part in it, and that "science" is not responsible for the conclusions reached, unless it is a postulate of science that miracles are incredible. It comes to this, that no evidence which could by any reasonable possibility be supposed to have come from the period in which Jesus lived could to-day establish miracle. We are not saying that the evidence we have is the strongest possible; we are not denying the presence of difficulties in the narratives when closely examined; we are not asserting that the evangelists are "historians" in the modern sense of the word, or that we can obtain from them testimony such as modern historians require. We are convinced that the evidence, when fairly viewed, is strong and sufficient; and we hold that its main strength cannot be seen when the narratives of the evangelists are taken to pieces, separated from their context, and considered quite apart from the whole series of events to which they belong. But our chief complaint against these writers is not that they do not give the evangelists a fair chance, though that is true. The real difficulty is that their attitude towards miracle is such that they will believe almost anything rather than accept the hypothesis that the Son of man was also Son of God and that He was "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead."

It will be well, therefore, to attempt a brief summary of the kind of reply to which the writers in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* lay themselves open. Their case is, that the narratives of the Gospels are comparatively late, and in any case untrustworthy; that if we could reach the "original" tradition, we should find it free from the accretion of legend which has gathered round it, that the records as they stand are so loose in construction and inconsistent in testimony that

they cannot be relied upon as history, and only a few fragments of fact and teaching remain as credible records of the existence of a certain Jesus of Nazareth, who has been reverenced for so many centuries by so many millions as the Founder of the Christian religion.

The answer is that

I. The narratives in the four Gospels may be proved to be at least somewhat earlier than the critics allege; that they point to still earlier (oral or written) traditions behind them, which must have contained in *substance* the main contents of our canonical Gospels. The letters of Paul—the dates of the chief of which have been conclusively ascertained—abundantly confirm this view of the history; *viz.* the acceptance by the Christian Churches within about twenty years of Christ's death of the main features of gospel history, including the resurrection of Christ from the dead. This part of the argument we do not attempt to work out in detail. It involves minute examination of authorities, and, when all historical research is over, room will still be left for differences in critical opinion, nor can anything like demonstration, to compel belief, be attained.[1] It may be said, however, that Harnack's now famous declaration in his *Chronologie der Altchr. Lit.*, concerning the confirmation in the main of the chronological framework in which tradition had placed the books of the New Testament, is very significant as coming from him, and fairly represents the trend of opinion. But without pressing chronological details,

II. It must further be argued—Which is the more probable

---

[1] An exceedingly able book, though decidedly advanced in its criticism, which has come into our hands since this sentence was written, is Moffatt's *Historical New Testament*. It is written by an ardent disciple of Dr. Bruce, who rejoices that his teacher "cut the cable and gave us a chance at the dangers and the glories of blue water." But when the cable is cut, we ask what kind of compass is on board the vessel and what kind of a hand is at the helm. There is no question of Mr. Moffatt's learning; but, as the volume entitled *Supernatural Religion* proved a generation ago, something more than rationalistic learning is needed for the solution of these supreme questions of religion.

hypothesis to account for the facts thus ascertained? Granted the existence of our four Gospels at a period which might be agreed on for the sake of argument—Professor Schmiedel admits that if they could be placed as early as A.D. 50, his argument is not invalidated, and we should not press for earlier dates than from A.D. 65 to 70 for Matthew and Mark, 75 to 80 for Luke, and 90 to 95 for John—granted also the existence of certain Pauline documents dated from A.D. 50–60, and the state of belief in the Churches of that period which Paul's epistles imply—what then? How does the hypothesis advocated in these articles work out? Those who refuse to admit the existence of supernatural elements in the person, life, and work of Jesus Christ have to face the following alternative incredibilities, as they appear to us.

1. It is quite incredible that such a rapid growth could take place in the belief of miracle as attaching to the ministry of a man who in fact worked no miracle, but died a shameful death as a discredited prophet. For it must be remembered that the "triple tradition," which lies some way behind the canonical Synoptics, is as full of miracle as any part of the gospel tradition, and that a large part of the teaching of Jesus is inseparably bound up with miracles and signs, being unintelligible without them. Yet all this "accretion" must have taken place in a few years, in spite of the hatred and opposition of Jewish leaders, who could easily have exposed the delusions or misrepresentations of too ardent disciples.[1]

2. It is quite incredible that narratives so artless and so full of personal and graphic touches—touches that are meaningless and useless except as transcripts of actual fact—are due either to deliberate invention or unconscious

[1] We are quite aware that Dr. Abbott has contended in his *Kernel and the Husk* and his *St. Thomas of Canterbury* that such a rapid growth of myth is a common phenomenon. The question cannot be argued out in a paragraph, but the conditions of every case need to be separately studied, and if Jesus worked no miracles the conditions in this case were wholly unfavourable to such growth.

"myth-making." This argument applies only to certain narratives, and is cumulative in character. But we might instance as examples the story of Peter and John at the tomb in John xx., the stories of Mary and Thomas in the same chapter, and those in the epilogue to the Gospel, chap. xxi. In the Synoptists also, narratives containing these personal and artlessly artistic touches are marked by a belief in the supernatural inextricably bound up with the fabric of the story. To reject the supernatural element without rejecting the whole story is impossible.

3. It is quite incredible that a belief in the resurrection of Christ should have arisen in the way described by naturalistic writers. This has been a standing difficulty of rationalistic critics, and Professor Schmiedel's attempt to remove it is no more successful than those of his predecessors. We do not deny the fragmentary and unsystematic character of the accounts that have come down to us, or the difficulty of interweaving them into an orderly whole. But this is as nothing compared with the difficulties encountered by those who deny the Resurrection altogether. According to Professor Schmiedel, Jesus had never given any intimation on this subject, He had by hypothesis worked no miracle, and none of His disciples could have had the slightest expectation of a resurrection from the dead. Yet within a very few days of Christ's death some of His disciples in Galilee imagined that they saw Him; the belief spread so rapidly and generally that the tomb was never examined to see whether the body still remained in it, until long after, when such examination was of no use. Enemies as well as friends, it would appear, were content that this simple test should not be applied, or else it was never thought of. The "visions" in question included the utterance of many profound and pregnant words on the part of the supposed Jesus; none of these were in reality ever spoken, but were a later invention of the handful of ignorant, discouraged and scattered disciples, who conceived the idea that their Master had appeared and addressed them thus, and who then excogitated for themselves the idea of a Church, which

was built upon the very foundation-stone of an entirely imaginary resurrection from the dead.

4. It is quite incredible that the *whole* picture of Jesus Christ as contained in the four Gospels should have "grown up" in the fashion implied by these writers. The critics are so occupied in investigating details that they seem to have no time to see the facts steadily and see them *whole*. In the gospel painting there is surely something to be observed besides canvas of a given texture, determinable by the archæologist to belong to a certain date, and certain splashes of pigment, more or less grimy, which have "accreted" in spots and the exact date and colour of which may be determined by the use of a strong magnifying-glass. The masterpiece must be viewed as a whole, and then its main feature is seen to be a Figure, a Face, a Presence. Despite the variety of details and the apparent or real inconsistencies in some of the narratives, a Whole appears, for which no rationalistic critic has yet accounted by his analysis of sources and "sources of sources." It is the old fallacy of materialistic evolution over again. Out of mindless matter, by means of an infinite number of infinitesimal variations more or less casually produced, may be evolved Mind, Order, and much besides. From the life of an ordinary Jewish carpenter, who had compassion on the multitudes and spake not as the scribes, may be evolved, within twenty years, by the exercise of the mythopœic faculty on the part of ignorant, unspiritual, but imaginative persons, not working in concert but each contributing to the steadily growing mass of tradition, a Figure, divine yet human, which has arrested the gaze of generations and revolutionised the history of the world. And men who believe this cannot believe in miracles!

5. It is quite incredible that the beliefs recorded in the New Testament, which on any hypothesis were beliefs on the part of fully established Christian communities long before A.D. 63, or the death of St. Paul, were based upon a fundamental delusion. Imagination can do something, hope can do more, faith can do most of all, towards the building up of religious ideals. But if this particular belief

in a Person and a lofty religious ideal inseparably connected with Him, could be proved to have for its very corner-stone, either a conscious invention, or an ignorant delusion, or a number of physical hallucinations, or a combination of all these, it would stand alone in history. If Christianity were such a moral monstrosity as this, then the world may rest on an elephant, the elephant on a tortoise, and the tortoise on nothing.

It may be said that biblical criticism has nothing to do with these religious and "dogmatic" considerations, that the analyst of the Gospels is not bound to take into account the beliefs of the Christian Church and explain their genesis, even as evidenced in the epistles of St. Paul. But students of literature should always be students of history, and no literary critic can do his work properly unless he is an historical critic also. It is in their judgment of history and religion that these critics so signally fail. If criticism concerns itself with the historical interpretation of a great religious movement at all, it must do so "all in all." Testimony acknowledged to be of a certain date must be admitted according to its merits, without being barred by the tacit axiom that "miracles do not happen." The very question at issue in this case is whether they did or did not happen, and a critic who is persuaded that they did not must be prepared with a hypothesis to cover *all* the facts. When he asserts the historic incredibility of miracles, it is unscientific for him to ignore certain other historic incredibilities, at the existence of which we have hinted, though we have not presented them with anything like their proper force and cogency.

III. But it may be replied that the best part of Christianity may be retained without a belief in "miracle." This brings us to another line of reply, which affects chiefly the position taken up by Dr. Bruce. Of the genuineness of the Christian feeling and spirit of the late professor, and to a large extent of his Christian faith, there can be no question. But, especially in his later years, he was wont to make such concessions to the assailants of Christianity, that he sometimes

surrendered the very key of the position. This was noticeably the case with regard to miracle, and in the article before us there are remarks concerning Christ's work—*e.g.* that "Jesus was not a thaumaturge, bent on creating astonishment"—which surely evince a strange misconception of the position.

Christianity is bound up with miracle. The supernatural is not for it a superfluous garment, which may be stripped off without loss, or perhaps with advantage. It belongs to the very essence of the Christian faith. Not thaumaturgy; not the working of wonders to make men gape and stare; but the delivery of a message from God, with credentials which give it a character and authority of its own. Christianity not contradicts, but transcends nature; it is based on a "super-natural" which forms, together with the "natural," one vast kingdom of natural-supernatural, in which the foremost figure is the divine-human Person of Jesus Christ our Lord. We do not deny that a very real and valuable religious belief may exist without this, though it hardly deserves what it often claims, the name Christian. The views which Professor Bruce's article would lead us to be content with, are what Lessing called by a misleading phrase "the religion of Jesus," as opposed to the Christian religion. There is a world of difference between a Theism such as Dr. Martineau's, with Jesus—a dim, fragmentary, and shadowy figure—as its ethical prophet, and that belief in "our Lord Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours," which characterised Paul the apostle, the writers and the Churches of the New Testament, as it characterises the orthodox Christianity of to-day.

And this Christ is essentially one with the Christ of the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel. It sounds plausible in many ears to say that we should travel back from canonical Gospels which represent a third stage of tradition to an original Mark and book of Logia which form its second stage, and thence to "sources of sources" which form its first stage and presumably provide us with a non-miraculous Jesus. But, apart from the hypothetical character of these

earlier stages and the mass of early evidence in Paul and other writers which would be conclusive did no anti-supernatural prejudice exist, it must be added that this hypothetical non-miraculous religion is not the Christianity of history. *It is not that which has done the work.* For a religious work has been done by Christianity, to which history affords no parallel; and pure Theism, with Jesus as its foremost teacher, is not the religion which has accomplished it. When such Theism has been revived, as it has again and again in the course of centuries, it has proved sterile and ineffective—a barren stock, with miscarrying womb and dry breasts, incapable of nourishing and bringing up spiritual children, like the gospel of the New Testament. This unquestionable fact does not of itself prove the truth of Christianity, but it adds immense corroborative force to other arguments, and goes to show that the hypothesis which would set aside the greater part of the doctrine of the New Testament as *Aberglaube* is utterly inadequate to explain the facts and the meaning of history.

IV. But is it not possible to roll back upon the critics of the Encyclopædia the reproach which implicitly, if not explicitly, they seek to fasten upon "conservative theologians"? What is the "science" in the name and for the sake of which so much of the faith which has regenerated humanity is to be given up? Is it not these critics, after all, who are belated? Are they not trying to work with tools which, in the hands of Paulus, Strauss, Baur, and a long succession of rationalists for more than a hundred years have been proved to be feeble and futile? The theories of the rationalists have greatly varied during the latter part of the eighteenth and a large part of the nineteenth century; but their fundamental position was the same, and its weakness has been found out. The days of the "science" which ignored the spiritual and tried to banish philosophy are passing away. The reign of mechanism is nearly over. The tyranny which sought to rule the whole realm of truth by the methods of physical science, and to explain away the higher faculties of man in terms of

a lower order of "nature," the limits of which must on no account be transcended, was at its zenith in the 'seventies, and has been very mighty for more than a generation; but its power is broken—we trust never to be restored.

Physical science has taught and will continue to teach mankind lessons, which theologians need constantly to bear in mind. The science of biblical criticism has taught and will continue to teach truths which certain dogmatists have been loth to admit, but which Protestants at least should never be afraid to face. But these and other sciences, some of them still very young, must learn their limits. We cannot ascertain the whole truth about man, if we begin with tacit axioms, supposed to be inculcated by science, which would interpret the higher faculties of man in terms of the lower, and shut him out from that "supernatural" world to which on one side he as surely belongs as on another side he belongs to the world of "nature." Signs are not wanting that the twentieth century will appreciate this better than the nineteenth has done, and what we must take leave to call the narrow and shallow rationalism of the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is not a real advance, but an attempt to put back the hands of the clock, which will not, we trust, even for a time succeed.

We are not blind, however, to the dangers which are likely to arise from the publication of these articles. It is because we are sensible of them that we have felt it important to point out the character and tendencies of the articles and to indicate their deficiencies, at the risk of wearying our readers with arguments which are not new. The conclusions put forward with so much confidence are sure to be quoted in certain quarters as containing the results arrived at by the "best" and most "fearless" critics, men who are not "bound" by mere traditions and an irrational conservatism. This tone, with its assumption of superior knowledge, is not lacking in the articles themselves, and it will doubtless reappear in the literature which is likely to follow in their wake. We are not afraid for those who have the time and ability, and will take the trouble, to

study the whole subject. It is neither possible, nor desirable, to fetter discussion. But a publication like the *Encyclopædia Biblica* speaks with a measure of authority, and we regret that a work of such scholarship and ability should have put forward, on the great subject of the origins of Christianity, one narrow rationalistic theory as the only one worthy the consideration of "truly scientific" students. At Oxford, and amongst the alumni of some theological colleges, the views here put forward may easily tend to become fashionable among men who desire to be known as "free" and "advanced" thinkers. They will henceforward be able to quote more than isolated teachers as warranting this attitude towards Christianity. We especially regret that the names of Canon Cheyne and Dr. Bruce—both deservedly honoured in the Anglican, Presbyterian, and other Churches of Britain—should be found as standing in some sense sponsors for this attempt to overthrow confidence in the gospel narratives, to strip Christianity of its supernatural elements and credentials, and to substitute a human Jesus, of whose ministry little or nothing can be accurately ascertained, for the Lord Jesus Christ of the New Testament, Son of man and Son of God, and Saviour of the world.

W. T. DAVISON.

SOME MORAL HERESIES OF THE PRESENT DAY.

1. *Die Grundbegriffe des Rechts und der Moral* von J. H. von KIRCHMANN. Zweite Auflage. (Heidelberg: Georg Weiss.)
2. *Die Ethik des Protagoras und deren zweifache Moralbegründung kritisch untersucht* von ADOLPH HARPF. (Heidelberg: Georg Weiss.)

> Und die Tugend, sie ist kein leerer Schall,
> Der Mensch kann sie üben im Leben:
> Und sollt'er auch straucheln überall,
> Er kann nach der göttlichen streben;
> Und was kein Verstand der Verständigen sieht,
> Das übet in Einfalt ein kindlich Gemüth.
>
> —SCHILLER.

TO all who take an interest in the well-being of humanity and who realise that only through the development of the moral faculties does man attain the highest conceivable form of excellence, it must be matter of profound regret to witness the widely speading tendency represented by the writings of men like Nietzsche, J. H. von Kirchmann, and their numerous and remarkably enthusiastic followers in this country. That self-interest is, and should be, the only principle of human action; that the sense of duty as being something uniquely sacred is after all only a figment of the consciousness superinduced by causes and conditions the discovery of which destroys entirely our belief in its genuineness; that there is no such thing as moral law; that virtue is a phantom, and that the only difference between the characters of men is one of natural and inevitable qualities in all respects analogous to the

physical peculiarities which differentiate man from man,—these and similar opinions, with the practical consequences resulting therefrom, have got a firm position in many scientific and philosophical circles, and penetrate largely the popular literature and particularly the fiction of our day. Such being the case a brief examination of some of the arguments set forth by supporters of these doctrines does not seem inopportune, and should it only serve to expose their weakness it will have done something at any rate to check the incoming tide. Broadly speaking such doctrines, in virtue of their main contention regarding the figmentary nature of morality, may be termed illusionistic, and it is here proposed to examine some of the arguments by which the illusionists seek to prove their contention.

1. We are told that, because the conduct of mankind shows them not to be in possession of a uniform state of moral knowledge, all such knowledge is figmentary. Thus many nations have refused to acknowledge the moral rights of strangers. Persons very high-principled and humane as regards dealings with their fellow-men think nothing of sacrificing the animal creation cruelly and ruthlessly to their own needs and even pleasures. Many estimable men have been lamentably deficient in respect of individual virtues, and even appeared not to perceive the binding character of the latter. From these and similar facts it is concluded that the sense of duty and the perception of what are duties is an affair of individual and social idiosyncrasy, and has no real ground in reason. But coming as this argument does from the camp of our friends the out-and-out evolutionists, it must be confessed that, whatever its defects may be, excessive modesty cannot be reckoned among the number. For, as the supporters of the evolutionary theory must admit, not one species only but all kinds of knowledge are attained by a slow process of acquisition liable to be thwarted by a thousand accidents, and when brought out fully such knowledge is rarely found to be altogether and without modification the possession of each individual person. The same thing is manifest with

regard to the development of the faculties, as we see in the individual aptitudes for different kinds of work, these being the outcome partly of inborn tendencies and partly of practice and discipline in particular crafts. Again, owing to a difference in the natural conditions of those speaking them, there is a great difference in the capacity and perfection of languages, just as for similar reasons there is in the nature of the intonation or in the extent and quality of the diction used by different individuals employing the same language. Yet all this does not prevent us from believing that man has a genuine faculty of expressing his thought by speech, that this faculty has persistently aimed at its own realisation, that it has worked from within upon conditions and been worked on from without by conditions, and that the phenomena of language as now existing are the outcome of this process.

2. The second argument on behalf of this theory closely resembles the first. It is urged that beside the striking anomalies of moral conduct occasioned by ignorance or thoughtlessness, or a slavish adherence to custom, there are anomalies no less remarkable arising from a difference in speculative views; and that if the first prove the want of a uniform moral knowledge, the second prove the impossibility of attaining it. The fact here stated is correct, though the inference is wrong. As Kirchmann tells us such divergencies of opinion relate not merely to accidental and negligible matters, but to the most vital questions of ethics, such as those dealing with marriage, family life, the state, and the individual virtues, hence we find moralists who, like Hilarius, Jeremy Taylor, Dr. Johnson, and Paley, teach that under certain circumstances a lie is justifiable, and others who would permit it under none, refusing like Atticus and Epaminondas to lie even in jest; and in Milton and Berkeley we see only the most distinguished leaders of the respective parties of great and good men who even up to this very hour differ regarding the momentous question whether kings should be resisted and brought to account when they do wrong.

But these differences instead of proving the theory on behalf of which they are triumphantly adduced actually make against it when duly examined. For if conscience were really the outcome of a given subjective bias or a certain inward formation leading to a given result,—as the eye, in virtue of its structural peculiarities, views objects as coloured and in perspective,—we should expect to find an all but uniform similarity of moral opinions, the exceptions thereunto being as distinctly anomalous and as readily traceable to their respective causes as those connected with optical defects.

But the very argument here before us admits that such is not the case, and hence acknowledges that conscience is not an illusion inherent in the laws of the mind and regulative of its inner experience. In fact, curiously enough the illusionist can be combatted by the same weapons that he is wont to employ against the intuitionist. For if conscience be an infallible guide to moral conduct, how come different consciences to point out different courses regarding the same thing? And if conscience be a subjective phantom arising from the human mind having been cast in a given mould, how comes it that the same structural peculiarity works so differently in different people?

3. In support of the illusionist theory it is further alleged that the absence of a moral sense in the case of animals, or the conclusion that if they have a moral sense it sanctions their pursuing conduct of which ours disapproves, is evidence against the genuineness of man's own moral obligation, because it puts the dictates he believes to be imposed thereby exactly on a par with the absolutely contrary conduct to which other creatures feel themselves equally inclined. This argument, however, is more likely to affect our gravity than to influence our reason. That birds are adapted to fly in the air, and fishes to swim in the water, that some creatures can live in the dark, that others can lose important members with apparently but little inconvenience,—all these are no proofs either that such qualities and conditions must be suited to the nature of man, or that,

failing this, the dissimilar qualities and conditions peculiar to him are not real but only a figment of his imagination. To make such an argument worthy even of the slightest attention it should be shown that the animals in question possess means of moral information analogous to those of man, and that in their case as well as his the general conditions requisite for the existence and activity of a moral being can be traced. Otherwise, however, to pretend that because some creatures slay or even devour their young, therefore the repugnance felt by conscience against infanticide and cannibalism has no objective ground in reason, is just as ridiculous as to say that because a whale can cross the Atlantic without being drowned, therefore a man only imagines that he requires a vessel to carry him over. In fact, the whole of this argument is based on a false antithesis between reality and relativity, it being supposed that the latter is the negation of the former; whereas the experience and activity of a being, though conditioned in such a way as to be peculiar to itself alone, are just as real as if they were cast in a mould shaping the experience and activity of all possible beings. Thus we are thoroughly convinced that the exercise of our physical powers as interfered with and governed by the law of gravitation affords us actual experience, and to avoid misfortunes we wisely remember this and act accordingly, though knowing very well that there may be other beings so constituted as to be altogether exempt from such a modification of activity, and that therefore the principle in question cannot be regarded as universally necessary and essential.

4. Kirchmann assures us that moral law does not exist because there is a host of actions which the instinct of nature and not the call of morality prompts us to perform, and which if we attempted to do them from a sense of duty would be seriously interfered with. He instances the performance of the rights connubial. The fact is patent to everybody, for a large number of our actions are not motived by the sense of duty.

But what does this prove?

Because a law does not operate except within a given sphere it by no means follows that within this sphere it is inoperative or that the sphere and the law are both figmentary. A law in so far as it affects the action of free rational beings may do so in two different ways, and this either separately or simultaneously. It may either prompt such beings to certain actions, or, whilst leaving certain actions optional to them, it may define the limits and restrictions to which these actions if performed shall be subjected, or again it may both prompt the actions and indicate their limitations. Thus to get a revolver is not under ordinary circumstances a duty, but it is a duty not to leave it about loaded, or to let it off carelessly so as to imperil the lives or limbs of others or to jeopardise oneself. Again, circumstances may make it obligatory to obtain a revolver; but nevertheless the former restrictions regarding its use still hold good.

5. On behalf of this theory may be adduced an argument urged by Kirchmann, namely, that since, owing to the many and complex factors that enter into human conduct, it is impossible to decide beforehand the exact moral worth or unworth of any given action, there is and can be no such thing as a prescriptive standard of morals, and that hence morality, using the word in an absolute sense, does not exist at all. From this position, being a sound reasoner, he rightly concludes that as there is no absolute morality to form the standard of comparison, one set of morals is morally speaking just as valid as another, for, says he,

> it is clear that the morality of no age and of no nation can have an advantage over that of others, and that there can be no mention made of a difference between true and false or higher and lower. The morality of the Maories and ancient Mexicans is rather just as moral as that of the Greeks and Romans; the morality of mediæval Christendom just as moral as that of the present time.[1]

---

[1] *Die Grundbegriffe des Rechts und der Moral*, 2 Edit., p. 194.

But specious as this reasoning is, there lurks in the premisses a great flaw. True, we are not in possession of a code of morals containing specific directions for every conceivable case; and besides, even if we had such a code, the knowledge to be derived therefrom could only be approximately applied since there are many circumstances, relating to any given act and agent, which remain concealed not merely from the spectator but also from the doer himself. But granting all this, it does not follow there is no such thing as an absolute moral ideal; nor does it follow that in any given case varying and contrary courses of action are alike morally indifferent.

For it can never with any show of reason be argued that the want of the entire presence of a thing proves its total absence. Hence although man's duty is not fully revealed to him it by no means follows that this duty is non-existent. Again, from the fact that we do not possess a thing in its fulness and highest form, it is ridiculous to conclude that we do not possess it at all, or that if we do the forms under which we possess it are alike indifferent. If a man have a coach and four, he may still possess a coster's barrow, and between these vehicular poles there are many other kinds of conveyances varying in their degrees of excellence. The fact that we have a thing at all proves that it exists *in genere*; as the coster's barrow is evidence of the existence of a vehicle. But when once a genus is admitted we can never deny the possibility of there being some highest type of that genus; and as regards the several species thereof which we observe our senses inform us of their relative perfection or imperfection. Let us apply this to morals. We know that moderation is a virtue; we know also that what is moderation in one man would be excess in another owing to the difference in constitution and natural needs; we know, again, that it is very difficult for any man to hit exactly the point of moderation, and that everyone fails over the matter more or less. Yet in spite of this we know the difference between moderation and abandon perfectly well both as regards ourselves and as regards the people we come

across in life; and though we may, especially when judging others, make mistakes, nevertheless in a broad general way our knowledge of when we have given place to the passions, indulged in wrath, drunkenness, gluttony, or any inordinate appetite, is substantially correct, and our observation of others who have done the same thing is in the most of cases correct likewise. Now, it seems that from this experience which everyone's heart must verify, the rational inference is, not that we possess no means of moral information because we have not perfect means, but that since we have some moral sense, therefore moral perception in general must be possible.

The fact is that although the general directions as to conduct at man's disposal do not suffice to enable him to hit the mark of moral perfection in each and all of his actions, yet they abundantly suffice for what is really far more important, namely, to assist him in acquiring or developing the moral virtues; for if he honestly tries to live up to these general principles, he gets the habit of doing the things which the principles inculcate, and thus wins an inward goodness which, in spite of all the errors and defects incident to its outward expression, infinitely transcends as an object of moral worth the mechanical execution even of the most exact of prescriptive codes.

6. Another argument urged by Kirchmann in support of empirical subjectivism is that morality is liable to change under changing conditions, and cannot therefore be regarded as being or as having any connexion with an abiding reality.

"Even the smallest advance in the knowledge of nature," says he, "the slightest improvement in a machine, works not merely upon the increase of possessions, but also upon the changing of morality."

Again:

If—as owing to the progress of organic chemistry is not improbable—science should succeed in obtaining from the elements abundantly extant in the earth and air a foodstuff

similar to bread, it is evident that agriculture and the position of the agriculturalist must suffer a complete change.

This argument, however, rests upon an entire confusion of morality with virtue. Morality is the given mode in which virtue expresses itself, and the nature thereof is necessarily conditioned by circumstances. Thus charity or benevolence is everywhere one and the same principle; but at the North Pole it will prompt the giving of warm wraps, and at the tropics ices. Under no circumstances can a malicious, wrathful, lying, sensual, cruel, or selfish disposition be regarded as anything but evil. But there are circumstances which permit or enjoin acts of vengeance and deception, and which modify the extent due to the gratifications of the senses and the protection of self-interest. Thus the British Government in India, the general humanity of which is indisputable, did not hesitate after the horrors of the Mutiny to tie offending Sepoys in bundles at the cannon's mouth and blast them to atoms; yet we justly distinguish between this conduct and that of the Sultan of Benin, who strung up rows of his hapless subjects to screen his favourite melon patch from the rays of the tropical sun. The truth is, that so far from the changes in morality being an evidence against the existence of anything real and abiding in virtue, they afford the strongest testimony in support thereof. For it is the presence and prompting influence of the social virtues, justice, benevolence, and so forth, that leads men to change or modify their conduct when circumstances show that the well-being of their fellows demands such a change or modification, just as one and the same desire of curing the patient leads the physician to change or modify his course of treatment.

7. Finally, it is often argued that because the morality of savage or primitive man differs widely and for the worse from that of civilised and modern nations, therefore the human race has had to acquire or develop the moral faculty under circumstances which would seem to make it appear that morality is of an arbitrary and non-essential character,

since otherwise we should have expected to find man fully equipped from the very beginning with a moral organ capable of unerringly directing his conduct even in casuistical affairs of the utmost nicety. To this argument it may be replied that as there must be a correspondence or analogy between man's physical, intellectual, and moral faculties, it is only natural to find the latter like the former susceptible to the modifying influence of circumstance and dependent upon suitable conditions for the perfection of its development.

Again, for man to have been placed with a fully matured conscience amid the strife of life prevailing in primeval or rudimentary states of existence, would most certainly have led to his destruction, since he would have felt himself obliged to pursue a course of conduct unsuited to his present circumstances and therefore destructive to him. Now, although the moral law is, and from its nature appears intended to be, often inimical to the individual's well-being by clashing in some respect or other with his particular interests; yet generically speaking and in its bearing upon the race as a whole, the moral economy cannot be regarded as having been framed in such a manner as to tend naturally to the destruction of mankind; for if it had, it would ultimately defeat its object, since were the beings under it destroyed the economy itself must cease to exist, which would mean utter failure if the production of character and the organisation of an invisible moral universe be the end of the economy in question. Hence in the discrepancy between savage and civilised morality and in the gradual development of the moral faculty, we see, not a proof of the arbitrariness of morality or the factitiousness of conscience, but an evidence of the adaptability of the means used to the end in view.

Again, because the morality and moral faculty of savage and civilised men differ widely, it does not follow that the morality and moral faculty of the one are not relatively speaking as real as those of the other. All that we can say is that the morality of the civilised man is of a higher and

fuller and more complex kind, and approaches nearer to the ideal of moral perfection, than does that of the savage; and that the moral faculty of the civilised man is more delicately perceptive than that of his savage brother. As to how far the morality of the savage agrees with the nature of the circumstances under which he exists, as to whether his conduct is relatively speaking the best he could pursue in his present situation, and above all as to the extent of his obedience to the moral faculty he actually possesses,—these are questions that can never be decided on the principle of putting every man's foot into one shoe, but must be left for final decision to a tribunal juster and more heart-searching than earthly wisdom can supply.

To the Christian at any rate it must ever remain a bright and cherished hope, that in virtue of the incarnation and atonement of our blessed Lord, countless multitudes, who living and descending to the grave amid the gloomy shades of heathendom have yet been faithful to the measure of their light, may by the mercy of Him that hasteneth not, but for whom the ages wait, be purified and perfected through means that we know not of and in depths beyond our ken, till, gathered into the one fold under the one Shepherd, they become partakers in the fellowship of saints and finally be numbered with those blessed ones who having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb stand before His throne and praise Him day and night in His temple.

CHRISTOPHER C. DOVE.

THE PRESENT ASPECT OF THE EVOLUTION THEORY.

1. *The Foundations of Zoology.* By W. K. BROOKS. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1899.)
2. *Footnotes to Evolution.* By D. S. JORDAN. (New York. 1898.)
3. *Die Entwicklung der Biologie im 19 Jahrhundert.* By O. HERTWIG. (Gustav Fischer. 1900.)
4. *The Grammar of Science.* [Chaps. x., xi.] By K. PEARSON. Second Edition. (London: A. & C. Black. 1900.)

EVOLUTION is the most characteristic intellectual catchword of the Victorian era, and at the beginning of another period it is not unfitting that we should consider how it fares with the theory which is generally regarded as one of the best scientific fruits of the nineteenth century. It is one of the uses of historical punctuation that it affords opportunity for attempting balance-sheets of fact and of opinion.

The general idea of evolution, like many other great ideas, is essentially simple—that the present is the child of the past and the parent of the future. It is the same as the scientific conception of human history. In human affairs, what seems to the careless to be quite new is revealed to the student as an antiquity. We see the gradual growth of social organisations, the natural transition from one established order of things to another slightly different, the transformation of one institution into another, and we formulate the growth, the transition, the transformation in the general concept of historic evolution. A process of Becoming leads to a new

phase of Being; the study of evolution is a study of *Werden und Vergehen.*

The General Doctrine of Organic Evolution.

Stated concretely in regard to living creatures, the general doctrine of organic evolution suggests, as we all know, that the plants and animals now around us are the results of natural processes of growth and change working throughout the ages, that the forms we see are the lineal descendants of ancestors on the whole somewhat simpler, that these are descended from yet simpler forms, and so on backwards, till we lose our clue in the unknown—but doubtless momentous—vital events of pre-Cambrian ages, or, in other words, in the thick mist of life's beginnings. Always, however, the evolutionist means by "simpler"—merely less developed, as an egg is simpler than the bird which is hatched from it, for he always looks back to beginnings which had in them the promise and potentiality of the ends.

"As in the development of a fugue," Samuel Butler says, "where, when the subject and counter-subject have been announced, there must thenceforth be nothing new, and yet all must be new, so throughout organic nature—which is a fugue developed to great length from a very simple subject—everything is linked on to and grows out of that which comes next to it in order."

The subject of the biological fugue is the organism, the counter-subject is the environment, the outcome is a progressively subtle harmony between them.

It is hardly necessary now to do more than allude to the fact that the evolution idea is not only essentially simple, but also very ancient. It is perhaps as old as clear thinking, which we may date from the (unknown) time when man discovered the year—with its marvellous object-lesson of recurrent sequences,—and realised that his race had a history. Whatever may have been its origin, the idea was familiar to several of the ancient Greek philosophers, as it

was to Hume and to Kant; it fired the imagination of Lucretius, and linked him to another poet of evolution—Goethe; it persisted, like a latent germ, through the centuries of other than scientific pre-occupation; it was made actual by the pioneers of modern biology—men like Buffon, Lamarck, Erasmus Darwin, Treviranus, and Etienne Geoffroy St. Hilaire;—and it became current intellectual coin when Darwin, Wallace, Spencer, Haeckel, and Huxley, with united but varied achievements, won the conviction of the majority of thoughtful men.

This is all familiar, yet it is profitable to pause to inquire why Darwin succeeded when Lamarck had failed. Certainly not, as is often said, because Darwin proved what Lamarck had merely suggested, for it must be admitted that there is no direct logical proof of the Theory of Descent. There were three reasons:—First, because Darwin's illustrations, what some would call his cumulative evidences, of organic evolution, were so masterly that they left few openings for effective criticism; the basis of fact which the formula was shown to fit was solid, broad, and representative. Secondly, because Darwin laid emphasis on a particular evolution factor—the natural selection of congenital variations,—which commended itself to critical experts as more satisfactory than Lamarck's postulate of the transmission of acquired modifications. But thirdly, and this is perhaps most important, because the times were more ripe; biological science had been growing rapidly; and in other departments men were becoming familiar with the historical method,—the first step to becoming evolutionists. Mr. Samuel Butler has said:

> Buffon planted, Erasmus Darwin and Lamarck watered, but it was Mr. Darwin who said "That fruit is ripe," and shook it into his lap. . . . Darwin was heir to a discredited truth, and left behind him an accredited fallacy,

and although this seems to us a prejudiced perversion of the history, it does express the fact that the intellectual temper of the time was changing.

The Evolution Formula not antithetic to Transcendental Formulæ.

The Theory of Descent tacitly makes the assumption—the basal hope of all biology—that it is not only legitimate but promiseful to try to interpret scientifically the history of life upon the earth. If we have good reasons for believing that the long process of Becoming which has led eventually to ourselves and our complex animate environment is altogether too mysterious or too marvellous to admit of successful treatment by ordinary scientific methods, then we deny at the outset the validity of the evolution formula. One may be an evolutionist, and yet much else—idealist, poet, or theologian; one may, that is to say, accept the scientific modal interpretation without believing that it alone is valid. One may be an evolutionist, and yet feel far from satisfied with the present-day analysis of the factors in the process—which is the position of many, perhaps of most, critical naturalists to-day,—but one cannot be an evolutionist if one has no confidence in the applicability of the scientific method to the problem of the history of life.

Here is a parting of the ways, and there is no *via media*. Is there no hopefulness in attempting this scientific analysis of the confessedly vast and perplexing problem?—then let us remain poets and artists, philosophers and theologians, and sigh over a science which started so much in debt that its bankruptcy was a foregone conclusion. On the other hand, if the scientific attempt is legitimate, and if it has already made good progress, considering its youth, then let us rigidly exclude from our science all other than scientific interpretations; let us cease to juggle with words in attempting a mongrel mixture of scientific and transcendental formulation; let us stop trying to eke out demonstrable factors by assuming, alongside of these, "ultra-scientific causes," "spiritual influxes," *et hoc genus omne*; let us cease writing or buying books such as *God or Natural Selection*, whose titular false antimony is an index of their

misunderstanding. Not that we are objecting for a moment to any metaphysical or theological interpretations whatsoever; we are simply emphasising the so much neglected commonplace that we cannot have scientific formulæ mixed up with any other interpretations in one sentence; and that to place these other interpretations in opposition to scientific formulæ is to oppose incommensurables, and to display an ignorance of what the aim of science is.

There can be no opposition between the idea of creation and the idea of evolution, for the first is an ultimate concept and the second a descriptive formula. The evolutionist takes the institution of the order of nature for granted—at the beginning of his problem—and his task is to show how one expression of the order has given rise to another. Nor is there opposition between the general idea of design and the Darwinian theory, as Huxley clearly pointed out, for it is the root-idea of evolution doctrine that there is nothing in the end that was not also in the beginning. In a true sense, Darwin did as much for teleology as Paley, though he punctuated differently.

The Evolution Formula compared with the Gravitation Formula.

A step towards an understanding of the modern naturalist's position in regard to the evolution formula may be made if we compare it for a moment with a great physical generalisation, like the gravitation formula. Both are simple in statement, both are wide as the world in their applicability, and both stand unchallenged by facts which they do not fit. Furthermore, they are alike in this, that neither pretends to suggest any ultimate explanation, that both are examples of intellectual shorthand, of descriptive, "thought-economising formulæ," in Professor Karl Pearson's phrase. We do not know why one body attracts another in the manner which Newton formulated; and we do not know why life should have its power of Protean growth, and of slowly creeping upwards.

But there is this difference between the gravitation formula and that of evolution, that while the experimental vindication of the first is easy, that of the second is, to say the least, extremely difficult. Whether we study the apples falling in the orchard or the planets in their courses, whether we make pendulum experiments or investigate the tides, we can continually confirm the accuracy of the gravitation formula, to which two centuries have not added anything essential, and from which two centuries have taken nothing away. But the evolution doctrine does not rest upon a similar readily demonstrable foundation. Like wisdom, it is justified of its children, and to speak of proving it is to misunderstand it. We often hear of the "evidences of evolution"—drawn from facts of structure and of development, from past history and present-day changes; but the expression "evidences of evolution" suggests the erroneous idea that the doctrine is a logical induction from these and other details. This is not really so, for an impartial examination shows that no item of the so-called evidence is in itself demonstrative in the strict sense. All that is shown is, that the evolution formula fits a wide and representative series of facts, and enables us to think of them in a clear and rapid way. There are no biological facts which may not be used as "evidences of evolution" if we know enough about them, and there are no biological facts which are inconsistent with the formula so far as we know. And, to be frank, it seems from an historical retrospect that the formula of organic evolution was accepted by the naturalist, in great measure, because it seemed to justify itself in many other departments besides his own—in application to the earth beneath, to the stars overhead, to languages, and to human institutions.

So far then, perhaps in too elementary a fashion, we have noted that the general formula of evolution, which naturalists are now practically unanimous in accepting as a workable modal interpretation of the history of life, is simple, ancient, and fruitful, and that it is the only scientific theory in the field. Since the early days of Darwinian enthusiasm and hot-blooded controversy, our attitude has changed to this

extent, that we regard the evolution theory as a descriptive formula rather than as an explanation. It is neither a rigorously demonstrated induction nor part of a philosophy of life; it has nothing to say against any transcendental interpretation, so long as that keeps consistent with the facts and keeps to itself. It is not demonstrable in the sense in which the doctrine of the conservation of energy is demonstrable, but stands rather on the same footing as the modern theory of the ether—a necessary and fruitful hypothesis. The old exaggeration, the old confusion of ultimate explanation and proximate formulation, the old dogmatism and intolerance—have they not passed away? We do not even believe that our evolution formula has received final form, for that phrase is applicable only to the extinct and the undevelopable. The consistent evolutionist recognises that he and his interpretation, like the world which he studies, are within the sweep of the evolution process, have been evolved, and are still evolving. Therefore he never claims finality of interpretation, for that would be self-contradiction.

From the Fact to the Factors.

So far, then, the formula; but let us pass to the more difficult question of the *factors*. Evolution is a certain mode of becoming; what are the operative conditions? Here we pass from practical certainty to perplexing uncertainty, as is so often the case when we pass from the general to the particular, from abstract to concrete. The gravitation formula is unassailable, but is there any unanimity in regard to the theory of the tides? The conservation of energy stands securely enough, but what is an electric charge? The undulatory, or even the electro-magnetic, conception of light is as convincing as any other scientific theory, but what are the Röntgen rays? The indestructibility of matter has been for a century one of the foundation-stones of chemistry, but what is inertia?

Huxley's saying, "If the Darwinian hypothesis was swept

away, evolution would still stand where it was," has puzzled some outsiders; but it obviously alludes to the fact that while all research has tended to confirm our confidence in the general idea of organic evolution, we are full of uncertainty in regard to the actual mechanism of the process. What we may venture to call the fact of evolution forces itself upon us; the factors elude us. It is in regard to these factors—a secure knowledge of which would be of so great practical as well as theoretical importance—that there is necessarily nowadays so much controversy. And much better that controversy, even with its prolific offspring of verbiage and personalities, than the dire scientific fallacy, which it seems so hard to exorcise, of using the modal formula as a demiurgic cause, able to do this or that without let or hindrance. One is ashamed to have to confess that there are still naturalists in whose writings the descriptive formulæ figure like the Greek gods come back again, and Evolution with a capital stalks through the pages like a Creator in disguise.

Though the presently existing schools of evolutionists are not quite so numerous as the divisions of the Church in Britain, they are equally perplexing to the uninitiated, and it seems too sanguine to expect general interest in the differences between Darwinians and Neo-Darwinians, between Lamarckians and Neo-Lamarckians, and so on, or to suppose in the reader an appetite which might help him to digest our attempt to elucidate the true inwardness of Weismannism. We propose, therefore, to leave the names of the sects alone, and to keep close to the actual problems, which touch ourselves at every turn.

Nature of Variations.

The first great question is as to what may be called the raw materials of progress,—the origin and nature of those variations or organic changes on which the possibility of evolution depends. The importance of this may perhaps be more vividly realised if we picture what would ensue if all human variation were abruptly to cease. Each child would then receive what is called a complete inheritance

from its parents and ancestry; each member of a family would express that inheritance completely; individuality would disappear; all would be like identical twins, only of different ages. Unless they were put out to nurse at birth and subjected as soon as possible to diverse surroundings, they would all be appallingly homogeneous. Sociality would increase by leaps and bounds, as a relief from the monotony of family sameness. But with intermarriage the distinctions of different stocks and castes would gradually disappear, and homogeneity would spread like an epidemic. The empire would expand like a diffusing gas in the hurry for new environments where superficial modifications might serve to differentiate one man from another. This dismal (presumably impossible) picture may serve to quicken our interest in the biologist's most baffling problem—the nature and origin of variations.

Darwin started from the broad fact that variability exists (illustrating it chiefly from domesticated animals and cultivated plants); he postulated a crop of organic changes, both of tares and wheat; and he pointed out how a process of singling and thinning, sifting and winnowing would operate upon the ever-growing, ceaselessly changing crop so that the result was progress. But all science begins with measurement, and the great step in advance that has been made of recent years is in the dry and tedious, but absolutely necessary, task of recording accurately the variations which do actually occur.

Without being biologists, simply as clear thinkers, we can see the unsatisfactoriness of the line of argument which was until recently prevalent,—that of simply postulating variability without statistically or otherwise defining it. Life is so abundant and so Protean that biologists tend to draw cheques upon Nature as if they had unlimited credit, and in their impetuosity scarce wait to see whether these are honoured. In our ordinary evolutionist talk, as Mr. Bateson points out, we are continually using such phrases as this:

If such and such a variation took place and was favourable, then . . . —a mode of talk which we would ridicule in Paley

or Butler, but which we in our inconsistency still tolerate in ourselves. It is obviously our business to be able to say, such and such variations *do* occur in nature, therefore . . .

But we are now changing all this. From Heligoland to California, from Plymouth to Nigg, we have now reports of fundamentally important studies on variation, which are rapidly helping us out of the slough of vagueness in which, to the physicist's contempt, biology still flounders. The very title—*Biometrika*—of a proposed new journal is a sign of the times.

It is far too soon to sum up recent studies on variation, but a few general results are becoming clear. The tiresome objector who challenges the evolutionist to demonstrate a single case of one species being turned into another, has an undeveloped "time-sense" (all natural history records embracing but a fraction of a tick of the cosmic clock); and he is a century behind the times, with an outlook like that of the catastrophic or cataclysmal school of geologists. Whoever expects to find big "Jack-in-the-box" phenomena in nature is sure to be disappointed. What the objector should do is humbly to study some of the recent researches in which the persistent patience of those who can appreciate millimetres has shown that variability is even greater than was supposed by Darwin, and is certainly not less among creatures living in a state of nature than among those domesticated or cultivated forms on which Darwin concentrated his attention. And he should at least give as many days as the observers have given years to the study of palæontological series, like those of Ammonites and Brachiopods. The fact is that whenever we settle down to measure, describe, and identify, we find that specific diagnoses are averages; that specific characters require a curve of frequency for their expression; that the living creature is usually a Proteus. There are no doubt long-lived, non-plastic, conservative types, like Lingula, and perhaps a score of other well known instances, where no visible variability can be proved even in millions of years; but to judge from these as to the march of evolutionary

progress is like estimating the rush of a river from the eddies of a sheltered pool.

In the study of variability it seems possible to distinguish between continuous variation, in which the descendant has a little more or a little less of a given character than the parents had, and discontinuous variation, apparently frequent, in which a new combination (say, an elegant vase-like pitcher on a cabbage leaf) appears suddenly without known gradational stages and with no small degree of perfection. Though Lamarck said "Nature is never brusque," though we adhere to our statement about the rarity of big Jack-in-the-box phenomena, the evidence (*e.g.* of Bateson) as to the occurrence of discontinuous variations appears conclusive. Such words as "freaks" and "sports" are open to objection, but they suggest the idea of what Mr. Galton calls "transilient" variations, and the fact that organic structure may pass with seeming abruptness from one form of equilibrium to another.

It also becomes more and more evident that the living creature in many cases varies as a whole or unity, so that if there is more of one character there is less of another, and so that one change brings another in its train. If this be so, we are not restricted to the assumption of the piecemeal variation of minute parts. This consideration and actual measurement seem also to suggest that there is greater definiteness and less fortuitousness in variation than was previously supposed.

Many inquiring minds have recoiled from a theory of evolution which seemed to rely on happy chances and on the occasionally apt ending of a chapter of accidents, and although this is partly due to a misunderstanding of the mathematical or scientific conception of chance, it seems a not unnatural repugnance. Therefore we hasten to point out that if we take two of the most diametrically opposed modern evolutionists—the late Professor Eimer and Professor Weismann—we find that by very different routes both land in a recognition of a tendency to definiteness in variation. Another argument towards the same conclusion has

been advanced by Professor Geddes and the writer in *The Evolution of Sex.*[1]

So much then, in the meantime, as a hint of current opinion (it can be little more than opinion) as to the nature of the raw materials of progress, to wit variations. They are of constant occurrence; they may be continuous or discontinuous; they may be indefinite freaks or definite mutations.

Origin of Variations.

In his great work, *Materials for the Study of Variation*, Mr. Bateson devotes a line to saying that inquiry into the causes is in his judgment premature; and it must be admitted that until we know the actual facts better, we cannot expect to say much that is wise in regard to their antecedents. A number of suggestions have been made, however, and some of these may be briefly stated.

A variation, which renders the child different from its parents, is often interpretable as due to some incompleteness of inheritance or in the expression of the inheritance. It seems as if the entail were sometimes broken in regard to a particular characteristic. Oftener, perhaps, as the third generation shows, the inheritance has been complete enough potentially, but the young creature has been prevented from realising its legacy. Contrariwise, it may be that the novelty of the newborn is seen in an intensifying of the inheritance, for the contributions from the two parents may as it were corroborate one another.

But in many cases something turns up to which we irresistibly apply the word novel, some peculiar mental pattern, it may be, which we feel bound to call original, some structural change which suggests a new departure. We may tentatively interpret this as due to some fresh permutation or combination of the complex nuclear and cellular substances which are mingled at the outset of

[1] See Fourth Edition, 1901.

every new life sexually reproduced. The plausibility of this interpretation is increased when we remember that our inheritance, as Galton has so clearly shown, is mosaic rather than dual. For it is not merely in an intermingling of maternal and paternal contributions that life begins, but of legacies through the parents from remoter ancestors. It is as difficult to predict what will result as to foretell the next pattern in a kaleidoscope, though there are limitations to the possibilities in both cases. Men do not gather grapes off thorns, or figs off thistles. The complexity of the problem is increased, not diminished, if there be reality in the conception that the different hereditary qualities may have a struggle *in nuce*, or that there is a "germinal selection" as Weismann calls it.

Another possibility of variation has been sought in the fact that the hereditary material is doubtless very complex and has a complex environment within the parental body. If it has, in spite of its essential stability, a tendency to instability as regards minor details, we may perhaps find the change-exciting stimuli in the ceaseless nutritive oscillations within the body. But enough has been said to indicate how uncertain is the voice of biology in answering the fundamental questions as to the nature and origin of variations.

Modifications.

Among the observed differences which mark man from man, trout from trout, buttercup from buttercup, there are many to which we cannot apply the term variations. Quite apart from constitutional or congenital changes there are differences which are obviously impressed upon the body from without, such as sun-burning, or which result from use and disuse, such as callosities on the fingers. These do indeed presuppose a constitution capable of being changed, but we can relate each of them (sometimes with certainty, sometimes only with probability) to some definite influence either of function or of environment which has brought

about a structural change transcending the limits of organic elasticity. We call these conveniently "modifications," and though they may be of much importance to the individuals possessing them, and may serve as a temporary shield for incipient variations in the same direction, they are not proved to be of any direct importance in the evolution of the race, for the simple reason that there is no convincing evidence that they can be as such or in any representative degree transmitted to the offspring. But here, as everyone knows, we are at one of the partings of the ways in evolution theory, we face the problem of the transmissibility of acquired characters or modifications—a discussion of which would require an article to itself.

The question must be waived, but it is indispensable that it be understood, and a simile may be permitted. In the observed differences between a hundred churches of the same style, *i.e.* of the same species, scattered through Britain, it would be possible to separate the differences due, let us say, to weathering and use, from the differences due to the particular kind of stone employed and to slight idiosyncrasies on the part of the builders. The former would be called biologically "modifications," the latter "variations."

Without seeking to prejudice a case which we are not here discussing, we may note that a very large number of the most active and thoughtful biologists of to-day have come back to the position of Kant and Prichard, that life does not run on a compound-interest principle of adding to the child's inheritance the individual modifications acquired by the parents. It is very difficult, even after a careful search through the available records, to find one clear case of modifications due to surroundings, education, work, or sloth, or the like, being transmitted in any degree to the offspring.

That the parents' mode of life may influence their children yet unborn is a commonplace of observation, but the point to the evolutionist is whether the influence produces in the offspring a corresponding or representative effect. To say

that the fathers having eaten sour grapes, therefore the children's teeth are set on edge, may be a very wholesome assertion, but it is exceedingly difficult to prove. It is by no means always easy, for instance, to be sure that the children have not been in the vineyard too. And although some consequences of the father's eating of sour grapes are often (though not always) obvious in his children, these are not to the point unless they are of the same nature as the changes which the father's diet wrought in him. As Romanes said, a case of wryneck in the child is irrelevant in relation to the perfectly precise question at issue,—whether modifications in the body of the parent are as such or in any representative degree ever transmitted to the child.

So far, then, we have seen that the raw materials of evolution consist of constitutional or congenital variations, and that we are not justified in including modifications or acquired characters because their transmissibility is unproved. Let us now pass to a brief consideration of the secondary or directive factors—operating upon the variations which crop up.

Natural Selection.

The first of these directive factors is natural selection, and it is well known that the most distinctive contribution which Darwin and Wallace made to ætiology was to emphasise its importance. The theory admits of brief statement.

Variability is a fact of life. The members of a family or species are not born alike: some have qualities which give them a little advantage both as to hunger and as to love; others are relatively handicapped. But a struggle for existence is also a fact of life, being necessitated especially by two facts: first, that two parents usually produce many more than a pair of children, and the population thus tends to outrun the means of subsistence; and, secondly, because organisms are at the best only relatively well adapted to their conditions, which, moreover, are variable. This struggle does not express itself merely as an elbowing and

jostling around the platter, but at every point where the effectiveness of the response which the living creature makes to the stimuli playing upon it, is of critical moment. As Darwin said, though many seem to have forgotten, the phrase "struggle for existence" is used "in a wide and metaphorical sense," including much more than an internecine scramble for the necessaries of life,—including, indeed, all endeavours for preservation and welfare, not only of the individual, but of the offspring too. In many cases, the struggle for existence both among men and beasts is more fairly described as an endeavour after well-being, and what may have been primarily self-regarding impulses become replaced by others which are distinctively species-maintaining, the self failing to find realisation apart from its kin and society.

Now, in this struggle for existence—manifold in its expression, but never unreal—the relatively less fit forms tend to be eliminated. This does not necessarily mean that they come at once to a violent end, as when locust devours locust, or the cold decimates the birds in a single night, but often simply that the less fit die before the average time, and are less successful than their neighbours as regards offspring. But whether the eliminative process be gentle or severe, the result is the same, that the relatively more fit tend to survive. It is, of course, a puerile error to suppose that fittest necessarily means best or highest according to any evolutionary standard; it only means fittest relatively to given conditions of survival. The golden eagle is a much finer creature than say the bacillus of any of the dirt-diseases, but the chances of the golden eagle's survival in Britain are much less than those of the bacillus,—not that it has not its struggle too. Since many variations (the argument continues) are transmitted from generation to generation, and may through the pairing of similar or suitable mates be gradually increased in amount, the eliminative or selective process works towards the establishment of new adaptations and new species.

Let us not think of this theory as anything far off and misty,

a question for plants and animals, for we are ourselves among its most vivid illustrations. The bacteria, for instance, which we are now so zealously striving to eliminate have in the past done no little work in sifting us. And whenever the man of business asks "Will this pay?" or the politician "Will this go down with my constituency?" or the popular writer "Will this sell?" each is bowing to the reality of the manifold struggle for existence whereby in the course of nature the relatively less fit tend to be eliminated. Whether we listen to the poetic insight of George Meredith,—

> Behold the life of ease, it drifts.
> The sharpened life commands its course:
> She winnows, winnows roughly, sifts,
> To dip her chosen in her source.
> Contention is the vital force
> Whence pluck they brains, her prize of gifts,—

or watch the worker in the fields "singling" the turnip crop with the eliminative hoe, or examine the chances of death for the different human occupations, we reach the same formula: struggle, elimination, selection.

As to that particular form of natural selection which is called sexual selection, to which Darwin attached so much importance especially in his later work, we are compelled, as in the case of the transmissibility of acquired characters, to shirk the discussion of a difficult problem which could not be fairly treated within our limits of space. Only a few remarks can be made. As is well known, sexual selection takes two chief forms: (*a*) where the rival males fight for the possession of a desired mate or mates, and in so doing reduce the leet; and (*b*) where the females appear to choose certain individuals from amid a crowd of suitors. The general verdict seems to be that while among some animals preferential mating appears indisputable, its range and its effectiveness in evolution are much less than Darwin believed. This is well expressed in the work of Darwin's magnanimous colleague, Alfred Russel Wallace, who has given good reason for believing that too much credit has

been given to this sexual selection factor. But just as the little child in a sense leads the race—being the expression of some new variation,—so we may still admit that there are facts which warrant us in saying that *das ewig-weibliche* plays a part in the upward march of life. Cupid's darts as well as Death's arrows have sometimes evolutionary significance.

Apart from differences of opinion as to the importance of sexual selection, it seems fair to say that the majority of naturalists continue to rely with confidence on the general selective or eliminative process. Whether the selection theory is "all sufficient," as Weismann calls it, or "inadequate," as Spencer says, it remains a potent theory. Given a sufficiently abundant crop of variations, a persistent struggle for existence, and a large draft on the bank of Time, what may the selective process not accomplish?

But as ætiology has grown older and wiser, it has begun to ask questions, the answers to which will mean much progress. Thus there is a demand for some serious attempt to measure the intensity of the struggle in typical cases, and for evidence that the absence of a particular variation in certain members of the stock does really determine their elimination. There are inquiries as to the frequency of discontinuous or transilient variations—where a new character is reached with apparent suddenness, for if these are frequent this may lessen the claims which have to be made on the selective progress. It is asked whether the task of elimination will not be further lessened if the crop of variations is more definite and less of the nature of random freaks than used to be supposed. Information is wanted as to the degree in which the struggle for existence is directly competitive, or merely between the living creature and its inanimate surroundings. Especially is it desired that statistics be forthcoming to show how far the elimination is discriminate, as when the pruner lops off the less promiseful branches, or the breeder gets rid of the unsuitable members of his stocks, and how far it is indiscriminate, as when the hastily driven hoe strikes the cluster of seedlings. In other

words, evolutionists have awakened to the necessity of testing natural selection in relation to actual cases. An illustration in reference to the last question (concerning discriminate and indiscriminate selection) may serve to suggest the more critical mood which is now widely diffused.

One hundred and thirty-six English sparrows in America were worsted by a severe storm and were brought benumbed into a laboratory. Seventy-two revived, sixty-four perished; and Professor Bumpus made a careful comparison of the eliminated and the survivors with the result of showing that the birds which perished because of the storm were deficient as regards certain structural features in which those that survived the storm were stronger. In other words, the case seemed to be one of discriminate selection, and we wish to know of hundreds of similar cases, where the discriminateness is proved and not merely supposed. The importance of this is obvious, since it is only discriminate selection that makes directly for evolution. There may be progress when certain microbes cut off those of our race who have weak and predisposed constitutions, but there is none when the strong and wise man perishes because his weak and foolish neighbour was careless about his drains.

Isolation.

The raw materials of progress are furnished, as we have seen, by congenital or germinal variations. What these may amount to depends in the long run on the potentialities resident in living matter, especially of reacting to external influences, and this forces us finally back to the institution of the order of nature which, at some level or other, the evolutionist takes for granted. In organic evolution, variation supplies the materials; heredity (or the relation of genetic continuity between successive generations) is one of the conditions; natural selection or elimination is one of the directive factors. But there may be others, and one has been indicated in what is called the theory of isolation.

A formidable objection to the Darwinian theory, first clearly stated by Professor Fleeming Jenkin, and familiar to everyone who has thought out the matter, is that variations of small amount and sparse occurrence would tend to be swamped out by intercrossing. In artificial selection, the breeder takes measures to prevent this by pairing similar or suitable forms together; but what in nature corresponds to the breeder? Lord Salisbury gave expression to this difficulty in his presidential address to the British Association meeting in Oxford in 1894.

"In natural selection," he asked, "who is to supply the breeder's place? Unless the crossing is properly arranged, the new breed will never come into being. What is to secure that the two individuals of opposite sexes in the primeval forest, who have been both accidentally blessed with the same advantageous variation, shall meet, and transmit by inheritance that variation to their successors? Is there anything but mere chance to secure that the advantageously varied bridegroom at one end of the wood should meet the bride, who by a happy contingency had been advantageously varied in the same direction at the same time at the other end of the wood?"

Various suggestions have been made in answer to this objection. Thus Professor Weismann says, "The necessary variations from which transformations arise must in all cases be exhibited over and over again by many individuals," but there is still a lack of concrete evidence to bear this out. We do not mean to deny it, but before we lean heavily upon it we should like to be able to furnish numerous examples of many similar variations occurring at once within the same group.

The favourite answer of recent years is that worked out by the late Dr. Romanes, Mr. Gulick, and others—the theory of isolation. They point to the great variety of ways in which, in the course of nature, the range of intercrossing is restricted—*e.g.* by geographical barriers, by differences in habit, by psychical likes and dislikes, by reproductive variation causing mutual sterility between two sections of a species living on a common area, and so on. According to

Romanes, "without isolation, or the prevention of free intercrossing, organic evolution is in no case possible." Again it has to be confessed that the body of facts in illustration of isolation and its effects is unsatisfactorily small.

An interesting corollary has been recently indicated by Professor Cossar Ewart. Breeding within a narrow range often occurs in nature, being necessitated by geographical or other barriers. In artificial conditions, this in-breeding often results in the development of what is called prepotency. This means that certain forms have an unusual power of transmitting their peculiarities, even when mated with dissimilar forms. In other words, certain variations have a strong power of persistence. Therefore, wherever through in-breeding (which implies isolation) prepotency has developed, there is no difficulty in understanding how even a small idiosyncrasy may come to stay, even although the bridegroom does not meet a bride endowed with a peculiarity like his own.

In Conclusion.

In conclusion, or we should rather say in ending this review whose point is its inconclusiveness, let us once more emphasise that while the general idea of evolution stands more firmly than ever as a reasonable modal interpretation of nature, there is great uncertainty in regard to the factors in the evolution process. How do variations arise? In what proportion are they continuous or discontinuous, definite or indefinite? How far is natural elimination discriminate? To what extent is isolation demonstrable?—before these and a score of similar questions we stand not less expectant—but perhaps less confident—than the evolutionists of a third of a century ago. It is not that we are where we were thirty years since; it is rather that we have become more aware of our ignorance and of the complexity of the problem.

It is a critical mood that becomes us as a reaction from earlier enthusiasm, and the value of this is borne out by the

history of science which shows that the rate of intellectual progress may be measured by the periodicity of the wave of scientific scepticism. But it is not a hands-in-the-pockets scepticism that becomes us as evolutionists, it is a *thätige Skepsis*,—eager to test and measure, to experiment and observe. After half a century of measurement and experiment, the voice of the evolutionist will probably regain confidence. What is especially needed is a national or international institute of experimental evolution where the trials and testings could be continued for generations by a carefully recruited staff, and thus remain unaffected by the death of individual workers.

As to the mood in which this measuring and testing should be done, we cannot do better than quote from one of the most important post-Darwinian contributions to evolution theory, Mr. Bateson's *Materials for the Study of Variation*. He heads his work with the familiar words :

"All flesh is not the same flesh : but there is one flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds," and says, "I have there set in all reverence the most solemn enunciation of the problem that our language knows. The priest and the poet have tried to solve it, each in his turn, and have failed. If the naturalist is to succeed, he must be content to go very slowly, making good each step. He must be content to work with the simplest cases, getting from them such truths as he can, learning to value partial truth though he cheat no one into mistaking it for absolute or universal truth ; remembering the greatness of his calling, and taking heed that after him will come Time, that 'author of authors,' whose inseparable property it is ever more and more to discover the truth, who will not be deprived of his due."

There is, however, another note which should be sounded, that of the unity of the sciences, and the bearing of this on evolutionary studies. While we rely upon the specialist and know him as indispensable, we cannot but recognise the danger of preoccupied aloofness. All students of science are facing one big problem—the order of nature and its evolution, and it seems on the face of it that co-

ordination of results must be a condition of progress. The historian and the sociologist are studying evolution, the psychologist and the teacher likewise; the medical practitioner experiments with evolution, and so do we all; geology is now in its evolutionary phase, astronomy has its modified nebular hypothesis of the evolution of stellar systems, chemistry has looming before it the problem of the evolution of the chemical elements, and the physicist is often engaged with studies in transformism. We need not multiply illustrations, for the point is simple, that since the evolution formula is applicable to all orders of facts, there is a strong probability that the future evolution of the evolution theory will depend in part on increased correlation of the various disciplines. Already, indeed, to the biologist, if he would or could use them, there are lights from above (from sociology and psychology), and lights from beneath (from physics and chemistry); and to shut out either means a prolongation of our obscurity. To use these lights from other sciences is in itself a problem, but it has to be faced, for we must let the theory of evolution evolve.

J. ARTHUR THOMSON.

NOTES ON MARK XIV.

IN the former part of the fourteenth chapter of Mark two figures stand out in sharp contrast at the side of Christ, one symbolical of the love that only seeks to give, the other symbolical of the love that only seeks to gain. Love seeking to give made Mary of Bethany; love seeking to gain, Judas Iscariot. One worshipped, one sought to exploit, the Son of man; and we may note that the second type criticised and condemned the first—as it must always do. The argument of Judas, as recorded by John, seemed more reasonable than the gift of Mary. The poor might have benefited by the price of the ointment. How true it was! and yet, through all the centuries, we see the light on Mary's face, as on the face of the other Mary, who washed Christ's feet with tears, and we know that both these women, just because their love transcended all human calculation, had found the peace past understanding. By which peace, Judas in his turn was judged.

Sometimes we are told that we are too hard on Judas. The difficulty is, however, not that we are too hard on Judas, but that when we are like him we refuse to be hard on ourselves. Christ was to Judas rather one from whom he expected honour and promotion than one to be reverenced and loved. Now, if that is the relation in which we stand to people, sooner or later, in one way or another, we shall betray them. Selfishness and treachery go hand in hand. But the treacherous act of Judas, prompted, no doubt, by many motives, not all evil, became a link in the greatest chain of events the world has ever known, and stands out lurid against an eternal background. Our need is not to palliate the crime of Judas, but to bring our own small treacheries, that shrink away into the dark, into as fierce a light, and see their altered aspect. How much of

one's life would bear recording in the Gospels in close association with the divine life? It might seem that not the sin of Judas, but his punishment, was phenomenal. But perhaps, when we see the real consequences of any sin, even the sin that seems to pass unmarked by man and God, its punishment too will appear phenomenal. We may travel a devious road, but we shall come to our Aceldama at last.

On Christ's dealing with Judas we will touch later: meanwhile, how the contrast between him and Mary of Bethany must have appealed to the Master! Everyone knows the power to scathe and sear of a suspicion that those to whom we would give all only love us for what we can do for them. Egotism by no means accounts for its bitterness: the sting is not that they have failed us, but that they have failed themselves. A good man will thank God for any sign of generosity in those for whom he labours no less sincerely because to him personally they have only shown black ingratitude; and it was not His own rejection by men—it was the hardness of their hearts that broke the heart of Christ. We know that there are atmospheres charged with poisonous fumes in which the body cannot live. No less surely there are spiritual atmospheres in which the soul may be done to death—atmospheres of ceaseless doubt, and callousness, and selfishness. When we see a man working on in what appears to be a moral desert, without one flower or leaf or stream, yet keeping faith and hope, we surmise a hidden oasis: it may be only the memory of the disinterested love of a friend.

> Somewhere in the main,
> Fresh water-springs come up through bitter brine.

Without them, it is doubtful if faith in God would survive—for we cannot separate the Creator from the creation made in His image. Such a spring of pure water was the gift of Mary of Bethany to Christ. By the side of the unselfish love that prompted it the treachery of Judas seemed transient and unreal. For though we may doubt, when we consider them apart, whether love or selfishness be the

stronger force, we can never doubt when we see them together. One beautiful generous act has more power to inspire faith than a dozen base acts have to quench it. In St. John and Mary of Bethany Christ saw of the travail of His soul, and knew a joy which the betrayal of Judas could not efface. Nor can we doubt that their loyalty made it easier for Him, afterwards, to break bread with the traitor, with the failure, with the man whose crime, at its core, was simply this, that he held it more blessed to receive than to give.

Christ's treatment of Judas is very significant. The difference between His method and the method of the world is, that where we deal with outward conduct, He deals with the soul. He foresaw the betrayal, as He foresaw the denial of Peter; yet we read of no strong effort to restrain either. To both, a mere warning, no impassioned plea, and this although He knew that Judas was about to lay upon his conscience perhaps the blackest crime of all the ages. Was it that He saw in the traitor a necessary element in the divine scheme? That the sense of His own destiny was strong upon Him in this hour we cannot doubt; but if we are likewise to hold that in Him the divine love was indeed incarnate, no acquiescence in fate withheld Him from even now endeavouring to turn the purpose of Judas. How we should have urged Him to do so! How we should have argued that at all costs the traitor must be saved from so unparalleled a crime, so stupendous a penalty—for we dread the penalty of sin, alas, as if it were another sin, if not far more!

But to Christ penalty was often healing; and He knew that sometimes the best that can happen to a man whose heart is resolutely turned toward evil, is to commit some sin of which the penalty can lay hold. Our one effort is to avoid errors of conduct, while Christ, at times, even suffered them, because they made it possible for Him to pierce the soul with shame. There must be a moment of self-realisation, and it is often the moment in which some overt crime has photographed our secret sin for us indelibly, as in fire. Some

must fall lower to rise higher, like Peter, so confident of the worth of his loyalty, never suspecting his shallowness. He barely heard the warning; but he was roused at last, when his own action confronted him, inalienably his own, for time and for eternity, and from the ashes of his egotism there sprang up a deeper loyalty, less conscious of itself, more conscious of Christ.

With Judas the sin was more far-reaching, more ingrain. Christ treated him with what looked half like fatalism. It was not fatalism, but deeper knowledge, the knowledge that character must work out its own salvation, that what is needed is not determination of conduct from without, but the slow, inevitable, and irrevocable spiritual growth that determines conduct from within. Not in anger, nor indifference—even then in pity, even then in love—did Christ suffer Judas to find in bitter earnest that sin's wages are despair.

We must remember this, when we read how He broke bread with the traitor at the Last Supper. It must be that, with eyes clearly perceiving the treachery, Christ yet pledged Himself to a loyalty to the forgotten ideal of Judas—a loyalty whose source lay deeper than all human sin, being the very heart of God. Judas might betray Him, but could not alter Him. But for that breaking bread and the washing of the feet of the betrayer there would be a note of failure in the story of the Last Supper, where only solemn triumph sounds.

> The wine Thou couldst not vainly pour.
> The bread in vain Thou couldst not bless.
> The silver on the temple floor,
> The field of blood, are witnesses.

One cannot, in one's mind, separate the Last Supper from the account given of it by John; but even in this briefer record the triumph of Christ through service is manifest. He reveals the divine life as one of ministry. He regards service as the function of sovereignty: without it, God would not be God. Absolute rule is absolute ministry, alike to the highest and the lowest, and but for the perfection of

His ministry the world at every instant would thwart God. All creation has this aspect of service. An artist is a slave; but it is a divine slavery. And when we try either to separate creation from service or service from creation, we are going on other than the divine lines, and we are destined to failure.

Doubtless, the very act of serving the disciples, at the Last Supper, deepened the calm of Christ. But just because His ministry was always creative,—the only real and lasting ministry,—there was a reaction to be faced, and an immeasurable solitude through which He must pass before the final service of laying down His life for men. So we come to Gethsemane.

Perhaps what strikes us first is the difference between human and divine success. For Christ's was the most successful life ever lived on earth; and yet, for the whole race, He drank the cup of failure. There are two kinds of failure: temporal success is often the careful avoidance of both. There is the failure of one who follows his lowest ideal; and there is the failure of one who chooses the very highest —no second best,—who never looks on time without a background of eternity, and never pretends to do so, to gratify popular prejudice. It is not his to gratify popular prejudice, but to correct it; and this with no personal pride, rather with deep humility, because he is Truth's bondman. He fails because the task is infinite and he is finite—and yet there is a mysterious success in his failure, since the verdict of the finite has ceased to touch him, and that of the infinite and eternal is on his side. Such a one was Socrates, who saw the real values of things so much more clearly than other men, that his life courted the hemlock. Courageous we should hardly call him; his strength went deeper than courage in the ordinary sense of the word. He was conscious of no danger in death: the danger of a broken law alone was real to him: the hemlock could only seal his witness to the sovereignty of law. The world would be a great deal poorer without the *Apologia*, and yet, perhaps, if we had been with Socrates, we should have played the part of Krito, and told him that it really was his duty to lower his ideal, at

least to the height of the prison-door. We should have said that the world could not spare him, that a subtle form of selfishness or spiritual pride led him to choose the hemlock —for which choice men have thanked God ever since. But Socrates, like Christ, could not save himself: he was thinking about those laws!

And Christ, just because He was the Redeemer of the world, could neither save Himself, nor His disciples, nor His cause, from apparent defeat and failure. It is a curious comment on all the worldly advice that Christians give each other. Here in Gethsemane He deliberately preferred the death of shame. If His disciples had known what was happening, how they would have entreated Him to escape! He was not yet surrounded: the hill was dark: there was time enough; and to remain was madness, and the defeat of good in the world. As yet they could not do without Him: the Father's will was not wholly revealed in His life: the leaven given them was not enough to leaven all humanity. Would not such arguments have appealed to Christ—nay, did they not appeal to Him? Was there no temptation to escape, not for His own sake, but for the sake of man and God? How utterly reasonable such a course might seem—and yet it was not the way of the salvation of the world. He waited for the coming of the soldiers, and the traitor's kiss, and the crown of thorns, waited, in the awful loneliness that knew no human being could understand, or even condone, the waiting—because, although the Father had sealed His eyes with earthly darkness, and filled His soul with earthly doubt, the Father's voice still bade Him wait. If He had not waited, it would be harder for all men now to do what they know to be right, at times when their finite reason justifies even more readily what they know to be wrong. The actions in which life reaches its high-water mark have little to do with human logic. They are full of a divine logic; but time-conditioned souls cannot grasp the premisses of God's argument, though they may live in touch with God until they know His will. We call a man with this knowledge—if we do not call him a madman—a

spiritual genius; but we must bear in mind that here as elsewhere genius is the reward of faithfulness. It is only because we view life in segments, and an individual as a unit independent of heredity, that we miss this fact, and its correlative, that disloyalty brings blindness. The genius of Christ had grown unceasingly. From the beginning He had kept Himself unspotted by the world, and therefore untouched by spiritual pride; and He had been wholly faithful. He knew the Father's gift—another would have passed it by without one thrill of consciousness—but He drank it to the dregs, the cup of a world's sin and of a world's despair. "He made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin."

This is another fact we must face—that the just suffer for the unjust. The unjust may say there is no need; but it is inevitable, it is one of the laws of the universe. The true saint is he who realises that spiritually as materially we are members one of another, and his "entire sanctification" is the salvation of the world. His interests are God's; but he remembers that the divine interests are not bound up with a clique, but staked in a Judas as in a St. Paul. If it were not so, the universe would be torn asunder by sin. Sinners presume on an isolation that does not exist, but the suffering of the saint asserts the unity which the selfishness of the sinner would abrogate; and the saint is stronger than the sinner, as love is stronger than hate.

We often talk as if it were a wonderful thing that God should condescend to offer to take away the sins of a being far off and wholly alien from Him. The wonder, surely, lies not in any work of divine supererogation, but in the fact that in the meanest and basest of us, as in the wisest and best, the issues of God's own conflict are somehow determined. We are not our own, for we are bought with a price, a price not paid once and for all, but a continual payment. We are an inalienable part of God's plan; and there is not a human sin, however trivial, but casts its shadow on the divine consciousness. If it were not so, would it greatly matter whether we sinned or no? We remember the Eastern legend where one knocked at a door, and the one within

said, "Who is there?" But the door was never opened till he who stood without answered, "Thyself."

Of course there is the other aspect, the aspect of separation; but always of a separation that must be overcome. In Gethsemane Christ tasted its utmost bitterness. Human companionship was withdrawn from Him: a stone-cast away, the chosen three, in spite of His request, had fallen asleep—they would wake to find themselves traitors, as any of us may do to-day, since the Son of man is with us still, even to the end of the world. So far as they were concerned, Christ was alone. Their thoughts were not as His thoughts: their aim was not His aim: their burden was not His burden. Very soon they would forsake Him and fly—nay, already He was forsaken. And these were His chosen ones! It made Him realise more vividly the infinitude of the task. The full weight of the human fetter, time, was pressing down on Him—or say that human cross, for it is time that crucifies eternity. When He was with the Father the thousand years seemed as one day: now He must bear the heavy finite consciousness of God's day as a thousand insupportable years. The cup of waiting, which He cannot drink, whose knowledge transcends time, was pressed to the lips of Christ in that hour. Even our poor experiences understand something of the sharpness of that cup; but for us, we hold that in a few brief years, at the utmost, waiting will be over. Only on Him who had identified Himself, not merely with the individual, but the whole race, there fell the shadow of illimitable time. Through it all the world would suffer, through it all, sin.

Then the tragedy of space, the apparent isolation. No more than time, does space exist for God. If we were spiritually-minded, it would not so greatly affect us: as we are, space and time are like two great stones rolled above our living graves. Theoretically, we may believe that in God we live and move and have our being, but practically all the physical laws of the universe seem to come between. "Closer than breathing, nearer than hands and feet?" No, we do not credit this. We cannot realise that heaven is

here, now, wherever a soul gets into touch with the divine love and will—perhaps we are not always meant to realise it. Perhaps God swathed us in these veils of sense, and sealed our eyes with physical phenomena, to make us trust Him in spite of all. However that may be, we are comforted, because in Gethsemane Christ also drank that cup—as we can never drink it—the cup of apparent isolation from God. He knew its bitterness, for all humanity, for all time. He prayed to God, in that hour, as to one separate and far away, whose will was not as His will. How can we—we who have never known that God was near us—realise what that means, what was implied in Christ's *submitting* His will to the will of God, as if the two were divergent? We cannot understand it afar off, because we cannot understand how much more near God was to the Son than are, to us, the one or two from whose wills it would be agony to dissent. The anguish is not in the submission on either side, but in the fact of a vital divergence between those who seemed absolutely one in spirit and ideal. And yet, for our sakes, Christ prayed to God as to one whose will was alien.

And the prayer was denied. Even here Christ trod the road before us—who tread it how differently, with what wild passionate repining. It was the hour of supreme darkness, but it was also the hour of supreme victory. Words on such a subject are profanity—and yet we know that it was for us that the prayer was denied, that at Gethsemane God Himself bore our griefs and carried our sorrows. Human limitations veiled the vision, and shook the will, of the Son of man; but the will and vision that were all divine remained unchangeable, and God spared not His own Son.

But was this once for all? We often speak as if God's sacrifice of the Son, the Son's obedience in life and death, were a supreme effort on behalf of man, followed by comparative indifference. Without intending it, we put the peace of God and His love at variance, and think that somehow, though in the Mount of Olives the love triumphed, the real dominion is of peace. Such a severance, however,

robs us of all worthy motive force. The other way is to regard Gethsemane not merely as a moment of consummate sacrifice and mercy on God's part, but as the transient revelation of an aspect of the world-process which is perpetual, at all events, till sin shall be no more. The peace of God brooded over Gethsemane as over the Transfiguration; but that peace is the clear light given by the flame of love.

We cannot afford to relegate either Gethsemane or the Transfiguration to hours in time. But since it may be said that the question is not what we can or cannot afford to do, but what is true,—we only know that the lives which make us believe in God are always lives which combine these apparently warring elements of sacrifice and victory, love and peace. And so we come to believe that Gethsemane and Mount Hermon are alike eternal in God's heart, and those who follow to the end will know them as but aspects of the infinite consciousness to which no human soul, in joy or pain, in triumph or defeat, can ever turn for help in vain.

But for us who see these aspects separate in time, it is well to note that even Christ paid the price of peace. It is about us and around us, and yet it is only manifest to absolute obedience and love. Not empty resignation, the annulling of the will, but the affirming, body, soul, and spirit, of the will of the Father. Only when that condition is fulfilled, appears "the angel from heaven," strengthening men. It is a lesson for those who talk of peace as of some abstraction in which they can take refuge from pain. It is no abstraction: rather, it is the goal of the most supreme, the most continuous endeavour; it is the answer God gives only to the human *proof* of Him—"whose fulness filleth all in all."

MAY KENDALL.

WHO ART THOU, CHRIST?

O JEW, whom Thine own generation would not
That all the generations might possess,
Thou who dost greatly shape our latter days
And of the sleeping future art the promise,
Thou scorned and buffeted the more to bless,
Thou put to man's last shame from shame to free,
Thou who didst die triumphantly to live,
On whom the great world leans of Christendom,
On whom the mighty thinkers fix their thoughts,
Perplexed, who dost allure even worldly men;
Dreamer whose gaze is on eternity,
Victor of fate and its accomplisher,
Who art not and who art for evermore,
Above all heroes, prophets, poets, saints,
In Thy great personality remote,
August, serenely smiling at our doubts,
Elusive, yet beside our thought alway;
Thou, who art still the loneliest of men,
Thou paradox and potent mystery,
So hated and so loved,—Who art Thou, Christ?
For no mere shade of History Thou art,
Who in Thine hour of utmost weakness still
Didst claim the grand prerogative of God,
Going to death not as we captives go,
But willingly and with triumphant step—
A living Christ Thou art Eternally
Imperatively haunting who ignore,
A closest friend, a presence never far,
A lover terrible e'en to Thy loved,
A sympathiser knowing human flesh,

A critic going to the very soul,
An awful judge, whose right to doom is clear,
A man of Heaven come down to help our clay,
A man of Earth to lift us to the Heavens.

O for the eyes to see Thee as Thou art!
O for a heart all-passionate for Thee!

WILL FOSTER.

OXFORD CONFERENCE ON PRIESTHOOD AND SACRIFICE.

Priesthood and Sacrifice. Report of a Conference. Edited by W. SANDAY, D.D. (London : Longmans & Co. 1900.)

NO feature of modern Church life is more prominent or welcome than the tendency to union. Different Churches and different parties in the same Church are seeking common ground on which to act together. Formerly points of difference were emphasised, now points of agreement. The issue of these efforts will not be to discover that there are no points of difference, but to show that the differences have been exaggerated, and that the common truth has been overlooked. In Scotland, as we have seen, these movements have led to organic union. A sign of the same spirit is seen in the recent Oxford Conference between members of the Established Church and Nonconformist ministers. The idea was initiated and carried out by Dr. Sanday. The Conference was quite informal and private; no representative character was assumed, no resolutions were passed. The original scheme was that the Conference should consist of five High Churchmen, five Churchmen of other schools, and five Nonconformists, and this scheme with slight change was adhered to. The chief subject of discussion was wisely chosen; *viz.* the sacerdotal view of the Christian ministry, in order to ascertain the amount of agreement and difference. The subject is indeed a critical one. It focuses the greatest difference in Christendom, that between Rome and Protestantism. Other differences rise out of this one. It is known that the sacerdotal theory is held in some parts of the Established Church, while the Nonconformist Churches are one and all anti-sacerdotal.

This formed the centre of the discussion as it is the centre of our review. Other interesting topics which are suggested we pass by.

First, what do we understand by the sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry? It is that the Christian minister is a sacrificing priest, offering in the Eucharist a sacrifice to God for human sin. The term sacerdotal is often used in a loose, general sense. But this is the strict sense, the unscriptural sense as we hold, the only one that we are concerned to combat. This too is the meaning of the doctrine in the Roman Church, and the meaning which the Reformation rejected. The sacrificing priest and the sacrificial Eucharist go together. A priest must have a sacrifice to offer, a sacrifice must be offered by someone. Logically transubstantiation also is involved. The doctrine has no necessary connexion with apostolic succession and a high theory of the sacraments. All these may be held together, but not necessarily. In Lutheranism, which has no sacrificing priests or sacrificial Eucharist and no apostolic succession, a high doctrine of the sacraments is held. In the new High Churchism, as we shall see, there is a similar separation.

To what extent is the theory advocated in the Conference? As far as I can see, only by Father Puller.[1] This is no criterion of the extent to which it is held in the Church, because the Conference is not formally representative. But the fact is significant for this reason, that former representatives of the High Church school would have agreed with Father Puller, whereas Canon Gore and his brethren do not.

There can be no doubt as to the position taken up by the member of the Conference just mentioned. Father Puller maintains that Christ's sacrifice is constantly offered both in heaven and on earth. What Christ does in heaven the Church does on earth.

[1] At first, on account of some expressions on pages 25 and 31 as well as on account of the general line of reasoning, I thought Dr. Moberly stood on the same ground; but further reflection leads me to class him with Canon Gore.

The matter of the Church's sacrifice is primarily Christ's body and blood. It follows that the sacrifice which the Church offers is identical with the heavenly sacrifice which Christ offers. In other words, Christ's sacrifice is perpetuated, not only in heaven above, but also in His Church below.[1]

The apostolic ministry has succeeded into the place of the apostles, and carries on their prophetic, priestly, and kingly work.[2]

There can be no doubt that the ministerial priesthood under the new covenant can rightly be described as a sacrificing priesthood. To speak of a non-sacrificing priesthood would appear to me to be a misuse of terms.[3]

Much more might be quoted to the same effect. It is a curious argument to say that because Christ perpetually offers His sacrifice in heaven, it follows that His Church does the same on earth. Does it not rather follow that because Christ does it in heaven there is no need for it to be repeated on earth?

The argument in favour both of a general and special priesthood on which Dr. Moberly lays the greatest stress is the mystical union between Christ and the Church, He the Head, believers the members; therefore whatever is true of one is true of the other. This is the strangest use to which the union between Christ and His people was ever put. From the direct fellowship between Saviour and saved the necessity of human mediation between the two is argued.

The Church, as His mystical body, is wholly made one with His manhood, therefore it is wholly made one *par excellence* with His priesthood and sacrifice.[4]

What Christ is the Church is; because the Church is the body, whose breath is the spirit of Christ, because the Church is Christ.

He argues from the priestly character of the body to the priestly character of the ministers, whom he calls "ministerial organs of the Church's priesthood."[5] He says our

---

[1] Puller, p. 21. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 41. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 47.
[4] Dr. Moberly, p. 31. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

first inquiry should be what the whole body is, then what particular members are.[1] Some words are quoted from the late Dr. Milligan:

> The Church of Christ is a sacerdotal or priestly institution. Sacerdotalism, priestliness, is the prime element of her being.[2]

We cannot, however, conceive that Dr. Milligan, a Presbyterian, meant anything else than the moral priesthood of all believers. We are glad to find the universal priesthood of believers so emphatically asserted by all parties. But what can that mean save a moral, spiritual priesthood—*i.e.* priesthood in a metaphorical sense? How does that avail to prove that the ministry is a sacrificing priesthood in the strict sense? Dr. Moberly seems to argue that the priestly ministry represents the priestly Church. But if one is derived from the other, the priestliness of both must be of the same kind. Here there seems to us to be much confounding of things that differ. To serve the argument the entire Church must be sacrificing priests, and their functions then delegated to a smaller number. But in this case how would such a relation agree with the derivation of the priestly functions of the ministry, not from the Church, but by succession from the apostles? As to the union between Christ and believers, there must be a limit somewhere. As the Head is sinless and divine, is the body also sinless and divine? We need not say how this reasoning is repudiated on the other side. Dr. Davison says that while the thought of the mystic union is to be valued, there is nothing to show that it applies to Christ's sacrificial work.

> Is it not clear that the attempt to preserve it down the line of priesthood and sacrifice has brought in disputable and even mischievous elements?[3]

Again and again scriptural evidence is demanded, but it is not forthcoming, except in some indirect, inferential way of the most doubtful kind.

---

[1] Page 142. [2] Page 15; also p. 27. [3] Page 151.

Let us take another example of the arguments used. In the third discussion, quite apart from the appointed subject, Father Puller states his reasons for believing that in the act of institution our Lord was offering a sacrifice. First, the bread and wine, which both in the Levitical service and heathen sacrifices were used in sacrificial acts. Then, Christ identified these with His body and blood. Again, He was establishing a new covenant, and covenants were established with sacrifice. Then, the word "remembrance" or "memorial" in the Septuagint represents a Hebrew word which stands for a sacrificial offering on the altar. To us this piecing together of a few details seems a slender basis for so tremendous a dogma. But the speaker makes up for the weakness of his argument by the strength of his conclusion. He says:

> It would require very explicit and authoritative statements in the opposite direction to induce me to give up my belief that the Holy Eucharist was instituted by our Lord as a sacrifice, the earthly counterpart of the sacrificial oblation which is being carried on in the heavenly tabernacle.[1]

Dr. Davison replies:

> I find in the New Testament no warrant for speaking of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice.[2]

In the account of the institution in 1 Corinthians xi. there is no reference to any sacrificial aspect apart from the small details just mentioned. In what respect Father Puller's view differs from the Roman one we are not told.

Another important matter to be noticed is the attitude taken on this question by Canon Gore and the other High Churchmen. Again and again they affirm that Christ's sacrifice is *unique* in its propitiatory character, and that by consequence the eucharistic sacrifice is not propitiatory.

> The wisest and truest use of language appears to me to restrict the phrase propitiation or expiation to Christ's initial work for us; but to assert also that propitiation does not exhaust

---

[1] Page 136. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 131; see also Dr. Salmond, p. 111.

sacrifice, but rather restores the worshipper to its true and original exercise.[1]

I claim to confine the word propitiation to that inaugural act by which our Lord, treading the winepress alone, brought humanity by His single, incommunicable act into a new relation to God and inaugurated a new covenant.[2]

This language is echoed by Dr. Sanday, Dr. Ryle, Mr. Headlam, Canon Scott Holland. Dr. Ryle and Canon Bernard are always frankly evangelical.

I think we all on this side are conscious of the perils of sacerdotalism, which history has only too abundantly illustrated, and which we all must earnestly strive to counteract.[3]

There is no need to dwell further on statements so plain; we gladly recognise their significance. Sacrifice in the sense of propitiation or expiation is the only kind of sacrifice affirmed of the Eucharist. It is affirmed in this sense by the Roman Church and those who follow it. No other sense is ever suggested. And here this sense is disclaimed by the Oxford High Church school as explicitly as by the Nonconformist members of the Conference. Those who make such a disclaimer dissent utterly from the Roman doctrine. To them the Christian minister is not a sacrificing priest, nor is the Eucharist a sacrifice in the proper sense. On this vital question they are with us, not with Rome, and not with Pusey, Newman, and the first Tractarians, *i.e.* they are Protestants, whether they like the word or not.

True, differences remain on other questions such as Apostolic Succession, the Sacraments, the Real Presence. Canon Gore several times reminds us that propitiation does not exhaust the meaning of sacrifice, intimating that the Eucharist is a real sacrifice in another sense; but he gives no hint what that sense is.[4] There seems to us to be here again confusion of thought. Although renouncing the propitiatory sense of sacrifice, Canon Gore does not rest in

---

[1] Page 96. [2] Page 113. [3] Canon Gore, p. 148.
[4] Except a dark hint on p. 113.

the spiritual or metaphorical sense of sacrifice and priest. He says: "The Church's acts or attributes of priesthood are no more 'metaphorical' than Christ's."[1] They are not sacrificial in the propitiatory sense. What are they then? We get no answer. This qualification seems to be advanced as a reason for retaining the old priestly language in a different sense. We venture to submit that when phrases have acquired in usage a certain fixed meaning, it is in the highest degree undesirable to continue their use in another sense. Here Father Puller on one side and Canon Gore on the other would use priesthood and sacrifice in quite different senses. Taking different views of the ministry and the Eucharist, they describe them in the same terms. What can be more confusing and misleading? But it has been done already on an extensive scale. Who can doubt that "priest" as sanctioned by the Reformers in the Prayer-Book meant simply presbyter? It is constantly quoted in a quite different sense.

More than one Nonconformist member of the Conference refers to the fact that the New Testament never applies the proper term for priest to the Christian minister.[2] Canon Gore may well speak of "the spare use of priestly terms for the ministry in the New Testament."[3] This is not done even in the Hebrews, which is full of priesthood and sacrifice. All through the post-apostolic age and the second century no sacerdotal teaching is found. It begins to emerge in the first part of the third century, and appears in strong form in Cyprian in the middle of that century. Whether even Cyprian represented the mind of the whole Church any more than Pusey and Newman in later days is a moot point.

An interesting by-discussion is raised by Dr. Moberly, who finds the essence of Christ's propitiation in penitence; Christ performed a great act of penitence for the world. The notion is taken from Dr. McLeod Campbell. The theory is that there is something propitiatory in all peni-

[1] Page 133 [2] See Dr. Salmond, p. 111. [3] Page 45.

tence; our penitence is necessarily imperfect; but Christ by His perfect knowledge and sympathy with righteousness could offer to God a perfect penitence. The idea of vicarious repentance and of this in a sinless being, is incongruous, as Drs. Fairbairn and Salmond do not fail to point out.

The subject proposed for the third discussion was "The Church and the Transmission of Priestly Authority." The subject itself is a wide one, raising Apostolical Succession and the Episcopal Power, and the time was further narrowed by the digression of Father Puller already alluded to. On the subject of "The Church, its Functions and Continuity," there is greater solidarity on the Anglican side. Here its spokesmen stood side by side. But as we have merely statements, without exposition and discussion, there is no need to enter on the subject at length.

On one more subject there is unanimity all round—"The Existence and Place of the Christian Church." It seems to have been a pleasing surprise to the Anglican members to find the other side so positive in its assertion of a lofty conception of the Church. It need not have been. Nonconformity does not mean individualism. Nonconformity and Puritanism have never questioned the necessity and rights of the Church, or even of definite outward forms of Church life. They have simply protested against certain forms or against the identifying of the Church with certain forms. They have contended for a spiritual as against a worldly Church. They do not object to episcopacy as one form, but to episcopacy as the one form of Church life. The difficulty on the other side has always been to conceive of a Church apart from highly organised institutions and even apart from episcopal forms. An attempt was made in the discussion by Dr. Fairbairn to identify transmission with continuity,[1] but it failed. Of course Nonconformists value continuity; we hold that we are continuous with the apostles and the early Church.

[1] Page 126.

Directly details are touched, differences arise. Dr. Fairbairn tries to pin down Dr. Moberly to the saying of Irenæus, that "where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God."[1] But Dr. Moberly will not accept the converse. He says:

> I do not think it would be right to say *simpliciter*, or in the way of definition upon earth, that where the Spirit of Christ is, there is the Church.[2]

In other words, there must be "a true and proper outward organisation of the Church, and in the orderly continuity of that organisation is the due historical expression of the Spirit on earth." Experience proves that the highest saintliness exists apart from particular organisations.

Another question which arises is, Which is first, the individual believer or the Church? Here different answers are given. Nonconformists say that individuals are first saved and then incorporated in the Church. Dr. Salmond says:

> I cannot say that the Church makes the individual member. I say rather that the individual members make what we call the Church.[3]

Canon Gore seems to concede something when he says:

> There is no being in Christ, except as a member of the community. I quite admit that those who become Christians in the belief of the heart are at first outside the body, and the faith that leads them into the body comes to them through the Spirit of Christ.[4]

Dr. Sanday calls attention to three results in the Conference emphasised by Dr. Salmond. 1. All acknowledge the absolute uniqueness of Christ's work and our dependence

---

[1] Page 167.

[2] Page 168. Dr. Salmond remarks that both statements are found in Irenæus.

[3] Page 166. [4] Page 167.

on it. This applies even to the extreme party. The Roman Church derives all priestly authority and sacrificial efficacy on earth from Christ's priestly character and work. We may say that practically this is neutralised by the concentration of interest on the earthly side. Still, the fact ought not to be ignored. Among all others the uniqueness of Christ's work is undisputed and unqualified. 2. All acknowledge the universal priesthood of believers. This again includes all the Churches. The Roman Church admits it, although, as we hold, it greatly limits the principle in application. 3. All find the essence of the Church in its spiritual character. Organisation, legal form, is secondary. Here too similar comments may be made. But in the last resort it is true of all. Dr. Sanday adds another point of harmony. All sought to put the best construction on the views advanced, in other words, put themselves at the others' point of view, instead of forcing their own interpretation on others. If this rule had been generally observed in the Church, the number of divisions would have been far fewer.

Dr. Sanday and others appeal to Nonconformists to help them in teaching the true ideas of Christian priesthood and sacrifice instead of attacking false views under the name of sacerdotalism. With all goodwill we scarcely know how to respond. The only priesthood of believers we know is a spiritual one. We are priests unto God as we are kings. The only sacrifices are spiritual sacrifices,—praise, prayers, saintly character, righteous living. On all this we are ever insisting. If we can do so more emphatically, we ought and will. How to give a sacrificial character to the Lord's Supper, we do not know. It is the memorial of a sacrifice, of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; there can be no second sacrifice, and therefore no second priest. The greatness of the Supper lies in the fact of the uniqueness of that which it commemorates. Perhaps we do not emphasise as we ought the truth we hold on this subject. We need not fear that the memorial will take the place of the sacrifice, the sign of the grace signified, the minister of the divine Priest.

In this sense only can we preach the true doctrine of priesthood and sacrifice.[1]

There can be no doubt that the late Conference, by promoting a better understanding on vital questions, will tend to peace and co-operation in Christian work. The surprise at the amount of truth held in common seems to have been great on both sides. It was a discovery, a revelation. We know how the tide of union is flowing in other directions. Nonconformist Churches are linked together as they never were before. And we rejoice to see a conviction expressed in so many quarters in the Established Church that the old attitude of aloofness from, not to say hostility to, Nonconformity is out of date. The change opens up glorious possibilities of united action in matters of social and moral reform in the nation. Our dissensions and conflicts have been the opportunity of the colossal evils that are preying on the national life. The greatest barrier to Church union is the sacerdotal doctrine. But, unless we are mistaken, this is more and more losing its hold on English Christian life. The recent Conference is one of many proofs of this, and there is no other formidable barrier. Let there be union, trust, love among all English Christians—one mind, one heart, one purpose—and the English people and English Christianity will advance and conquer together.

JOHN S. BANKS.

---

[1] Page 148, Canon Gore says: "I believe we could make one important step towards agreement if we all realised that the true way of counteracting the evils of a false sacerdotalism lies in emphasising not in minimising the priestly character of the Christian life and society as a whole."

The World of Books.

I. THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS.

Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament. By G. Adam Smith, D.D. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 6s.)

THE eight lectures of which this volume is composed were delivered on the Lyman Beecher Foundation at Yale University in 1899. Few living men could be as well fitted to deal with their subject as Dr. G. Adam Smith. He is a critic and a preacher—eminent alike in both departments. He has proved, in his commentaries on Isaiah and the Twelve Minor Prophets, how thoroughly he is versed in critical analysis and in the work of bringing home the lessons of the prophets to "the business and bosoms" of men in these later days. Professor Smith claims in these lectures to set forth and prove the Christian right of criticism. This is still necessary for many, and the author accomplishes his task reasonably and well. He also gives an account of the modern critical movement, so far as the Old Testament is concerned. This was possibly desirable, though many such accounts have been given, and no one can have anything new to say about it. But the last of the objects enumerated in the preface is the chief, and the one which invests the book with its real interest—to furnish an appreciation of the effects of recent criticism "upon the Old Testament as History and as the Record of a Divine Revelation."

Many persons who have looked askance at the work of modern criticism upon the Old Testament will feel at least partially reassured by Professor Smith's vindication of the reality of the divine revelation contained in the Old Testament Scriptures, even should some of the more extreme theories of the date and authorship of its documents be accepted. The postponement of a large portion of the Law to a date considerably after that of the chief Prophets is not the main difficulty. The surrender of

the narratives of the patriarchs as trustworthy history, and the acceptance of the fact that we have little real knowledge of Israel before the time of the Judges or the early Kings, will occasion much more disturbance of mind. We advise our readers to study carefully what Professor Smith has to say on these points. Though we are not prepared ourselves to accept all his conclusions, it is easy to see whither the researches of modern scholarship are tending, and it is well that there should be devout and evangelical exponents of critical theories, and that the whole subject should not be left to men of rationalistic spirit and temper.

One of the most interesting chapters of the book deals with Messianic prophecies. This is a subject which needs careful but thorough handling in our theological schools. Many of the views of prophecy current a generation ago are quite untenable to-day; and a student who is brought suddenly face to face with some of the difficulties caused by the earlier theories is only too apt to lose faith in prophecy altogether. Professor Adam Smith's treatment of the Immanuel prophecy of Isaiah vii. on page 160, and the prophecies of Isaiah ix. and xi. on page 161, furnishes good examples of his method. We are glad to see that he does not fall in with the fashionable interpretation of "the servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah liii. as collective Israel. One interesting point which the lecturer makes is to lead us away from several passages of the Old Testament which have generally been supposed specially to prefigure Christ—*e.g.* the Levitical sacrifices and the celebration of royal dignities and conquests—to other passages which dwell on the grace and pity of God Himself and "the sufferings of the righteous and the vicarious strife and agony of the heroes of Israel."

Our space does not admit either of an exposition or a criticism of the eloquent professor's views. There are certain points which we should feel compelled to criticise, but more which we should be happy simply to expound and commend. On the subject of the ethical and social teaching of the prophets Dr. Smith is, as might be expected, strong and effective. We should ourselves have been glad of an even fuller statement of his own views and rather less of the history of exegesis in the past. But we are grateful for a living, earnest, and useful book —one in many respects well calculated to reassure anxious minds in these days of questioning and transition.

W. T. Davison.

The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation: The Positive Development of the Doctrine. By Albrecht Ritschl. English translation edited by H. R. Mackintosh, D.Phil., and A. B. Macaulay, M.A. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 14*s*.)

Ritschl's system of theology is contained in three volumes, dealing respectively with the historical, biblical, and positive aspects of the subject. The first volume was translated about twenty years ago; the third, containing the author's own system, is now reproduced in English. Whether the second will be translated does not appear. But the third assumes the results of the second volume. In the former Ritschl constantly refers to his exegesis in the latter. Here the results appear without the alleged biblical basis. The present volume will be valuable to those who are already initiated in the writer's teaching, but not to others. The teaching is so peculiar and the style so abstract and cumbrous as to unfit the work to serve as an introduction. Justification is completely identified with forgiveness. Every legal or forensic element is eliminated. The same is true of reconciliation. Propitiation or expiation in every sense is excluded, and is said to be opposed to the Scripture idea of sacrifice as explained in the second volume. Justification is an attribute of the Church or Community only; fellowship with the Church is a condition. Original sin is denied. A very different meaning is given to the divinity of Christ. He is said to be divine as the Revealer of God. How that constitutes divinity we are nowhere told. Our belief in Him as divine is a "value-judgment." "The nature of God and the divine we can only know in its essence by determining its value for our salvation." Prophets are revealers of God. Are they, then, in their degree divine? There is no mention in the chapter on "The Doctrine of God" of the Trinity. We are not irrevocably committed to ancient definitions of the doctrine; but it is strange to find no reference to it. Retributive righteousness has no place in the divine character. "God's righteousness is His self-consistent and undeviating action in behalf of the salvation of the members of His community; in essence it is identical with His grace." Perhaps the strangest position of all is that "*Christ is first of all a priest in His own behalf* before He is a priest for others." But then, according to Ritschl, the priest's only work is drawing near to God, not

offering expiatory sacrifice (p. 474). In one chapter forgiveness seems to be based on Christ's work and passion, but the connexion is not explained. It is not difficult to discern the trend of the new theology. J. S. BANKS.

Truth and Reality, with Special Reference to Religion, or a Plea for the Unity of the Spirit and the Unity of Life in all its Manifestations. By John Smyth, M.A., D.Phil. (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark. 4*s*.)

The title scarcely indicates the purport of this book. The volume better deserves to be called a Philosophy of Religion than many more ambitious works bearing that name. It deals in a very original, thorough, and convincing way with the question which underlies all religion—the reality, unity, and supremacy of man's spiritual nature. The reasoning is very clear and compact. The author, while evidently familiar with the leading philosophies of the day, has thought out his own conclusions, in one instance breaking a lance with the learned author of the "Introductory Note," and in another with Mr. Kidd and Mr. Balfour.

The author's thesis is that the spiritual in man is the only explanation of the world and man. The terminology is somewhat strange to English readers. "The Given" is the non-ego, all that exists independently of us. Naturalism is one professed explanation of this ; and the castigation which the theory receives in the first chapter is very refreshing. It can explain neither the unity of self-consciousness in us nor the sense of obligation. It is also built upon *petitiones principii*. "Every form of naturalism, in spite of itself, implies a spirit in man other and higher than the given or non-spiritual, which it asserts is the all." In the same chapter the idealistic or speculative theories, which use intellect alone, are similarly criticised. Feeling and Will have claims as well as Reason. The spirit includes all three. Having shown the failure of naturalism, the writer proceeds to argue the sufficiency of the spiritualistic explanation, with its ideals of absolute truth and goodness. Science, art, morals, history, are shown to be inexplicable without such ideals. There is much wholesome thinking here. The third chapter is the longest and richest in the volume, discussing the "Given," Experience, Fact, Truth, Reason. Here is one passage : "Necessary thought and

necessary existence are postulates of our thinking and existence. It is folly to talk of proving everything mathematically. We cannot prove we are alive except by living; we cannot prove we are moral except by being moral; we cannot prove we love except by loving. The necessary laws of thought cannot be so proved; they are supposed in the very attempt which seeks to prove them." "When a religious man sincerely exclaims, 'This I must believe, or life is a lie, a fraud, and a madhouse,' he has given a proof for his position which no sceptic can overturn." The exposition of the nature of Truth is very fine. The last chapter on Religion as a Manifestation of the Spirit is a piece of closely knit argument. Religion is shown to answer all the tests of truth and reality. The whole work is a masterly apology for the spiritual view of life and the world. J. S. B.

Sermons on Faith and Doctrine. By the late Benjamin Jowett, M.A., Master of Balliol College. Edited by the Very Rev. W. H. Fremantle, D.D., Dean of Ripon. (London: John Murray. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This third volume of the late Professor Jowett's sermons does not compare favourably with his "College" sermons, or those styled "biographical." Jowett was not a theologian. He disliked and distrusted "doctrine," and though he did possess "faith" in certain great verities, his mind was essentially critical, and there was little that was contagious or inspiring about his religious beliefs. Dean Fremantle, in a preface to this volume, protests against the charge that Jowett "held lightly by Christianity itself, and was content with a vague theism." We have examined the sermons carefully in the light of these words, and are compelled to come to the conclusion that the charge is in the main true. Perhaps the epithet "vague" may be disputed, and it is perfectly true that Jowett did not "hold lightly by" Christ as an ethical teacher. But of the person and work of Christ, and the great doctrines of Incarnation and Atonement, we naturally find little or nothing in these pages, and for ourselves we cannot think of "Christianity" without them. A pure and lofty theism, with Christ as its main prophet, would, we imagine, fairly describe Jowett's religion; though it is significant enough that these sermons were mostly preached from twenty-five to thirty years ago, and in his later days Jowett's faith dwindled rather than grew. All

that Dean Fremantle claims for him is that sometimes he would speak of Christ as "our Saviour," or as "the expression of the divine nature in a human form"; but none of the sermons lead us beyond the position that in Christ we have a Revealer of the will of God, and an Exemplar in action and in suffering.

To hold this "faith" and preach this "doctrine" is something in days of materialism and agnosticism, but experience has shown how inadequate is such a gospel for the uplifting and renewal of the world. Jowett in these sermons shows himself a colder Martineau, with no fuller Christian creed than the famous Unitarian teacher, and with much less devout faith and inspiring imagination. The closing sermon on Friendship is a specimen of the kind of "moral essay" which suited best the genius of the late Master of Balliol. W. T. D.

Jesus Christ and the Social Question. By F. G. Peabody. (London: Macmillan & Co. 6*s.*)

The writer of this delightful volume remarks that a Christian reformer may legitimately pray in the present age: "Create a better social order, O God, and renew a right relation between various classes of men"; but he considers that a much deeper and worthier petition would be, as it was of old: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." This indicates the writer's point of view in interpreting the teaching of Jesus in its relation to modern social problems. It is not easy to find a book on these questions which is not vitiated by the falsehood of extremes. On the one hand, we have the atheistic socialism of Engels, Marx, and Belfort Bax—frankly irreligious and frankly blasphemous. (The latter, *e.g.*, resents "the continual reference of ideal perfection to a semi-mythical Syrian of the first century," finding that the modern world offers higher types of humanity!) On the other hand, we have the socialism which would reconstruct society according to the principles of Christian ethics, while rejecting the Christian religion. Mr. Peabody, in an argument characterised by a charming lucidity and directness of expression, appears to us to move straight to the truth. Christ is not the creator of a mechanical and external system in which character is of subsidiary importance. His way of approaching the life of His age, and therefore, we may say, of all ages, was "by interior inspiration, by the quickening of individuals, by the force of

personality, or, so to speak, from within." He is a teacher, not of "industrial mechanics, but of spiritual dynamics." We have found this book a most suggestive and sane exposition of the teaching of Jesus concerning the family, the rich, the care of the poor, and the industrial order. It deserves to have a wide circulation among those who seek light on the whole question of the reform of the social order—a problem which is widely considered to be *the* problem of the new century.

R. M. Pope.

Evening Thoughts. By Rev. Paton J. Gloag, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 4*s*.)

There is pathos in the title of this book—pathos, too, in the fact that it is dedicated to three parishes in which the author laboured as a minister for nearly fifty years. The associations which gather round the sermons of the past are not unlike those which hallow an ancient dwelling-place; and the memory of a valued ministry, perpetuated in a record like this, will surely find a circle of appreciative readers. But we question Dr. Gloag's wisdom in presenting these sermons of other days in a condensed form. Condensation too often removes the human touches, the gleams of fancy, the illustrations that go to make up the immediate effectiveness of discourse. Nevertheless, these sermons are marked by the Scotch solidity of thought and sobriety and dignity of expression. Possibly many will desiderate a certain freshness and crispness in the presentation of the truths that are unfolded; but all will feel that they bear out the author's statement that he has "always endeavoured to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ." R. M. P.

The Preacher's Dictionary. A Biblical Conspectus, and Compendium of Religious and Secular Thought, past and present, topically arranged. By F. E. Cavalier, M.A., Rector of Wramplingham. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 12*s*.)

Mr. Cavalier has aimed in this volume to supply a synopsis of essentials for sermon production. He gives an accurate definition of each subject, a conspectus of Bible teaching, and a compendium of thought, ancient and modern. The range of subjects is somewhat limited, but each subject is treated with considerable fulness, and the quotations are often fresh and always suggestive. The handling of such a topic as the Atone-

ment shows the value of the Dictionary, and ministers with somewhat limited libraries will find here much helpful matter carefully arranged. It is a workmanlike book.

1. *Palestine in Geography and in History.* By A. W. Cooke, M.A. With Topographical Index and Maps. Vol. I. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 2*s.* 6*d.*)
2. *First Steps in New Testament Greek.* By J. A. Clapperton, M.A. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 1*s.* 6*d.*)

1. Mr. Cooke has given us a valuable handbook. He has made good use of the publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund and of Dr. G. A. Smith's classic, and has mastered the literature of the whole subject, so that his book is packed with matter, and is so clear and pleasantly written that it ought to be really popular. The interest of such a study grows on everyone who undertakes it, and a student could not have a better guide than Mr. Cooke. He deals in his first section with the geography and history of the whole country, then he treats Galilee and Samaria in detail. Judæa is to come in the second volume. The maps are excellent, and every lover of the Bible will find this a charming and most helpful book.

2. Mr. Clapperton divides his study of New Testament Greek into twenty-six lessons, so that anyone who will master one per week may be able to read the Greek Testament in less than six months. He has aimed at the utmost possible simplicity, and has provided exercises which enable a young student to test his progress from step to step and make sure of his ground. The printing and arrangement are as good as they can be, and the book will be a boon to young students who have to work alone. They will find their way made easy, and will soon get a firm grasp of the rudiments. The book is a thoroughly good one.

The Preacher's Magazine. For Preachers, Teachers, and Bible Students. Editors: Mark Guy Pearse, Arthur E. Gregory. Vol. XI. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 5*s.*)

This annual volume helps us to appreciate more justly the value of *The Preacher's Magazine*. It is admirably edited, and has a staff of devoted contributors, who provide sermons, notes on books, and Bible subjects of great variety and rich in helpful matter. The notices of books are a useful guide to buyers, and students will find stimulus and instruction on every page.

Journal of Theological Studies. Vol. II., No. 6. January, 1901. (London: Macmillan & Co. 3*s.* net. Annual subscription, 10*s.*)

Dr. Lock contributes a very suggestive study of Balaam's character, adducing many heathen analogies. Dr. Strong begins what promises to be an exhaustive study of the theological term "Substance." Dr. Llewellyn Davies comments on Dr. Sanday's paper in a former number on the "Righteousness of God in St. Paul." Dr. Swete has a most interesting review of Archbishop Benson's "Study" of the Apocalypse. The Review grows in learned value and usefulness.

The new volume of *The Biblical Illustrator* (Nisbet & Co., 7*s.* 6*d.*) deals with the First and Second Books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. There is a wealth of good illustrative matter here for teachers and preachers. Much of it is very fresh, and all of it is helpful. Mr. Exell is to be congratulated on a capital volume dealing with a part of the Bible that is of growing interest and value.

Until the Day Break, by William Landels, D.D. (2*s.* 6*d.*), is a selection from the writings of a greatly honoured minister. It has been prepared by his son, and is intended for the comfort of mourners. It is a rich and ripe book that seems to scatter fear and bring light and help for life's bitterest hours.

Confession and Absolution. Hooker's Sixth Book. Edited by Rev. John Harding, M.A. (London: C. Murray. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

A timely republication of Hooker's learned and judicious discussion of the nature of spiritual jurisdiction, penitency, and absolution. Mr. Harding has written a capital introduction, and his summary of contents, biographical and other notes, will be very useful to readers of this masterpiece.

II. FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation. By D. S. Margoliouth, M.A. (London: Hodder & Stoughton.)

THE papers which compose this volume appeared originally in the *Expositor*. Professor Margoliouth's position in relation to biblical criticism is probably well known to our readers. While accepting many of the premisses of modern critics, he dissents from some of their main conclusions, and represents a conservative reaction against the excessive analysis and post-dating of documents at present fashionable. Unfortunately the learned professor does not always exhibit judgment equal to his erudition. The volume before us, while containing some sound and well reasoned arguments, teems with examples of doubtful exegesis and strained conclusions, which greatly diminish confidence in the author's trustworthiness as a guide. In his very preface he commits himself to a fanciful interpretation of Ecclus. xxxvi. 20 (15), finding a reference to the Bible in the words of the former clause, which, to say the least, is highly questionable.

Professor Margoliouth in this volume seeks to prove among other things that the Book of Wisdom is a translation from the Hebrew ("practically certain," p. 11), to "demonstrate" (p. 42) that it was "a Hebrew classic to Ben Sira," and to establish "the strong probability that the work which ascribes itself to Solomon is really Solomon's" (p. 62). He gives his readers the alternative of viewing the book as "either genuine or else a deliberate fabrication," just as in the case of Isaiah xl.—lxvi. he lays it down that the author is "either a prophet or a great rogue and impostor," implying that the probability is that the chapters were written by the son of Amoz. But the main arguments on which Professor Margoliouth depends are linguistic, and of a very doubtful kind. All students of literature know how frail and untrustworthy are most attempts to determine priority between two parallel passages on literary grounds alone. Whole pages of this volume, learned and interesting as it is, would count for little or nothing in the estimation of the best judges. The attempt to show that phrases in Isaiah "can

most easily be understood as allusions to the work of the earlier classic"—the Book of Wisdom—might easily be turned the other way. Several pages are occupied with the attempt to prove that "the prophetic terminology which is already familiar to Isaiah appears in Wisdom to be in course of formation," but we venture to say that they will convince few besides the erudite and ingenious author himself.

Now, all this is very unfortunate in the case of a writer who charges the reigning school of critics with establishing bold conclusions upon flimsy and unsubstantial foundations. In some respects he may be right. The argument "from silence" and the argument from what Mr. Margoliouth awkwardly calls "tendentious alterations" have both been greatly over-strained by many modern critics. But it does not lie with a critic who argues from doubtful linguistic premisses to press home this charge. It is probable that the reaction against the traditional ascription of most psalms to David has been carried much too far, but no careful student of the subject is likely to be convinced of this by Professor Margoliouth's ingenuities concerning David's "divan." Amongst a score of similar futilities he argues from Psalm lxxi. 15 that the psalmist "*could not write*." "My mouth shall recount Thy righteousness—for I know not how to write." This is supposed to be established by comparison of the phrase with Isaiah xxix. 12, and the language of Psalm cxix. 13 and xlv. 2. So as we read Professor Margoliouth's attempt to show that Daniel "formed part of Ben Sira's canon," without any recognition of the weighty internal evidence as to date found in the Book of Daniel itself, we cannot help wondering whether he seriously expects to overthrow the conclusions of modern criticism by means of ingenious verbal arguments to show that "Ben Sira identified the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel with the Daniel of the book that bears his name."

This volume makes but slight reference to the controversy in which Professor Margoliouth has engaged concerning the Cairene Ecclesiasticus. But he is as scornful as ever of the critical acumen of critics who could be "deceived for a day" into accepting the recently discovered document as dating from the second century B.C. He has pledged his critical reputation on the success of his undertaking to prove it to be a work of the eleventh century A.D., but at present, as far as we can gather, he stands almost alone in this belief. We regret to say that

the greater part of the reasoning in this volume concerning the dates of biblical documents appears to us of a kind ill-suited to constitute a "line of defence of the biblical revelation."

W. T. DAVISON.

Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament. By Eb. Nestlé. Translated by W. Edie, B.D. (London : Williams & Norgate. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Professor Nestlé is well known in this country as a biblical critic and a writer on biblical subjects generally. His edition of the Greek Testament for the Stuttgart Bible Society has been much appreciated in this country, and many will welcome this exposition of the principles on which, in his view, a sound text should be constructed. It is an authorised translation of the second German edition, with corrections by the author. The work consists of four parts: a history of the printed text since 1514, a full description of the materials for textual criticism, a discussion of "theory and praxis," and tolerably full "critical notes" on certain important passages, which illustrate Professor Nestlé's method at work. In each case the subject is brought up to date; a matter of some importance at a time when the chief works in use in this country—Westcott and Hort, Scrivener, Hammond, Warfield, and others—cannot be said to embody the latest results of inquiry, especially in relation to the "Western" text and its value.

Professor Nestlé furnishes materials for judgment rather than elaborates a theory of his own. In this he is wise. The time is not yet ripe for a final word on one or two points of importance. But the tendency of the author's remarks may be gathered from his criticisms of Westcott and Hort. "Undoubtedly," says Dr. Nestlé, "Hort has established the principle that the restoration of the text must be grounded on the study of its history, and no one has studied that history as carefully has Hort has done." But it is still a question whether Hort's interpretation of the history is correct, whether he does not follow B too closely, whether what he calls the Neutral text is the original, and whether he is fair to the Western text in labelling nearly all its additions as interpolations and corruptions. "I cannot presume to judge; but I have the feeling that the history of the transmission of our New Testament text must be studied in quite another way from that in which it has been done hitherto, and in a twofold direction:

"(1) The manuscripts and their relation to each other must be subjected to a still more searching investigation, and

"(2) The works of the ecclesiastical writers, especially the Commentaries and the Catenæ, must be thoroughly explored for any information they may have to give regarding the history of the text of the New Testament, and these two results must then be set in relation to each other."

These general statements fairly represent a reaction against the rigorous application of Hort's method, of which we see several signs in Germany and in this country. No one questions the great value of the text known by the name of Westcott and Hort, nor the general principles of the genealogical method laid down by Dr. Hort in his masterly essay. The question is whether his application "with rigour and vigour" of his abstract principles, resulting as it has done in so general a glorification of B, does not need to be modified considerably in practice. Dr. Salmon of Dublin, in his good-humoured, bantering fashion, has pointed out some of the weaknesses of Dr. Hort's theory and some questionable results of its application. Dr. Nestlé to some extent follows suit. But it is not very easy to understand the principles on which the latter works. They appear to be eclectic, and we should desire to consider them more at length and in detail before forming a final judgment on their value. At present it appears to us as if Dr. Nestlé had done little more than put in a kind of plea in arrest of judgment, a "demurrer," giving in his own notes his conclusions on definite passages, but not furnishing a guide for students who wish their "praxis" to be governed by a definite "theory."

The book, however, is full of interest, well arranged, admirably printed, and illustrated by interesting facsimiles. It should find a place in the library of every student of the text of the New Testament. W. T. D.

The Historical New Testament: being the Literature of the New Testament arranged in the Order of its Literary Growth, and according to the Dates of the Documents. A new translation, edited, with Prolegomena, Historical Tables, Critical Notes, and an Appendix, by James Moffat, B.D. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 16*s*.)

This is the first attempt on a large scale to naturalise the results of negative New Testament criticism in this country.

Respecting the learning and ability of the work there can be no question. The author seems to have read and mastered everything written in recent days on the subject in Germany as well as farther west, and he is master of his knowledge down to the smallest detail. As a mine of information on all modern theories, especially on the negative side, the work will have great value. The Prolegomena, Historical Tables, Appendix of a hundred pages, elaborate indices testify to enormous labour. Vulnerable points are plentiful. Generally speaking, the final result is to reduce the New Testament to the same fragmentary and uncertain condition that criticism brings the Old into. On what evidence? The main difference between the old and the new criticism is that the former relies on external evidence, the testimony of "historical" witnesses; the latter upon internal, upon analysis, and dissection of the contents. Both lines of proof are necessary, one checking and supplementing the other. If the internal method was formerly almost ignored, now its use is enormously exaggerated. In the present work only slight reference is made to the really "historical" evidence in the introductory notes to the different books; the old writers on the Canon are passed by; the old method is apparently regarded as obsolete. And yet the opinions of later writers and the usage of the Church must have some weight. On the other hand, while judgment from the nature of the contents has its place, it is peculiarly liable to deflection by the idiosyncrasies of the judge. In courts of justice such evidence only comes in as secondary. It is impossible not to feel that writers of this school unintentionally come to their work with certain preconceptions which greatly influence their conclusions. Results reached by only one line of inquiry can scarcely be called "historical." We must protest against the misappropriation of a fine term and method by the negative school.

As to the results advocated, the following books are denied to their professed authors—all the Gospels except perhaps Mark, Acts, all the Johannine writings, the pastoral epistles, the catholic epistles, many being brought down to a very late date. Even as to 1 Peter it is said, "No case for the authenticity of the writing amounts to much more than a combination of slender probabilities." 2 Cor. i.—xiii. 10 is printed as "an intermediate letter." These are tolerably sweeping conclusions, to say nothing of alleged interpolations on an extensive scale.

Only the most stringent proof would justify changes much less radical. Evidence on the other side already exists in many writers, who are certainly mentioned by the author of the present work. It is curious that in most cases the author speaks highly of works whose authenticity and composition he criticises adversely. The Apocalypse is regarded as made up of the most heterogeneous materials. Yet it is "a glowing unity." "The whole book is a religious and artistic masterpiece of its class," like a king's robe made out of patches from a dust-heap. Of the Fourth Gospel we are told, "The treatment of the subject in form and contents constantly exhibits the careful and speculative grasp of a trained thinker." Strange that there should be so many unknown philosophers, historians, and moralists of the highest genius. The contents of 1 John are criticised less favourably (p. 534). Many far more drastic opinions and theories we pass by. J. S. BANKS.

The Book of Numbers. Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text. By Rev. J. A. Paterson, D.D. (London: D. Nutt.)

The last issue of Professor Haupt's "Sacred Books of the Old Testament" is before us in Dr. Paterson's edition of *Numbers*. The polychrome method of indicating authorship has resulted in this instance in a very gorgeous display of colouring. The main body of the book—understood to belong to the Priestly Code compiled in Babylonia about 500 B.C.—is printed on a white background without colour. But about eight colours are needed to distinguish the Judaic document, the Ephramitic document, the document blended of these two, the Deuteronomistic expansions, the later strata of the priestly code, the "law of holiness" document, the later additions to the Balaam prophecies, and some other documents into which the marvellous "science" of the nineteenth century has resolved the ancient book of Numbers. This critical edition reaches us at the very end of a busy century; what will the critics of a hundred years hence say of its elaborate analysis? We would give something to know. W. T. D.

III. HISTORY.

Christianity in the Apostolic Age. By G. T. Purves, D.D., LL.D. With Maps. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 6s.)

THIS volume belongs to "The Historical Series for Bible Students," written and edited by American professors. It suggests comparison with Mr. Bartlet's volume on the same subject, which also forms part of an American series. The mode of treatment is different. Mr. Bartlet's work discusses general ideas and principles, and is full of stimulating suggestion. The present work limits itself much more to the sphere of historical fact, which it faithfully reproduces in consecutive order. The service it renders is to bring the stages in the rise and growth of the Apostolic Church implicitly contained in scattered form in the Acts and Epistles into one connected view, and it does this in a very complete way. Each one of the five parts states first the books of the New Testament which supply the material for the part in question. Thus the whole of the New Testament is brought under review. The author's position is decidedly conservative. He has taken it "only after careful and candid investigation; and, if the result is to uphold in all essential points the traditional conception of Apostolic Christianity, it has been because such appears to me to be the inevitable issue of unprejudiced inquiry." The "Johannean literature" is earnestly defended. The inferiority of post-apostolic writings is emphasised in opposition to the present effort to abolish all distinction between them and the apostolic. The author takes into account the most recent theories. There is a useful Appendix on the Chronology of the Apostolic Age.

J. S. B.

The Paston Letters (1422–1509 A.D.). A Reprint of the Edition of 1872–5, which contained upwards of Five Hundred Letters, etc., till then unpublished, to which are now added others in a Supplement after the Introduction. Edited by James Gairdner, of the Public

Record Office. (Westminster: A. Constable & Co. Four Volumes. 21*s.* net.)

It is more than a century since the Paston Letters were first published. Horace Walpole grew enthusiastic when they reached his hands. "To me," he said, "they make all other letters not worth reading. I have gone through one volume, and cannot bear to be writing when I am so eager to be reading." The letters were written by or addressed to various members of an old Norfolk family at Paston, and had the good fortune to be preserved after the family became extinct. Mr. Gairdner's account of the MSS. is quite a romance, and it becomes even more romantic after their first publication by Mr. Fenn, a country gentleman, in 1787. He gave the originals to George III., then they disappeared for a century, till they were discovered at Orwell Park in Suffolk. The letters throw no little light on State matters in the days of Henry VI., Edward IV., and Richard III. Here are letters written in the midst of Jack Cade's rebellion and just after the battles of Towton and Barnet. Henry VI. and Edward IV. become quite familiar figures as one turns over these old letters. We see Sir John Paston treating with their new neighbour, Lady Boleyn, for his brother's marriage, but he writes: "I kannot in no wyse fynde hyr a greable that ye scholde have her dowter." She assured him, however, that she would not oppose the match if the young people desired it, and Sir John advises his brother to see the daughter herself. Nothing, however, came of the suggestion. The family life at Paston is somewhat sordid. There seems to be an absence of domestic affection. Children, "especially daughters, were a mere burden to their parents. They must be sent away from home to learn manners, and to be out of the way. As soon as they grow up, efforts must be made to marry them, and get them off their parents' hands for good." Elizabeth Paston, as we find from a friend's letter of 1449, "was never in so gret sorow as sche is now a dayes, for sche may not speke with no man, ho so ever come, ne not may se ne speke with my man, ne with servauntes of hir moderys but that sche bereth hire an hand otherwyse than she menyth. And sche hath sen Esterne the most part be betyn onys in the weke or twyes, and som tyme twyes on o day, and hir hed broken in to or thre places." This was rough treatment for a girl of twenty, but it is a fair illus-

tration of the manners of the age. The letters are, in fact, a mirror of the time. We read about gowns, leases, fierce disputes about property, marriages, funerals, and wills. Sir John Paston fought in tourney on the king's side, at Eltham, in 1467, and was described by one of his friends as the best chooser of a gentlewoman that he knew, yet he died a bachelor. He wasted time and substance at court, but he has lent us his eyes, and through them the England of the fifteenth century seems still to live before us. The queer spelling is rather a trial to a modern reader, but the letters are one of the treasures of England, and Mr. Gairdner has lavished his learning on their interpretation. J. TELFORD.

The Reformation. By Williston Walker. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 6*s*.)

In previous numbers of the LONDON QUARTERLY we have drawn the attention of our readers to the merits and defects of this series of "Eras of the Christian Church." The great weakness, we have insisted, has been the diversity of method, aim, and idea: here a work by a sturdy Protestant, there the pleadings of an ardent Anglican; now a work of considerable originality, *e.g.* Professor Bartlet's *Apostolic Age*, following the product of scissors and paste. The volume before us is no exception to this rule of diversity. Its predecessors have been all too sparing in the matter of notes; but from the first page to the last Mr. Walker gives neither note, bibliography, nor the slightest indication, for reader or student, of his sources, authorities, etc. The narrative swims along with what may seem to the general reader a delightful freedom from all such tags of scholarship. The writing of history on such a method is very simple, but we are not sure that when written it is of much value. Half the value of history as an education lies in the grasp of the problems which it presents, whereas the reader of a work like the present would imagine that all is as certain as the axioms of Euclid. But we suppose that we have no right to object. Certainly this is an age of hand-books, and Mr. Walker is strictly fashionable in his elimination of all notes, indication of sources, and such-like.

Judged according to this fashion, the book before us is a very fair *résumé* of the main facts of the Continental Reformation, the Reformation in England being reserved for another volume.

Chapter II., "The Spanish Awakening," deals with a period not always noticed in text-books of the Reformation, while the narrative preserves throughout a good proportion among the numerous figures that crowd the canvas. One exception should be made. What has Erasmus done that he should be so slightly treated? Perhaps Mr. Walker is indignant at the undue emphasis laid upon him in some recent volumes, and would redress the balance by studied neglect.

The volume before us is without maps or other necessary aids to the understanding of history. We have recently had forwarded to us the best cheap historical atlas that we have yet seen. Putzger's *Historischer Schul-Atlas*, with 139 maps (twenty-fourth edition: Velhagen & Klasing, Leipzig), is a marvel of accuracy and cheapness, such as in England we seem unable to produce. Including postage it costs half a crown, and is simply invaluable to the student. The existence of such an atlas is the only justification for the absence of maps from history text-books like Mr. Walker's *Reformation*.

H. B. WORKMAN.

Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (1644–1658). Collected and edited by Charles L. Stainer, M.A. (London: Henry Frowde. 6*s*.)

Cromwell was a very rapid speaker, and his great speeches were delivered in crowded rooms, where the extreme heat made his two or three hours' orations a severe test of endurance. The systems of shorthand in use at that time were somewhat clumsy and needed extreme accuracy. The original reports have disappeared, so that we have to content ourselves with copies. It is small wonder that the speeches "do little justice to the man who seems to have been the greatest orator of his time." Mr. Stainer has edited them with scrupulous fidelity. All emendations have been placed in brackets, so that a glance shows the actual condition of the text. Notes are added as to the source from which the report of each speech is drawn, and the circumstances under which it was delivered. Nothing could be more complete or workmanlike, and the volume forms a singularly interesting study of the Protector and his times. The reporter's work may have been imperfect, but we seem to be listening to Cromwell's voice and reading the secrets of his heart.

The French Monarchy (1483–1789). By A. J. Grant, M.A. Two volumes. (Cambridge University Press. 9*s*.)

Professor Grant has given us an illuminating study of the French monarchy. Despite its dismal corruption under Louis XV. and its final catastrophe under Louis XVI., he holds that Absolute Monarchy rendered great service to France, anticipating in many points the beneficent work of the Revolution, and in many others preparing the way for it. Professor Grant makes no attempt at fine writing, but his style is so clear and he gives so much information that his book has no dull pages. The account of the massacre of Bartholomew and the sketch of the policy of Richelieu and Mazarin are of real value. Louis XIV. crushed out all individuality. He did not want men of eminence for ministers. He tried to make it clear that he would have no sharer in his power. His mistresses, however, exercised great influence, and no pages of this book are more interesting than those devoted to Madame de Montespan and Madame de Maintenon. In the later stage of the history the question of finance became supreme. Turgot and Neckar tried to save the kingdom from wreck, but Louis XVI. was a bad master. Real statesmanship and honesty were at a discount in his court. He played into the hands of the extremists. The monarchy and all its institutions were soon bankrupt, and on May 5, 1789, the Revolution began. Students will know how to value this book, but we hope that it will have a wide circulation among all who wish to have a clear and reliable account of French history in its three proudest centuries.

Messrs. Ward, Lock, & Co. have published *Carlyle's French Revolution* in their Minerva Library. It contains the original three volumes unabridged, printed in clear type, with an index, and an admirable little introduction by the late G. T. Bettany. There are 622 pages and nine or ten full-page illustrations, yet the price is only two shillings. It is a marvel of cheapness. The poorest lover of literature can now have this classic.

Annals of Politics and Culture (1492–1899). By G. P. Gooch, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.)

This volume is intended to give a concise summary of modern times. It embraces the life of mankind in its entire range of thought and action, showing the political, religious, social,

scientific, and artistic movements of all countries during the past four centuries. The book was suggested by Lord Acton, and has enjoyed his counsel and revision. Mr. Gooch has had some valued helpers in the various sections, and the result is a unique book of reference, which will be of real service for those who wish to trace the currents of political life and culture from generation to generation. Each paragraph is numbered, and the index thus helps anyone to construct a history of Poland, of Italian literature, of geology, or the Jesuits. The book is a monument of patient research, and has been carried out with admirable judgment.

The Clergy in American Life and Letters. By Daniel Dulany Addison. (London : Macmillan & Co. 5*s*.)

This volume belongs to the "National Studies in American Letters Series," which appeals to readers on both sides of the Atlantic. It gives an impressive account of the literary work of American ministers, and their influence on public morals and education. In colonial days, and far on into the national era, the parson was the chief person of every community. His position often developed a rugged type of manhood, and many a quaint story keeps alive the sayings and doings of the New England worthies. Slavery was the greatest moral question that the American clergy had to face, and they faced it boldly and with wisdom. Tribute is paid to the powerful influence of the itinerant Methodist preacher in disseminating anti-slavery ideas. Mr. Addison sees clearly what America owes to its clergy. "If Christianity has been a power in the land in developing the human conscience and inspiring rectitude of character, in encouraging men to lives of service, in introducing sentiments of high honour and business integrity, it has in large measure been due to the ministers." Much out-of-the-way information as to typical men is given in these pleasant pages. English readers will find it a most instructive book. The first four chapters, which give a general survey, are followed by vivid and picturesque sketches of Timothy Dwight, Channing, Theodore Parker, Bushnell, Beecher, and Phillips Brooks. Brooks has been described as "the ideal" minister of the American gospel, and we have never seen a more attractive and informing study of his noble personality than this. The

writer's catholic sympathies add zest to his descriptions; and though we cannot always agree with his verdicts, we like to see how he reaches them.

The Great Boer War. By A. Conan Doyle. With Maps. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.*)

This is the finest book yet published on the Boer War, and every Briton, both at home and throughout our empire, ought to master it. Dr. Doyle has strong opinions; but even where he finds reason to accuse our generals of want of foresight and adaptation to new conditions of warfare, he never fails to pay tribute to the magnificent heroism of our men. The history of South Africa, the cause of the quarrel with the Transvaal, and the outbreak of hostilities are described in four introductory chapters; then we find ourselves on the battlefield, following every step of the complicated movements, and living again through the sorrows and the tardy triumphs of the great war. The record will help the ordinary Englishman to appreciate, as he may not have been able to do before, the vastness of our task. High tribute is paid to the volunteers who flocked to our standard in the dark days that followed Colenso. The authorities were perplexed by their numbers and their pertinacity. "If there were any who doubted that this ancient nation still glowed with the spirit of its youth his fears must soon have passed away. Many young men about town justified their existence for the first time. In a single club, which is peculiarly consecrated to the *jeunesse dorée*, three hundred members rode to the wars." Dr. Doyle has no patience with the "insensate railing of Germany" in the hour of our misfortunes. If Germany and Austria were not swept from the map by Napoleon, it was largely due to British subsidies and British tenacity. "And yet these are the folk who turned most bitterly against us at the only time in modern history when we had a chance of distinguishing our friends from our foes. Never again, I trust, on any pretext will a British guinea be spent or a British soldier or sailor shed his blood for such allies." The noble help given by our colonies is one of the abiding blessings of the war. The empire has "found itself." "The real glories of the British race lie in the future, not in the past. The empire walks, and may still walk, with an uncertain step, but with every year its tread will be firmer, for its weakness is that of waxing youth not of waning

age." The whole book is a tonic for the pessimist. Abundant justice is done to our brave antagonists. Every feat of theirs is ungrudgingly recognised, yet Dr. Doyle shows that our empire has come out of its struggle with experience which may embolden us to face all the perils of the future. Our army must not be bigger, but more highly trained; our volunteers and militia must be encouraged and their fighting powers developed. Then England need fear no invasion, whilst her professional soldiers will be free to deal with every outbreak of hostilities in any part of the empire. We have had some sharp lessons, but we have learned that our empire is strong in the goodwill of all its scattered children, and that when rightly led its soldiers are still invincible.

Winchester. By R. Townsend Warner. With forty-six Illustrations. (London: George Bell & Sons. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Mr. Warner has not only aimed to supply a history of the mother of English public schools, but to guide and instruct parents who wish to send their boys there. He has met the double purpose well. The history is adequately sketched, whilst present-day customs and arrangements are not lost sight of. Mr. Dolling, who was closely connected with the school, says: "Three facts about Winchester struck me—its simplicity, its unity, its solidity." Many old words and customs are retained, and there is a rooted aversion to ceremony and display. The picture drawn from the Verney letters of life at Winchester in 1681 is very entertaining. Dr. Ken lent young Verney a bed. His father writes: "You give me no account concerning Doctor Ken's bed, whether he hath his owne again and you have yours, or whether you are acquainted with that excellent man, who, by what I heare of him, must needs excell in goodnesse beyound the superlative degree, so that I am extremely desirous that you should have a friendship with him, and then pray make good use of it." The book is brightly written, and Mr. Warner's researches have cleared up some important points of the school history. The illustrations are very good, and they are well chosen.

IV. BIOGRAPHY.

Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillips de Lisle. By Edmund Sheridan Purcell, Member of the Roman Academy of Letters, author of the "Life of Cardinal Manning." Edited and finished by Edwin de Lisle, F.S.A. Two Volumes. (London: Macmillan & Co. 35*s.*)

The last forty years have been years of widespread, and ever more widely-spreading, historical research and reading in England. The work which Macaulay began by his brilliant history has been followed out in various directions by later writers. John Richard Green, in another style and spirit, following up and deepening the work began by Charles Knight, has furnished an inspiration in his masterly and profoundly studied, yet truly popular, history of the English people. Other gifted historians—McCarthy, writing for the intelligent commonalty of all classes and creeds; Lord Rosebery, in his brilliant and clear-visioned studies of great characters in the story of the modern development of our national life, and not a few besides, especially in serial historical studies of England's men of fame—have combined to make political and social history familiar ground for Englishmen to a degree and extent never approached in former generations. In this way the main stream of the world's story—for England's history embraces that of the world—has been surveyed and sounded and charted out during the latter part of the nineteenth century. There are still, however, depths in the wide stream which have not been fathomed, and reaches which have hardly even been surveyed. In particular, to Englishman generally the history of the Roman Catholic *renaissance* on the Continent, by way of reaction from the materialistic infidelity which, like a deadly exhalation, spread over Europe a hundred years ago, has been a sealed book. The first work which, for English students of history and theology, lifted the veil distinctly from that field of history was Mr. Wilfrid Ward's Life of his father, "Ideal" Ward of the Oxford Movement. The two volumes before us furnish valuable aid in tracing the course, and indicating the

force and extent, of the same Romish revival, especially so far as it has taken hold of certain families and some localities, even in England. On that account they possess a peculiar and profound interest, and to most English readers will be a revelation of a hitherto unknown world. That what is recorded in these volumes is actually part of the modern history of England will make some readers almost shudder will be to most a painful and wonderful surprise.

The Phillips and De Lisles are old English families, Tory and Anglican for many generations past, High Church but yet loyally Protestant for centuries past. Unfortunately Ambrose Phillips, the subject of these volumes, fell in with a devout French *émigré* in his boyhood, who not treacherously but inevitably imbued his susceptible pupil with tastes and feelings specifically Roman Catholic. The atmosphere of his mind, the habit of his religious feelings, were gradually and unconsciously prepared for the acceptance of Romish superstitions of faith and feeling. He had at the same time an uncle who, as a clergyman imbued with the tone and tendency of old Nonjuring English High Churchmanship, unknown to himself had admitted, in a blind and unintelligent way, the germ of Romish superstitions into his own religious beliefs, and into some of his practices. The consequence was that, by the time he was fourteen years of age, the precocious and wilful—though by no means unamiable—heir of the family had actually become a Roman Catholic. He was very clever and susceptible, and had found Romish books which helped him on his way. This boy became Ambrose Phillips De Lisle in after-years. He fell in love as a boy with monasticism. His father, remaining himself an English Churchman, got him married very early to a highly-born Roman Catholic, for fear he should become a monk. He built a monastery—became himself a lay-monk—was the most devoted and accomplished Roman Catholic layman in the kingdom—was in religious and family alliance with the Roman Catholic Talbot (the "Shrewsbury") and the Howard (the "Norfolk") families, swallowed all Romish superstitions, gave his time, his talents and influence, a ruinously large part of his fortune, to founding monastic institutions, building splendid churches, and in every way promoting the interests of his adopted religion. The correspondence in these volumes is intensely interesting, and includes, besides letters to and from the most distinguished Roman Catholic leaders, including Montalembert as well as

Newman, a large number of letters to and also from Mr. Gladstone, who was a close personal friend of Mr. Phillips de Lisle, the main point of sympathy being that of "Catholic" Reunion.

J. H. Rigg.

Wellington's Men. Some Soldier Autobiographies. Edited by W. H. Fitchett, B.A., LL.D. (London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 6*s*.)

The autobiographies which Dr. Fitchett has edited with such skill and knowledge are voices straight from the battlefield. Here the soldier speaks for himself. We look into the soul of the veteran, and begin at last to understand what victory and glory really mean to the men who win them for their country. The pride of regiment which nerved these men of war for their heroic deeds gleams forth from every page of these four stories. We understand the actual feelings of men in the thick of the fray; we follow them on their hard marches, and see their scanty fare and stern privations; we watch the soldier's wife sharing her husband's rough lot with a heroism no whit less conspicuous than his own. Each of the four stories has its own merit, but Rifleman Harris's account of the retreat to Corunna stands out unrivalled in its grim realism, whilst Captain Mercer's description of the way his troop struggled with their guns from Ostend to Brussels, and served in the very thick of the fight at Waterloo, makes a reader feel as though he was actually on the field itself. It is a superb piece of battle scenery. Dr. Fitchett has done his work as editor with masterly skill.

The Life of E. Herber Evans, D.D. From his Letters, Journals, etc. By Rev. H. Elvet Lewis. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 6*s*.)

Thomas Jones said that Herber Evans was "the greatest orator Wales ever produced." He had a gift of picturesque eloquence, with that inimitable "hwyl" which Mr. Lewis describes as speech haunted with music. The glow of spirit which lies beneath it no man can order at will. Dr. Evans followed Thomas Jones himself at Swansea, and was equal to the strain. He was urged to become Samuel Martin's colleague at Westminster Chapel and to follow Dr. Raleigh at Harecourt. For more than thirty-five years he maintained his reputation as one of the foremost preachers in Wales. These are his credentials.

Mr. Lewis gives many incidents of his long and honoured ministry that will delight those who knew and loved him. There are some fine touches, as in his description of the great field-preaching, when "we could think, by the sound of responsive Amens, that every Aaron and Hur, from all that country-side, had met together that evening." "How easy to pray, when there is a prayer already in every bosom!" He owed much to a Wesleyan schoolmaster, who "understood his work, and knew how to draw forth the best in every child." Dr. Evans had the orator's high-strung organisation. His unconcealed anxiety on the eve of any public effort remained part of himself to the end. A friend said to him, "You are too anxious; you want to strike twelve every time: no good clock does that! Be content like me, to strike one and two and three occasionally!" But Herber Evans could not be content to strike two. He wrote in his diary on May 18, 1896, when he was not yet sixty: "I am too apt to complain that I am getting old. Mr. Chamberlain is my age, and he seems to begin his career now—at least, he is full of energy. The right way is to go on as long as I can, trusting God and serving Him to the end." On December 30 "the great oak" had fallen.

Joshua Clarkson Harrison. A Memoir. By one who knew him. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Joshua Harrison gave forty-four years' service to one Church in Camden Town. The history of Park Chapel forms his own life and history. He was a great Nonconformist bishop, with a certain gentle imperiousness befitting such a veteran, but with a ceaseless devotion to his work as pastor and preacher which made him the father of his whole flock. He was "great in the harmonious combination of some of the rarest qualities of human nature, and in the perfectly inevitable fulfilment of the task which he set himself, or rather the task which God set him to discharge." His gifts were not showy, but his preaching "combined a rich religious life with a power of clear exposition and application," which Dr. Horton never saw equalled. His friendship with Dr. Binney, Dr. Stoughton, and Samuel Morley stamps him with a kind of hall-mark. He was a true Baxter, devoted to Christ and to his flock, and he had his reward. Dr. Dale said "there was no other man in our ministry who was so deeply and universally loved." The book is a graceful tribute to an ideal pastor and a noble preacher.

V. ART AND TRAVEL.

The Painters of Florence from the Thirteenth to the Sixteenth Century. By Julia Cartright (Mrs. Ade). With Illustrations. (London: John Murray. 6*s.* net.)

The Story of Assisi. By Lina Duff Gordon. Illustrated by Nelly Erichsen and M. Helen James. (London: J. M. Dent & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

In Tuscany. Tuscan Towns, Tuscan Types, and the Tuscan Tongue. By Montgomery Carmichael. (London: John Murray. 9*s.* net.)

EACH of these books is steeped in Italian sunshine. Mrs. Ade's *Painters of Florence* brings back the great masters of that city, and teaches us to understand them and their work by a set of studies which only an accomplished critic could have written. Cimabue takes the first place as a herald of the coming dawn, then Giotto dazzles us with his wealth of fancy, his intimate knowledge of human nature, his profound sympathy with every form of life. The great epic painter was an insignificant little creature, and his children were as ill-favoured as himself. A friend wondered that the creations of his brain were so much fairer than his own offspring. Leonardo da Vinci, on the other hand, had every gift of beauty, grace, and genius, but he was distracted by a multitude of occupations, and was never satisfied with his own efforts. He seemed overcome with fear when he sat down to paint, and could finish nothing because he was so keenly alive to the blemishes of his own work. Mrs. Ade has spent endless pains on these studies, and each of them has its own charm and individuality. The pictures are exquisite reproductions of some of the finest masterpieces of Italy.

Miss Duff Gordon's *Story of Assisi* begins with the legends of the town, and then concentrates itself on the saint who has given Assisi an ever-growing fame. She traces the youth, conversion, and growing influence of St. Francis in a way that every lover of the saint will appreciate. The style of the book may be seen from the description of the river of Assisi, the Tescio—"only a trickle of water it is true, but sparkling in the

sunshine like a long flash of lightning which has fallen to earth and can find no escape from a tangle of fields and vineyards." St. Francis' life gains fresh vividness when we read how he stepped from the underground caves of his hermitage "into the ilex wood, with the banks above and around glowing with sweet-scented cyclamen, yellow orchids, and long-stemmed violets," or went out under the moonlight to have his nocturnal duet with the nightingale. Giotto's paintings in the famous memorial church are described with much helpful detail. We see the everyday life of the town and watch the pitiful superstition of the hordes of pilgrims who stream in for the festa at the beginning of August. Penitents crawled from the entrance of the great church to the Portiuncula, licking the floor with their tongues, so that something like the trail of a slug was left behind them. A terrible sense of compassion, misery, and disgust came over the English visitor. It brought tears of shame and anger to her eyes to see people allowed to practise such ignoble acts of self-abasement. The book is alive, up-to-date, brightly written, freely illustrated, and packed with matter. It is a dainty volume.

Mr. Carmichael, who writes *In Tuscany*, lives at Leghorn, and has taken the Tuscans to his heart. They are a simple folk, yet strangely complex, full of contradictions and contrasts. A stranger's life among them develops daily. "The commonest people are casuists, metaphysicians, diplomatists, keen observers of human nature, instinctive judges of human character." When they like anyone their goodwill and devotion are unbounded. Mr. Carmichael gives a little portrait gallery of his own retainers which helps us to understand the real goodness of the people. This is the most charming part of the book. The study of the Tuscan dialect is of real interest and value for students. Then we go on tour through Tuscan towns and villages. The well known resorts are not visited, but we see Leghorn, where Shelley lived and Smollett is buried; and Lucca, whose fascination grows upon you as you linger in that curiously recondite city. We visit Elba, find our way to Volterra, queen of Etruscan cities, and tread in the steps of St. Francis at Mount La Verna, where he is said to have received the stigmata. The descriptions of State lotteries and of the Tuscan game of Pallone throw light on the everyday life of the people. The book is written by one who has made Tuscany a second home, and we grow eager to visit the spots of which Mr. Carmichael writes. The

illustrations are excellent. The page of Leghorn types is very attractive, and the pictures of scenery are a great success.

Giorgione. By Herbert Cook, M.A., F.S.A. (London: George Bell & Sons. 5*s.*)

Giorgione is somewhat a shadowy figure. The question of his birthplace and origin has been much disputed, and only three of his works are universally regarded as authentic. He had not even found a modern biographer till Mr. Cook set himself to study the man and his pictures. He has devoted immense labour to this book, having personally seen and studied all the works of the master, save two paintings in St. Petersburg. The evidence for or against each picture is investigated in the light of documents recently discovered. The result is to clear away some of the mist which surrounds the great Venetian artist, who died in his thirty-fourth year. Giorgione was a poet painter, a man of moods, but those moods were healthy, joyous, and serene. He painted things as they were, blending landscape and human figures as no previous painter had done. He is the herald of the Renaissance. Titian may justly be described as his pupil. He showed extraordinary skill in representing rich brocades, while for quality of line and sensuousness of colour no artist has surpassed him. Some of Mr. Cook's positions will no doubt be disputed, but it is a little book that marks an epoch in the study of a man who had an "overwhelming influence on succeeding painters in Venice."

A Short History of Renaissance Architecture in England, 1500–1800. By Reginald Blomfield, M.A. (London: George Bell & Sons. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is an abridged edition of Mr. Blomfield's classic work on Renaissance Architecture in England. It seeks to give its readers a clear grasp of the historical development of this movement; details and illustrations may be added by each student for himself. The study opens with Wolsey's Italian workmen at Hampton Court, who mark the dawn of Renaissance architecture in England. The largely extended use of terra-cotta is characteristic evidence of the presence of the Italians. Sutton Place, near Guildford, and Lord Sandys' new buildings at the Vyne, near Basingstoke, furnish fine specimens of this work, but its influence did not extend beyond the southern counties. Germans and Flemings came next. Their principal

work consisted in the making of monuments and chimneypieces. Nearly every Elizabethan house of any importance has such chimneypieces. Inigo Jones routed these workmen. The force of that great architect's genius is shown by the fact that almost at one effort he produced finished masterpieces of a design quite unfamiliar in England. His Banqueting House at Whitehall the most accomplished piece of proportion in this country, and his work at Wilton is almost equally fine. Sir Christopher Wren gained force and skill at every step. He had little of the *abandon* of the purely artistic genius, but his resource and power of adaptation were unrivalled. He learned his art on the scaffolding of his own buildings, and thus gained a practical mastery of planning and construction never since equalled. Mr. Blomfield follows the course of Wren's successors down to Robert Adam, and in a series of valuable chapters describes the house-planning, the trades, the brick and iron work of the period. He is master of his subject, and it is a pleasure to sit at his feet as he opens out his stores of knowledge. The drawings are very well executed and of great interest.

Stage-coach and Tavern Days. By Alice Morse Earle. (London: Macmillan & Co. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

Mrs. Earle has made the life and manners of the American colonies her special study for many years, and has given us a library of delightful volumes. This is perhaps the most charming of them all. It is packed with pictures and with good stories about inns and innkeepers, coaches and coach-drivers in olden times. The City Hotel in New York, held by travellers to be unequalled in the United States, was kept by two old bachelors, one of whom it was reported never went to bed and had not owned a hat for years. He was never away from his post. The tavern occupied a very important place in colonial life, and only men of some consequence were allowed to hold the position. Mine host was full of eager curiosity about his guests, whilst his family waited on them and sat at table with them as equals. Some amusing extracts are given from a Boston widow's narrative of her entertainment at various hostelries in 1704. The potations at ordination dinners, which were held at the taverns, almost take away one's breath. At one of these gatherings in 1785 eighty people drank thirty bowls of punch before going to the meeting, and sixty-eight who dined together afterwards disposed of forty-four bowls of punch,

eighteen bottles of wine, eight bowls of brandy, and a quantity of cherry rum. The coach-drivers were a fine set of men. They were the trusted friends of the residents along their routes. One old driver told Mrs. Earle with pardonable pride how he used to buy bonnets for all the ladies who could not go to Boston. In springtime he often had a pile of bandboxes on the top of his coach. He never bought two bonnets alike, and the women would trust no driver on the road save himself. The driver was an autocrat. One of these worthies told a hungry passenger who urged him to drive faster, "When I drive this coach I am the whole United States of America." We owe Mrs. Earle many thanks for a book that makes the past live again so vividly and delightfully.

Highways and Byways in East Anglia. By William A. Dutt. With Illustrations by Joseph Pennell. (London: Macmillan & Co. 6*s*.)

East Anglia, with its wild coast, its fenland, its broads, its churches, castles, towns, and villages, is a fine field for treatment in such a series as this, and Mr. Dutt has risen to his opportunity. We have read every sentence of his book with eager interest. He knows the ground, and loves its history and its people as only a native can love them. Mr. Pennell's pencil has been used with his wonted felicity, and the result is a volume full of delights and allurements for the holiday-maker. Our travels begin at Ipswich, where Defoe found "very agreeable and improving company almost of every kind" when he made his tour of the eastern counties. We soon find ourselves at Framlingham Castle, which is now an empty shell of a great baronial stronghold. Here Mary held court when Edward VI. died. The story of Dunwich is a tragedy of the sea which one reads with keen interest. After a visit to Southwold, with its glorious church and its memories of the Stricklands, we pass to familiar ground at Lowestoft, Yarmouth, and Norwich, whence our road leads up to Cromer and past Sandringham, which is a memorial of our King's skill as a great landlord and agriculturist. We visit Lynn, Ely, Thetford, and Bury St. Edmunds. Every place has its own charm, and Mr. Dutt almost brings back the old pilgrim days of Walsingham and Bury St. Edmunds by his skilful representations of olden times. Hereward the Wake fills considerable space in these pages. We feel as though we were in the English Holland, and loth indeed to leave it.

Spanish Highways and Byways. By Katharine Lee Bates. Illustrated with many Engravings from Photographs. (London: Macmillan & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Miss Bates gives her impressions of that strange, deep-rooted, and complex life shut away beyond the Pyrenees in so bright a fashion that it is a pleasure to be in her company. She throws a flood of light on the real conditions of life in the Peninsula, and teaches us to modify not a few of our notions. The bull fight is a passion. The boys play *al toro* in the streets, and find it hard to forgive the sensitive little king because he cried when first taken to the bull-ring. Miss Bates went to one exhibition, and found it a dreadfully disgusting spectacle. Her picture of Spanish superstition as seen at Santiago will be a revelation for Protestant readers. During one of the last afternoons which she spent at Vigo she visited a hill-top shrine, and found the way fringed by a double line of dirty, impudent beggars, stripped half naked, and displaying every sort of hideous deformity. "We had to run the gauntlet, and it was like traversing a demoniac sculpture gallery made up of human mockeries." Yet Spain, despite her woes, is "far from unhappy. It is beautiful to see out of what scant allowance of that which we call well-being may be evolved wisdom and joy, poetry and religion." Madrid is "the yolk of the Spanish egg." The popular saying is, "From Madrid to heaven, and in heaven a little window for looking back to Madrid." The gay life of the capital is almost transferred to these bright pages, and the chivalrous courtesy shown to two American ladies at the very time when Spain was smarting from her defeat in Cuba and the Philippines was a fine exhibition of the inbred gentility of the nation. Miss Bates gives a pleasing account of Spanish boys and girls and their games. She made herself at home with these little folk, and tried to understand the life of the peasants. Her book will be prized by all who wish to see Spain as it really is. Its pictures are a great success, and Miss Bates has a rare grace of style and an enthusiasm which is contagious. Protestantism has now an assured footing in Spain, and its churches may be found in most of the important cities. Miss Bates shows only too clearly that Spain needs the pure light of the gospel if she is to be saved from her low estate.

VI. BELLES LETTRES.

Anthology of French Poetry. Tenth to Nineteenth Century. Henry Carrington, M.A. (London: H. Frowde. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

DEAN CARRINGTON has from his childhood been as conversant with French and French literature as with English. He has employed many leisure hours in making translations from French poetry, and published these for private circulation in 1895. His daughter, the Countess Martinengo-Cesaresco, has made this selection from the larger volumes. Dean Carrington's translations may lack some of the incommunicable charm of the original, but they are both graceful and melodious. His little book of translations from Victor Hugo has already reached a third edition, and this volume will be welcomed by all who wish to gain some knowledge of the great poets of France. Eight hundred years of love and chivalry seem to unfold as we turn these pages. It is a book full of delights.

Two Lectures Introductory to the Study of Poetry. By Rev. H. C. Beeching, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 2*s.*)

There is a great deal to interest lovers of poetry in this little volume. Mr. Beeching adopts Milton's description of poetry as "simple, sensuous, and passionate," and claims that the poet's manner of viewing things is not that of the average man, but requires genius, the faculty of looking at the world not only frankly but freshly. It is this fresh outlook and insight which is the root of the whole matter. The poet interprets the world to us and interprets us to ourselves. The meaning of imagination is discussed in an instructive way, and in the second lecture the poet's means of expression are suggestively dealt with. Metre and rhythm are two ingredients of the magic cauldron, then there is language and painting to the imagination. The lectures will certainly impress students with the greatness of the poet's task and mission.

Outlines of the History of the English Language. By T. N. Toller, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 4*s.*)

This volume belongs to the Cambridge Series for Schools and Training Colleges. Professor Toller attempts to show under what conditions language-material was gradually accumulated, sifted, and shaped to form the English tongue. He regards the language as a living organism ever undergoing change, and wishes to open his readers' eyes to the changes still going on around them. English is what Dante called "a noble vulgar tongue," and this history of its gradual upbuilding is profoundly interesting. The whole subject is approached from a new point of view. We measure the influences that have built up our speech, and trace the labours of the past on the language of to-day in a way that will quicken the interest of every thoughtful student. The illustrative extracts are well chosen, and the book is a ripe piece of scholarly work.

The Companion Dictionary of Quotations. Selected and arranged by Norman MacMunn. (London: Grant Richards. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This little volume is full of good things drawn from familiar sources, as well as from those that are less known and less accessible. Mr. MacMunn is not afraid of what flippant people style "commonplace," and his aim has been to give new currency to the words of the truly great thinkers of the world. He has shown admirable judgment, and has given us a really valuable collection of fine sayings in prose and verse. The book is a bright companion for one's leisure moments.

The Mantle of Elijah. By I. Zangwill. (London: Heinemann. 6*s.*)

Elijah is the Right Hon. Thomas Marshmont, who, despite his blue blood, is an honest Radical, with a seat in the Cabinet. He makes a famous oration at the unveiling of his friend Bryden's bust in the metropolis of Radicalism, after which a local aspirant delivers a rousing speech, and attaches himself to the minister, with the hope of winning his mantle. Robert Broser has married a rich wife, and soon begins to climb the political ladder. He is troubled by no scruples, and when Marshmont resigns as a protest against war, "Fighting Bob" is true to his principle of self-advancement, and before the story ends is in sight of the premiership. His first wife dies early,

and he is thus free to marry his patron's clever daughter, Allegra. She and her sister Joan, with their aunt the Duchess of Dalesbury, are the most interesting figures of the story. Margaret Engelborne is a delightful character, but the brilliant Raphael Dominick proves himself a contemptible fellow despite his fine theories. Allegra is fascinated, but she has moral strength to resist his overtures. She finally leaves Broser, and takes refuge under her aunt's wing. Fizzy, the Radical editor, is a very clever study. The book is a political novel written by a man who hates war, and paints the change of opinion during the last quarter of a century in political life with a Jew's aloofness. Broser is not a pleasant character, but Allegra might have made more out of him, and she deals hardly with him at last.

Senator North, by Gertrude Atherton (John Lane, 6s.), is full of strong situations and well written. Politics, love, and the race problem give the story threefold interest. Betty Madison develops an enthusiasm for politics which leads her into the gallery of the Senate House, and brings two Senator lovers to her feet. She discovers a half-sister of negro blood, whom she takes under her wing with tragic results. The political world is unveiled in a way that will interest readers on this side of the Atlantic. The moral tone of the book is distinctly bad and uncomfortable. Betty Madison's devotion to Senator North leads her into a dangerous and most reprehensible position; but the problem is solved by his wife's death, and Betty has to get out of her engagement to Senator Burleigh as best she may.

The Inimitable Mrs. Massingham, by Herbert Compton (Chatto & Windus, 6s.), is a story of Botany Bay. The scene opens in London a century ago, where a man who professes to be an inventor proves to be a clever forger. Robert Borradaile saves his innocent daughter from arrest, and is transported for violence done to a Bow Street runner. His experiences in Botany Bay are painful reading, but they form a true picture of convict life, and the account of the outbreak of the convicts is very exciting. Borradaile saves Sydney from assault, and returns to England with his honours, to find his old love faithful to him.

Max Thornton, by Ernest Glanville (Chatto & Windus, 6s.), is a powerful tale of the Boer War. The young English athlete proves himself a brave fellow, and Abe Pike is a splendid guide and a wily strategist, who outwits the Boers, saves an English troop from falling into a clever trap, and brings Max safely

through many perils. The villain of the story, Piet Marais, is a terrible fellow, as Max Thornton finds to his cost, but he meets his doom at last. The book is a spirited description of some sides of the Boer War, and is full of adventures, told with great skill and vigour.

Foes in Law (Macmillan & Co., 6s.), by Rhoda Broughton, is the story of a country gentleman's marriage. Despite her Bohemian ways, Marie Kergouet proves herself a treasure, and her family grows upon us. They are boisterous enough, but they are loving and generous-hearted. Miss Trent's curate-lover turns out badly, and the reader is thankful when he vanishes from the scene. The book is too Bohemian for our taste.

Mr. C. H. Kelly sends *Crosbie Urquhart's Sowing*, by Kate T. Sizer (2s.). It is a capital story of Methodist life fifty years ago. Crosbie is a banker's son, whose resolve to become a Methodist brings him many trials, but he comes out of them well, and his decision proves a blessing to all his friends. *In Distant Lands*, by W. J. Forster (1s.), is a series of imaginary journeys to Palestine and other lands which will delight little people and make geography a pleasure to them. Mr. Forster does such work well. *The Nine*, by Emily Bryant (1s.), is a bright tale of a bright family. The Methodist preacher's quiver is full, and the little people are a merry set, whom other children will be glad to know.

Stories Without Names, by Elsie (R. Culley, 2s.), are intended to stimulate Bible study. The interest is well sustained, and the book cannot fail to hold a child's attention and quicken its zest for the stories of the Old and the New Testament. *The Bite of the Serpent*, by Emily Spratling (R. Culley, 9d.), is a powerful temperance story which ought to be widely circulated. A young wife's temptation, fall, and final victory are told in a way that should help many to resist the first approach of evil.

The Mystery of Godliness. By F. B. Money Coutts. (London: John Lane. 3s. 6d.)

Mr. Coutts has a happy gift of poetic phrasing, and his poem is packed with thought. It is really a theological treatise in verse. Mr. Coutts tries to fasten on Christianity a charge of heresy for what he calls its disbelief in the story of the Fall, which "presupposes a God of Good and a God of Evil." We

are quite unable to follow his argument or to accept his conclusion. His poem has a fine vein of humanitarian sentiment; but it has no tonic for doubting hearts, no gospel for the weary and heavy laden.

The Thrush is a monthly periodical for the publication of original poetry (Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.). The limited *edition de luxe* is priced at half a crown, but there is also a fourpenny edition. The selection of poems for the January number is very attractive, and we are in hearty sympathy with the effort to put true poetry into the hands of the mass and million. We hope the publication will have due encouragement. The second number is largely devoted to memorial verses for Queen Victoria, none of which possess much merit. "Our Little Life," a four-line piece, is very good. "Federation" and the Kitchener ballad are excellent.

New Century Hymns for the Christian Year. By Rev. F. W. Orde Ward, B.A. ("Home Words" Office. 5*s.*)

Mr. Orde Ward has a graceful style, and he gives us much good stuff in this handsome volume. It is a book that many will be glad to set beside their Keble's *Christian Year*; and though it lacks the touch of genius, it is sweet and gracious.

John Inglesant has been added by Messrs. Macmillan to their Sixpenny Series, and that masterpiece of philosophical romance ought to have a great sale. It blends the memory of the dead, the life of thought, and the life of the individual, and it has a charm of its own which has won it a host of admirers. This cheap edition is a boon to lovers of a noble romance.

Daddy's Girl (George Newnes, 3*s.* 6*d.*) is a pretty story by Mrs. L. T. Meade. Sibyl's faith in her father and mother is beautifully told; and though Mr. Ogilvie lends his name to a false report of a gold-mine, his little girl helps him at last to conquer himself. The story is a touching one, and it is sweetly told.

VII. MISCELLANEOUS.

Œcumenical Missionary Conference: New York, 1900: Report of the Proceedings. (London: Religious Tract Society. Two volumes. Large 8vo. 6*s.* net.)

THESE are not, of course, volumes which anyone will read straight through, but, considered as a work of reference, invaluable is not too strong a word to apply to them. Preachers, advocates, members of missionary boards, and others who give this Report a place on their shelves will find out its use and worth by degrees. Indeed, the best result of a great conference such as that held in New York last spring is, in our judgment, to be found in a permanent record like this. True, there is a wonderful fascination in the personnel of such a gathering, representative of the whole habitable globe; a rare stimulus in the interchange of thought and experience by word of mouth; a real advantage in the *discussion* of important topics as contrasted with mere reading about them, and an enviable opportunity of spiritual profit when such a crowd of godly enthusiasts gather day by day: but these and kindred privileges could be but the portion of a few out of the myriad lovers of missionary work; and those few, again, too near for accurate focus. But everyone who possesses these volumes will have an abundant store of interest and information on the great topic, and food for thought to be digested at leisure—a thing that cannot be satisfactorily done in passing from one session of a conference to another, and taking up in rapid succession the diverse subjects germane to the missionary question.

The method of preparing the Report is novel. There has been no attempt to reproduce the discussions in the order in which they took place, or to give a complete history of the proceedings, but, instead, a skilful arrangement of the papers and speeches—or the pith of them—under various and multiform headings; so that, aided by an exhaustive index, most important in such a work, those interested in one or another of the different departments of missionary work can quickly find helpful and profitable material on their special topic.

The danger always is that great meetings such as these volumes tell of should end in talk. If the Christian public will

read, and lay to heart, what is here written, that danger will in this case disappear, for it cannot be that such testimony, argument, and eloquence as meet in these pages can be studied without deepening the conviction that Jesus Christ is the final hope of this world, that "the fields are white unto the harvest," and that if there ever was a period in human history when Christians ought to be impressed with their opportunities and respond to the call of the Christless world, it is now.

Elaborate tables of statistics and an extensive bibliography enhance the value of this most interesting Report.

M. HARTLEY.

The Oxford English Dictionary. Edited by Dr. James A. H. Murray. Green–Gyzzarn. Invalid–Jew. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.)

Among the many interesting articles contained in these sections none yields in interest to that on *guild*, which gives in the least possible compass nothing less than a complete index of the principal authorities bearing on the origin and historical development of one of the most characteristic features of mediæval life. The subject is obscure and much controverted, but the plain man will find much in this *résumé*, just the preliminary direction that is needful to enable him to wind his own way into its recesses. We observe, with some disappointment, that *groin* and *gun* still defy the resources of etymology, and that even the ulterior derivation of *iron* and *jaw* remains uncertain; but even lexicographers of the twentieth century cannot be expected to achieve finality. The articles on *Jansenist*, *Jesuit*, and *Jew* are clear, concise, and adequate. The typography of the work maintains its high standard, and editors, contributors, and public are alike to be congratulated on the steady progress which this great monument of learning is now making towards its completion.

The Ancient Scriptures and the Modern Jew. By David Baron. (London: Hodder & Stoughton. 6*s*.)

The writer of this volume is a converted Jew, editor of *The Scattered Nation*, and author of *Rays of Messiah's Glory*. It is divided into two parts, in the former of which he seeks earnestly and intelligently to show how certain prophecies of the Old Testament pointed to Jesus of Nazareth. The second part contains sundry papers on the present condition of the Jews, the Zionist Congress, and kindred topics. The whole forms

a very interesting testimony on the part of a Jew who loves his own nation, but has become convinced of the truths of Christianity. His method of interpreting prophecy can sometimes hardly be justified in the light of modern exegesis, and the transliteration of Hebrew words is often inexact and misleading.

An Alphabetical and Chronological Arrangement of the Wesleyan Methodist Ministers and Preachers on Trial. Nineteenth Edition, enlarged and revised to date. By David J. Waller, D.D. (London: Wesleyan Methodist Book-Room. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

This edition contains some new features of the greatest value. The list of ministers arranged according to the number of years spent in the ministry will be eagerly scanned. It is headed by Richard Rymer, who entered the ranks in 1829. John Gay Wilson, who is an older man than Mr. Rymer, is three years younger in the ministry; Dr. Rigg is the oldest man in full work; Giffard Dorey heads the list of men in circuit life, on which he entered in 1846. The new arrangement of foreign missionary appointments does not give the stations at which a man has laboured, but simply the district and the number of years spent in it. This is to be regretted in the interest of the historian and biographer, and the reason which has prompted it does not appear very cogent. We bow to the judgment of authorities in this case with regret. Dr. Waller has done his work with characteristic thoroughness, and the volume is another monument to his patient skill and abounding knowledge. It is the essence of our ministerial biography, and its columns have a fascination of their own for Methodist officials.

A Primer of Astronomy. By Sir Robert Ball, LL.D., F.R.S. (Cambridge University Press. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is the first volume of a series of Science Primers which are to be issued from the Cambridge University Press. It has 180 octavo pages, with eleven full-page plates and many diagrams, and is conveniently arranged in chapters and sections. Sir Robert Ball is a master of popular exposition, and gives such a view of the whole subject as can be found in no other cheap manual. The marvels of astronomy grow more marvellous as they are studied, and this little volume will give real pleasure to everyone who reads it.

The Church Directory and Almanack for 1901. (London: Nisbet & Co. 2*s.* net.)

The new directory has proved a great success. It gives particulars of everyday interest to the clergy as to patrons, value of livings, etc., which can be found in no other cheap manual; and it adds features of its own, such as the lists of all missionaries working in connexion with the S.P.G. and C.M.S., the hints for seasonable sermons, the lists of members of Convocation. It is an invaluable Directory for Churchmen.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have published a sixpenny edition of Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Sherwell's *Temperance Problem and Social Reform.* It is somewhat abridged, but it is all that ordinary students of the subject need, and a temperance sixpence cannot be so well invested as in securing this wonderfully cheap edition of our greatest book on temperance.

The Historical Sketch of the Manchester Mission is inspiring. Mr. Heap has allowed the facts to speak for themselves, so that we watch Mr. Collier taking up his task and gradually building up the greatest mission in the world. The work has been a fruitful mother of kindred service all over the world, and this shilling sketch will stimulate and guide a multitude of mission workers. It shows that to attempt great things for God is still the high road to success.

Mr. Von Dadelszen has just published the ninth issue of *The New Zealand Official Year-Book* (John Mackay, Wellington, N.Z.). We are not surprised to find that the work is becoming known outside the colony, and that the demand for it is increasing. Its epitome of the history of the colony is well done, and the facts as to the present trade, population, and position of New Zealand are given in the most compact form.

A Cyclist's Note-Book. By A. W. Rumney. (London: W. & A. K. Johnston. 2*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Rumney began to ride at Rugby, twenty years ago, and chose Cambridge as his university because it had the better cycling club and track. He gives many amusing accounts of his experiences as a racer and tourist, with discussions as to brakes, free wheel machines, food, dress, and all that a cyclist wishes to know. He is an enthusiast, but a sensible and well informed one, and his advice is well worth following. The book is a helpful record of long and wide experience.

VIII. SUMMARY OF FOREIGN REVIEWS.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (January 1).—The Marquis de Gabriac gives an interesting account of his work as French Ambassador at the Vatican in 1878-1880, when Leo XIII. had just been chosen Pontiff. The marquis busied himself in trying to secure a cardinal's hat for Bishop Dupanloup, whose vigorous opposition to the dogma of infallibility had given umbrage at Rome. All seemed promising when Dupanloup's sudden death put an end to the plans of his friends. The marquis enjoyed the special favour of Leo XIII., and found him anxious to do all he could to promote better relations with the Republic, though Gambetta's attack on clericalism disturbed him very much.

(January 15).—M. de Gabriac continues his narrative in this number with a sketch of the delicate negotiations for the appointment of two French cardinals, which help an English reader to understand the relations between the Papacy and the Republic. M. Lévy discusses the cost of our South African war in a somewhat unfriendly spirit. He thinks that our sky is charged with clouds, although he admits that we are not a people to be broken down by reverses nor to be turned out of our path by the obstacles we meet there.

(February 1).—M. Fouillée writes on "The Religion of Nietzsche." He asks whether he who hoped to be the most irreligious of men, and boasted "I have killed God," was not really the high-priest of a religion and the worshipper of a new divinity. His philosophy was poetry and mythology. It was faith without evidences, an endless chain of aphorisms, oracles, prophecies. He had a naturalistic paganism, and did not understand Christianity or contemporary idealism. His philosophic thought is full of contradictions, which he himself failed to perceive. His life and teaching are admirably sketched in this paper.

(February 15).—M. Hanotaux gives his impressions of Arny-le-duc, which is the centre of the French St. Gothard, and of the cathedral at Chartres, which made him feel that the works of man could bear comparison with those of Nature herself. "The International Council of Women" and "The Conflict of Races in the Philippines" are articles of special interest. Madame Bentzon shows how the International Council of Women arose. It was first held in 1888, but its real development dates from the Chicago Exhibition. Since then Canada, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, New South Wales, New Zealand, and Roumania have joined the Council, and other countries are preparing to cast in their lot with the movement.

METHODIST REVIEW (January-February).—Dr. Jackson pleads for a new alignment of the Church forces which would bring weight to bear on social and moral questions. The writer quotes with approval an appeal recently issued to the municipal electors of London, calling on them to abstain from party politics and vote for candidates solely with a desire to promote the social and moral reform of the people. The good citizenship movements in the Epworth League and in other young people's societies point in this direction. He thinks that the attempt to cleanse the springs of national life by going into questions of politics that are moral would involve the co-operation of all denominations, and would involve the separation of local and municipal politics from national politics, but he pleads for greater zeal in warring against the evils of society.