

MAY 1890

The Theological Monthly

THE SITE OF THE CITIES OF THE PLAIN AND THE "PITS" OF THE VALE OF SIDDIM.

THOSE two wealthy sheikhs, Abraham and his nephew Lot, met one day on the highlands of Israel in amicable conference on the subject of their separation. This had been rendered necessary by the vast increase of their flocks and herds, so that "the land was not able to bear them that they might dwell together," that is, could no longer supply them in one place with sufficient pasturage and water. And we read that "Lot carefully viewed [literally "lifted up his eyes and viewed"] all the Circular-plain (כִּכָּר *kikkar*) of Jordan, that all of it was irrigated [literally "drinking"] before Jehovah's destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, like a garden of Jehovah, like Egypt's land."¹ These last appear to be Lot's own words as he looked long and eagerly on the tempting landscape, for had he not travelled with his uncle in this same land of Egypt, and been as fascinated as travellers are to-day with its wondrous subtropical verdure? The expression he uses, "a garden of Jehovah," if it stood alone, and if it had the definite article, which it has not, might refer to Eden; but being the first, and therefore, on the face of it, the weaker of the two similes, it must be taken merely as the strong Hebrew superlative, like "trembling of God," *i.e.*, "a

¹ Gen. xiii. 10.

very great trembling," or "an earthquake,"¹ "cedars of God," "mighty cedars,"² "mountains of God," "mighty mountains,"³ "a wind of Jehovah," "a mighty or terrible wind,"⁴ &c. We may render it accurately "like a splendid garden, like the land of Egypt." It implies that "the *Kikkar*, or Circular-plain, of Jordan" was under extensive and abundant irrigation, and that it enjoyed a climate as hot and dry, and therefore presented the same wonderfully rich and luxuriant prospect, as the Delta of the Nile.

There can be no doubt as to the district whence Abraham and his nephew viewed the Jordan Valley. It is said to have been "between Bethel and Hai."⁵ The little village of *Beitin*, three hours, that is, nine miles north of Jerusalem, evidently retains the name of Bethaven, "House of Folly," given in later times to Bethel, "the House of God," as appears from Hosea iv. 15. It would seem that Bethaven was a village somewhat to the east of Bethel, for we read of "Hai which is beside Bethaven, on the east side of Bethel."⁶ From *Beitin* an elevated ridge runs towards the east, and where this abruptly ends, about a mile away, in a remarkable, conical hill with a broad flat summit stand mounds of a ruin called simply *Et Tell*, "the heap." Its sides are, in some places, covered deeply with fragments of large time-worn stones, which have every appearance of having been purposely strewn there long ages ago. Now, we

¹ 1 Sam. xiv. 15.

² Ps. lxxx. 10.

³ Isa. xl. 7.

⁴ Ps. xxxvi. 6. With which compare Ps. ciii. 16, and Jonah iv. 8. See also "wrestlings of God" for "mighty wrestlings" (Gen. xxx. 8), "voices of God" for "mighty voices," *i.e.*, "thunders" (Ps. xxxvi. 6), "a city of God" for "a mighty city," applied to heathen Nineveh. Thus Manoah's wife, Nebuchadnezzar, and the centurion in charge of our Lord's execution each use the expression, "a Son of God," figuratively, to mean "a mighty or great person" (Judges xiii. 6; Daniel iii. 25; Matt. xxvii. 54; Mark xv. 39). So also in the New Testament, "faith of God" is "mighty faith" (Mark xi. 20), and "prayer of God" is "most earnest prayer" (Luke vi. 20), and "children of God" is "mighty persons" (Luke xx. 36). Sometimes the name of God occurs with the dative of possession, instead of the genitive, with just the same meaning, as in Acts vii. 20, where "beautiful to God" stands for "very beautiful."

⁵ Gen. xiii. 3.

⁶ Josh. vii. 2.

read that Joshua "burnt Hai, and made it a *heap* for ever, a desolation unto this day."¹

Here, then, in this spot to the east of Bethel, called to this day "the heap," and answering to the requirements of the narrative of the assault by Israel, given in Joshua viii., in all probability we may recognize the ancient Hai, or at all events its immediate neighbourhood. No traveller has yet remarked, what struck me most forcibly, as with difficulty I pushed my horse over the large, broken, deeply-worn stones which cover the ground, in some places to a great depth, that those stones have every appearance of having been placed there by pious Jews in succeeding ages to keep up the perpetual desolation decreed by Joshua. In his report of this region, made during its survey, Major Conder shows at length how exactly *Et Tell* agrees with the graphic description of the storming and capture of Hai.² But in his *Tent Work in Palestine* he now rejects the identification of *Et Tell*, and considers that the remains of a large ancient town at *Haiyan*, "which approaches closely to *Aina*," the form under which Hai appears in the writings of Josephus, "are on the true site."³ *Haiyan*, close to the modern village of *Deir Diwan*, is only a mile S.S.W. of *Et Tell*, so that practically for our present purpose it is a matter of no importance which of these two identifications we adopt.

Somewhere, then, on the lofty ridge which joins *Beitin* and *Et Tell*, or at all events, in its immediate neighbourhood, the Father of the Faithful and his too worldly-minded kinsmen stood to view the surrounding country. None who have gazed on the Jordan Valley from various points in this same neighbourhood can doubt where Sodom and Gomorrah and their rich garden lands were situated.

They could not have stood where now lie the waters of the Dead Sea. This was formerly taught, but science has convincingly shown that this salt sea has from the earliest

¹ Josh. viii. 28.

² *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, April, 1874.

³ *Tent Work in Palestine*. Vol. ii. pp. 108, 109. Richard Bentley & Son. 1878.

period occupied its present position, and cannot possibly have been formed in historic times above the ruins of the cities of the plain. Major Conder declares, "Geologists now hold that the lake had reached its present condition before man was created," and he establishes this conclusion by various proofs.¹ Indeed, since Professor Hull's account of his geological expedition across the Peninsula of Sinai, and through the Wady Araba into Palestine, this question may be said to have been finally settled.²

Nor could these Cities of the Plain, as some suppose who follow the tradition of Josephus, have lain to the south of the Dead Sea, for only the country lying to the north of that lake is visible from any hill in the neighbourhood of Bethel or Hai.

A sketch of the landscape looking east from Hai may be seen in Major Conder's last work.³ Over the rolling sea of countless brown hills that intervene, the comparatively barren mountainous inheritance of Benjamin, the eye passes on to rest with pleasure on the wide expanse of the green plain of Jordan at their feet. Both a portion of that part of the *Kikkar*, under the western hills around *Ain es Sultan*, the ancient Jericho, and the whole of that still more extensive part of it which lies beyond the river at the foot of the mighty natural well formed by the mountains of Moab, are well in sight.

As Professor Socin, M. Clermont Ganneau, Mr. Guy Le Strange, and others, misled by tradition, which in this, as in all other matters, is never to be followed if it "makes the Word of God of none effect," have insisted on the Cities of the Plain lying south of the Dead Sea, it may be well to give Dr. Birch's short but unanswerable reply. In addition to the argument that I have adduced, he says, "Lot chose the plain, *Kikkar*, of Jordan." This *must* mean the plain at the northern end of the Dead Sea, since no valley at the southern end

¹ *Tent Work in Palestine*. Vol. ii. p. 46.

² *Mount Seir*. By Professor Edward Hull, F.R.S.

³ *Palestine*. By Major C. R. Conder. p. 32. Richard Bentley & Son, London. 1886. George Philip & Son.

could possibly be called the Valley of the Jordan, as the nearest point of that river would be forty miles distant at the opposite [south] end of the sea." Nor, as he further points out, can it be said that while Lot "chose" the plain at the northern end of the Dead Sea that he went to "dwell" in that at the southern end, because we are distinctly told that he "beheld all the *kikkar* of Jordan" (ver. 10) . . . "and chose him all the *kikkar* of Jordan" (ver. 11) . . . "and Lot dwelt in the cities of the *kikkar*" (ver. 12).¹ To this may be added the argument of Canon Tristram, who points out that the site of the Cities of the Plain at the northern end of the Dead Sea is the only intelligible view of their position in connection with the raid of Chedorlaomer, who, after he smote the Horites in Mount Seir (Edom), on the south of the Dead Sea, attacked the Amorites in Hazezon Tamar (Engedi), on its eastern shore, next met the King of Sodom and his allies in the Vale of Siddim, and then returned towards Damascus (Gen. xiv. 1-14).²

This district of Jordan bearing the name of "the *Kikkar*," *הַקִּקָּר*, "the Circular-plain," is a well-marked region distinguished from the rest of the valley. *קָקָר* is literally in its primary sense "anything flat and round," hence the meaning it bears of "a loaf of bread"—that is, the circular, pancake-like, thin toasted cake of unleavened bread, the universal form of the *fellahheen* loaf.³ Thus, when applied to land it naturally denotes "a tract of country, appearing to the eye as limited within a circle," "a plain roughly circular." The name is most appropriate to this particular part of the Jordan Valley, because, whereas its average breadth from Baniyas to this point is only about six miles which is out of all proportion to the length of its various reaches, here it broadens out to fourteen miles, while the length of the district, from where the hills draw near together on the north at *Kurn Surtubeh* to the head of the Dead Sea on the south, is about the same. This may be seen by a glance at any

¹ *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, p. 32. January, 1886.

² *The Land of Israel*. Second Edition, p. 366.

³ Exod. xxix. 23; 1 Sam. ii. 26; Prov. vi. 25; Judges viii. 5; 1 Sam. x. 3.

good map. It is the only part of the Jordan Valley where the mountains enclose a roundish plain, and its circular character is especially marked at its south-western extremity, where, as I am about to show, the Cities of the Plain stood.

The prospect from the neighbourhood of Hai is said to have extended to Zoar, for we read, "Lot carefully viewed all the Circular-plain of Jordan [as] thou comest [to] Zoar." Two widely different identifications of Zoar have been proposed. Canon Tristram claims to have discovered it in the course of his deeply interesting wanderings in Moab in 1874. On the western slope of the mountains of Moab, below the heights of Nebo, he found ruins on a bold headland 3,000 feet high, commanding magnificent views, and bearing the Arabic name *Zi'ara*, which preserves the consonants of the Hebrew Zoar. But surely a moment's reflection would show that the whole of the five associated Cities of the *Kikkar* must have been situated *on* the *Kikkar*, and not in one case 3,000 feet above it. Zoar, like Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, in all probability occupied the invariable position of towns and villages in Palestine plains, namely, slightly rising ground, or the tops of low hills at the foot of the mountains. So far from it being situated, as Dr. Tristram supposes, far up towards the summit of the highland, it is expressly intimated that it was not on the highland at all. In asking leave to take refuge there, Lot cries, "*I cannot escape to the highland. Behold now, this city is near to flee to, and it is a little one. Oh, let me escape thither therefore the name of the city was called Zoar*" [זָעַר from זָעַר, "became little," compare זָעַר and Chald. fem. זְעִרָה "little"].¹

But another very different and hitherto unsuspected explanation has lately been given of these words, "as thou comest unto Zoar," which proposes a startling identification of this spot, not with any place in Palestine at all, but with a fortress in Egypt! It seems to have been ventured first by the learned Dr. Haigh in 1876 (*Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache*, p. 54), was adopted by Dr. Dümichen in his *History*

¹ Gen. xix. 19-22.

of Egypt, in Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte*, and has been set forth popularly by the Rev. H. G. Tomkins in a very interesting paper on "Recent Egyptological Research in its Biblical Relation," read before the Victoria Institute in 1855. All along the east of Egypt the kings of the mighty Twelfth Dynasty had built a vast wall with many towers, whence sentinels constantly kept watch and ward against the dreaded desert beyond, the *Shasu*, or *Bedaween* Land. Not only had they to fear *Bedaween* raids, but also attacks from the powerful Eastern and North-eastern empires, Philistine, Hittite, Syrian, and Assyrian. Now, the great entrance and outlet in this wall, by which the Egyptian kings of the Eighteenth and following Dynasties led forth their forces and brought back their captives and spoils, was a strong important fortress called *Zar*, or *Zaru*, meaning apparently "a rich and well-watered plain," for a Semitic people gave the name *Zeru* to the similar rich plain north of Babylon, watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. We have mention as early as the Sixth Dynasty of "a person of *Zaru*,"¹ and this most ancient fortress was called by the Egyptians "the sentinel at the gate of Egypt." This *Zar* is now with much probability identified with Sellé, near Lake Timsah. It is contended that the words "[as] thou comest [to] Zoar" should be rendered "when thou enterest *Zar*." To put it in Mr. H. G. Tomkins' words, "The sandy wastes of the *Shasu*-land came up to the walls of *Zar*, but within the traveller saw opening before him the goodly green levels, irrigated by numberless canals and watercourses, the watered field of *Zar* (*Sekhet es Zar*), so flowery and beautiful that such a region was called in Egypt 'the divine watered land' (*Sekhet Nuter*. Brugsch., *Dict. Geog.*, i. 13), as by the Hebrews 'the Garden of Jehovah.' This, then, was the view of the land of Mizraim when thou enterest *Zar*, which represented the former glories of the warm, palmy Jordan plain 'before Jehovah destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah.' Well did Moses know that familiar sight of 'the land of Rameses,' as it had

¹ *Records of the Past*, vol. viii. p. 147.

greeted his eyes on his return from his long exile in wild Arabia."¹

I have thought it right to state this interesting and ingenious explanation of the passage, but I cannot by any means admit its accuracy. *Zar*, or *Zaru*, is not the Hebrew *Zo'ar*, lacking as it does the strong important ν , and the word, spelt in precisely the same way, occurs within ten verses further as the name of the fifth City of the Plain, and is shortly afterwards interpreted to mean "little," as it does elsewhere.² The Hebrew expression בְּאֵרֶה לָעֵר is elliptical, being literally "thy coming Zoar," not as ordinarily in such a Hebrew use of the infinitive בּוֹא , "thy coming towards Zoar" (לָעֵרָה), or "thy coming to Zoar" (אֶל-לָעֵר), and this on the face of it may seem to favour the rendering, "thy entering Zoar," but an examination of those passages where בּוֹא stands for "entering" does not confirm it. Biblical Hebrew is altogether too elliptical to build anything for certain upon the omission of a preposition or of the suffix ה . We have solid grounds for concluding that in the words of Genesis xiii. 10 "[as] thou comest [to] Zoar," the town of that name at the foot of the mountains of Moab in "the *Kikkar* of Jordan" is intended, and not the differently spelt *Zar*, or *Zaru*, the fortress entrance at the south end of the towered wall to the east of Egypt.

Having now found the general position of the *Kikkar*, or Circular-plain, of Jordan, we are in a position to appreciate the importance of Dr. Selah Merrill's discoveries in this region, when engaged, as archæologist of the party, in the survey of Eastern Palestine by the American Palestine Exploration Society. He calls attention to the *tell*-system of the Jordan. These *tells* are natural and in some cases perhaps artificial mounds at the foot of the hills, on which it is evident that the cities of the ancient inhabitants were built. He claims that his "researches have established that, with regard to the Jordan Valley, the flat land was never occupied by cities or towns of

¹ *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, vol. xviii. pp. 75, 76.

² Genesis xiii. 10; xiv. 2; xix. 20-22.

importance, but these stood either in the foot hills or upon natural or artificial mounds in the plain," and with such a conclusion all must agree who are acquainted with this malarious region. He then shows that around the north-east end of the Dead Sea, in "the plains of Moab"—the great Shittim plain of Numbers xxv. 1, still abounding with the *shittah*, or acacia tree—there are *exactly five tells*, or mounds, affording the characteristic sites of Palestine cities. These are now called *Tell Kefrein*, also known as *Tel es Sharab*, and identical with Abel Shittim and the Abila of Josephus; *Tell er Ramr*, the Beth Haram of Joshua; *Tell Suweimeh*, probably the Beth Jesimoth of Joshua; *Tell el Hammam*, and *Tell Ektanu*, the last standing furthest towards the south-east. On all these *tells* there are ruins. The district is watered by three streams, flowing respectively from the *Wady Shaib*, *Wady Kefrein*, and *Wady Hesban*, besides the springs of *Tell Suweimeh*. These, Dr. Selah Merrill thinks, may well have formed the sites of the five Cities of the Plain, and *Tell Ektanu*, which is certainly in the right position, he would identify with Zoar. He speaks of it as the most remarkable of the group, and as containing the oldest ruins he had seen in the country. He says, "Its position also deserves notice, it being nearer the mountains of Moab than any of the others, and although it cannot be reckoned as one of the foot-hills, it is so situated as to command an extensive view of the whole plain around and below it. I learned the name from some of the most intelligent Arabs who belong to that region; questioning different persons on different occasions, that there might be no mistake about it. They could, however, give no account of the origin or meaning of the name, except to say that it was very old. They said also that the ruins upon this *tell* were the most ancient of any that were known to them. The name, indeed, has no meaning in Arabic, and we are compelled to look elsewhere for its origin and signification. It appears to be the Hebrew word *Kātān* [קטן], which means 'little,' or the 'little one.' This signification is appropriate for this *tell* as compared with the others.

“ If the cities that were destroyed were at the north end of the Dead Sea, this *Tell Ektanu* would be exactly in the direction that Lot would take, if his intention was to hasten to the neighbouring hills or towards them for safety, and its distance from the rest of the mounds corresponds well with the time allowed the fugitive, namely, from dawn to sunrise.

“ In my judgment, they are not merely accidental circumstances that this *tell* should be one of a group of five ; that it should be in the same plain, but nearer the mountains than the others ; that the direction and distance corresponds exactly with the requirements of the Biblical account ; that the ruins upon it should be some of the oldest in the country ; and that the name it bears should have no meaning in Arabic, but be apparent by the Hebrew word signifying ‘ the little one.’

“ The fact that one Hebrew word has been substituted for another identical with it in meaning, *i.e.*, *Katan* for *Zoar*, ought not to be urged as an objection to identifying *Tell Ektanu* with the site of the ‘ little city’ to which Lot fled, provided all the other circumstances of the case point to it as the proper one. Besides it is much easier to understand how this substitution could have taken place than it is to understand how the name *Bela* could have given way to that of *Zoar*.¹

But there is a fact, which, I believe, I was the first to discover, of still greater interest in connection with the northern end of the plain where these *tells* are situated, and one which greatly strengthens the theory that this is the site of Sodom and its sister cities, while at the same time confirming in a most remarkable manner the minute accuracy of the Scripture account of Chedorlaomer’s campaign. On this east side of the Jordan, to the north of *Tell Nimrin*, which stands in a district still capable of being well irrigated by a rich stream from *Wady Shaib*, but desolate for want of cultivation, as foretold by the prophet Isaiah,² there is a singularly dry and waterless

¹ *Palestine Exploration Society* (American), *Fourth Statement*, p. 95. January, 1877. New York.

² Isaiah xv. 6.

region, extending for some ten or twelve miles in length. I visited it in the spring of 1873, and was much struck with one of its features, the full meaning of which I did not then realize. Along its southern boundary, where the river Jordan in its windings comes nearest to the mountains of Moab, are two lines of the remains of regularly formed pits extending across the greater part of the valley. Some two-and-a-half miles farther south is another shorter line of similar ruined pits.

The two lines of these pits farthest to the north meet at an angle, and the pit where they join is larger than any of the others. Each of these pits is merely marked now by a basin-like, circular mound, resembling the den of an ant-lion, which is only a few feet in height, but measures some thirty feet in diameter. The actual pits themselves which once yawned deep and wide within these protecting enclosures are now, in all instances, filled up. They are generally thirty feet apart, but in some instances are separated by a distance of from fifty to sixty feet. In the two lines, which meet at an angle in a large central basin, there are no less than fifty-two pits, thirty-one in the longest line and twenty-one in the other. At a distance the whole row resembles a string of huge molehills, only placed at regular intervals.

Though they are evidently very ancient, and have long been unused, I immediately recognized them as the remains of a very peculiar and interesting water system, with which I became familiar on a journey to Palmyra in 1872, and which is still in use on the plains of Damascus.

Since my visit to the Jordan Valley and discovery of the pits in 1873, the American Palestine Exploration Society have surveyed this part of the land of Moab, and Dr. Selah Merrill has carefully described these remains, but, strangely enough, declares that he has no idea of the purpose they served! To those who are acquainted with the plain of Damascus these circular basins are most familiar objects. There, as also right away to Central Asia,¹ they form the unmistakable mark on

¹ Mr. William Simpson has traced them as far as the Khyber, and tells us they are numerous at Jellalabad, and speaks of the Valley of Nishapur in Khôrassan as

the surface of a curious underground aqueduct in connection with a simple but effective system of irrigation, which may be seen in working order at the present time. A wide well-like pit is sunk till water is found, often at a depth of from thirty to sixty feet, and then, along the downward slope of the land, another such pit is made, not quite so deep, some fifty or sixty yards away, and the two are connected at the bottom by a channel which just allows a slight fall, sufficient for the water to flow. Another and then another is sunk, each gradually decreasing in depth, until there is a long line of pits connected below by a continuous channel conducting a stream of water, which comes at length to a level with the surface, and is then employed to irrigate the land. Some of these aqueducts extend for two or three miles, and the long line of pits resemble an extensive earthwork; for the soil, when each is first dug, is thrown out in a ring some thirty feet in diameter around the pit mouth. This is what forms the regular basin-like enclosure, originally some four to six feet high, to which I have alluded, and which often leaves a unique and unmistakable appearance above ground, even when, as is now the case in the Jordan Valley, the pits and their subterranean channel are entirely obliterated. The whole plain of Damascus is full of these curious constructions, some crossing and running under the others, and catching the waste water which percolates through the soil from those above. Dr. Porter has described them in a sketch of Damascus.¹ They are called in some parts *karaizes*, and the channel connecting the

called at one time "The Valley of Twelve Thousand *Karaizes*," *Karaize*, being the name given to the water system of which these pits are a part. He says, "In the part of Persia that I journeyed over with the Afghan Boundary Commission—that is, in a line from Teheran—these works exist everywhere. There are men whose profession it is to find out a source of water below ground near the foot of the hills, and when this has been discovered there are men who will make the *Karaize*." *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, January, 1890. p. 56. The mistake into which Mr. H. A. Harper has fallen, in giving, on p. 12 of the first edition of *The Bible and Modern Discoveries*, my description of these pits, to which Mr. William Simpson alludes in the above paper, will be found explained and corrected in the *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, April, 1890. pp. 130-132.

* ¹ Murray's *Handbook for Travellers in Syria and Palestine*, pp. 497, 540. 1858.

bottom of the pits a *kanot*. The pits are not what we understand by wells, being merely the means by which the tunnelled aqueduct is made, and by which it is from time to time cleared out and kept in repair. Most of these *karaises* now in use are, like many others in ruins, the laborious and costly work of very ancient times; for modern Syrians possess neither the means, enterprise, nor ingenuity to construct them.

By the men of the *Adwan* tribe of *Bedaween* Arabs, who were my escort on the plains of Moab, and who have long been settled on this spot, I was gravely informed that these lines of basins were earthworks thrown up in connection with military operations, and once played a very important part in a campaign which took place in remote ages, with which they connect a certain sheikh Zeer, who was possessed of miraculous powers. They appeared wholly incredulous when I told them, apparently for the first time, the true purpose for which undoubtedly they were constructed. But this legend connecting them with a great battle is most significant, the more so as their very nature is unknown to the *Bedaween*, who have held this district for so many centuries.

Nothing like these remains, so far as I have been able to ascertain, is to be found in any other part of Palestine, for what at first was thought by those who made the survey of Western Palestine to be a similar ruin near *Kurn Surtubeh* appears, from the account in the Memoirs of the Survey Map (vol. ii. p. 397), to be merely some three rock-cut *beers*, or ordinary underground water cisterns, connected with one another by a rock-cut channel. Nowhere else in the Holy Land, east of the mountain ranges of Moab, Gilead, and Bashan, have we any trace of these pits save in this one spot in the Jordan Valley, just to the south of which the latest criticism and the most recent discoveries agree in locating the Cities of the *Kikkar*.

Who can now fail to draw the deeply interesting conclusion that these, together no doubt with many other such lines of pits, which, in ancient times, formed the extensive system

of irrigation at this particular spot, must be the constructions mentioned as a marked feature of the Vale of Siddim, so long ago as the days of Abraham? I allude to the "pits" of Gen. xiv. 10, which contributed largely to the defeat of the armies of the five Cities of the Circular-plain when driven northward by the victorious hosts of Cherdor-laomer, advancing upon them from the south.

The Vale of Siddim was certainly a portion of this same eastern side of the Jordan Valley. A striking evidence of this has been discovered by Major Conder, R.E., during the work of the Survey. He met with the occurrence of the precisely similar Arabic word *Sidd* at the present day, *in this part of the Jordan Valley, with a meaning which it has nowhere else in the country*, given as a technical name to a peculiar feature of the district. While engaged in this spot in taking down names for the Map, he observed that *Sidd* and *Sâdeh* were the appellations given to the cliffs, or banks of marl, which form a marked characteristic of the alluvial soil of that lower part of the valley through which the Jordan flows.¹ He has the following important note in the Memoir which accompanies the Survey Map of Western Palestine:—"There has been much doubt as to the meaning of this name (the Vale of Siddim). Gesenius compares it with the Arabic *Sidd*, and Dean Stanley with *Sâdeh*. It is worthy of notice that the words *Sidd* and *Sâdeh* are frequently used in the Jordan Valley with a meaning peculiar to the dialect of that part of the country. Thus we have *Sidd el' Attyeh*, 'the dry Sidd,' applied to one of the great marl banks below the cliffs of the Dead Sea, near *Râs Feshkhah*. The word was in this instance explained to us as meaning a cliff. Again, we have *Deir es Sidd*, 'Convent of the Cliff,' a ruin on the edge of a precipice; *Sidd Harîz*, 'the fortified cliff,' a precipice near Phasaelis; *Sâdet et Fikiyah*, 'the cracked cliff;'; *Sâdet el Hermil*, 'cliff of rue;'; *Sâdet en Nahleh*, 'cliff of the torrent;'; *Sâdet el Tâleb*, 'the straight cliff;'; *Wâdy Siddeh*, 'the valley of cliffs.' The word is unknown to the inhabitants of

¹ *Tent Work in Palestine*, vol ii. p. 16.

the towns ; it seems peculiar to the Jordan Valley, and does not occur in the nomenclature of the other parts of the country. We may, perhaps, render the Vale of Siddim 'Valley of Cliffs,' and the title would apply to the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea or to the whole valley."¹

If we turn to the account in Genesis, we find that it is said, "And the Vale of Siddim was full of slime pits," literally "was wells, wells of *hhaimar*," בְּאֵרֹת בְּאֵרֹת הַחַמָּר, *beeroth beeroth hhaimar*, "And the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, and fell there ; and they that remained fled to the mountain."² What this "*hhaimar*" was is doubtful. It occurs in the Hebrew Bible only three times ; some would translate it "bitumen." It is mentioned as the substitute for mortar, employed by the builders of the Tower of Babel, and as the material used by Jochebed to line the ark, or box, in which she laid the infant Moses, and it occurs again in this passage in describing these pits in connection with an aqueduct. Those who would render it "bitumen" have supposed that the Vale of Siddim was full of pits from which this product was dug out. No such pits, however, are to be found anywhere in the neighbourhood of the Jordan. It is true that at intervals large quantities of bitumen, or asphalt, called in Arabic *hummer*, are thrown up by volcanic action from the bottom of the Dead Sea, and are found floating on the surface ; but, as we have seen, the latest criticism and scientific research prove conclusively that the Cities of the Plain could never have stood on land now covered by the waters of this lake. I have elsewhere shown that there is a production of Palestine called *hhomrah*, consisting of crushed pottery, largely used in the preparation of a water-tight cement.³ Either this, or simple clay, or possibly the *hummer*, or asphalt, thrown up from the bottom of the Dead Sea, may have been employed to render

¹ *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement*, p. 18. January, 1878.

² Gen. xiv. 10. The word used here, which is translated "pit" in our version, בְּאֵרֹת, *bəair*, evidently the Arabic *beer*, the technical term at the present day for the huge underground water-cisterns and large wells of Palestine, is in almost every other place rendered "well," and connected with water, and so it should be here.

³ *Palestine Explored*. Third Edition, pp. 116-119. J. Nisbet & Co. 1882.

these underground aqueducts and the bottoms of the pits they connected better able to hold water.

But is it necessary to suppose that any lining or cementing of the pits is implied? חֲמֵר, *hchaimar*, like the similar חֲמֵר, *hhoamer*, may mean simply "clay" or "earth,"¹ and there seems to be every reason to believe that it does so here. *Beers*, or "water-pits," in Palestine are usually excavated in the rock, and carefully plastered with a thick coat of cement, but these, we are told, to distinguish them, were simply "*beeroth hchaimar*," "water-pits of earth," that is, dug as *karaises* usually are, in the earth or clay marl. No mere collection of ordinary cemented *beers*, or wells, which are always carefully roofed over and closed in, could have contributed to the utter overthrow of the forces of the Cities of the Circular-plain, when "the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled and fell there." But a widespread network of open *karaise* pits, extending all across the line of their retreat, especially if the basin-like surrounding walls had been washed away, would most naturally account for the entire destruction of any army that became entangled in it. Hence no doubt the tradition still lingering amongst the *Bedarween* of this district, that these remains were connected in remote times with a remarkable campaign.

How exceedingly dangerous the pits of this water system are to a single horseman or fugitive, and much more to a troop of cavalry or a large body of infantry in rapid retreat, may be gathered from the following graphic description. It is from the pen of the well-known special correspondent of the *Daily News*, when writing a few years ago from Central Asia. It occurs in his account of the various modes of irri-

¹ That חֲמֵר means "clay" and "earth" is clear from its use in Job iv. 19; x. 9; xxx. 19; xxxvii. 6; Isa. x. 6; xxix. 16; xl. 9; lxiv. 8; Jer. xviii. 4, 6; Neh. iii. 14; Hab. iii. 15. All ancient Hebrew MSS., being, as we know, unpointed, that is consisting of consonants only without vowels, there is nothing in the inspired original to show that the word which occurs only three times, as *hchaimar* was not really the same as *hhoamer*. The Masoretic critics who pointed, that is, added the vowels to the inspired text, have often misled us in this way, as witness מִצְבֵּה, "bed," for מִצְבָּה, "staff" (Gen. xvii. 31), and כּוֹרֵשׁ, *Koresh*, for the true name כּוֹרֵשׁ, *Kuresh*, "Cyrus," in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, and the thirteen other places where Cyrus is mentioned, &c.

gation in the watered gardens around Meshed. Besides the surface water derived from the river *Keshet Rood*, he says, "There is also a large subterranean amount being conveyed in underground channels to more distant fields situated at a lower level. These subterranean watercourses (*kanots*) are, especially in the case of the more ancient ones, a source of continual and terrible danger to the travellers. When they are being formed, shafts are sunk at intervals of thirty to forty yards, and the sand and gravel brought to the surface by means of a bucket and rude wooden windlass. The material brought up is thrown in an annular heap, like the den of an ant-lion. These heaps mark the line of the *kanot* often for miles across the plain, just as molehills do the track of the animal. During rainy weather these circular heaps, with their central shafts, act like so many tundishes, and gradually the earth is washed into the channel below, and swept away by the current. The mound thus gone, there is no mark whatever as to the whereabouts of the shaft, which yearly grows wider and wider. I have seen them from ten to fifteen feet across, and going down sheer to a depth of sixty or seventy feet, yawning on the edge, or even in the midst, of much frequented thoroughfares. Sometimes they were naked and undisguised in the arid plain, sometimes their mouths were completely hidden by undergrowth, and luxuriant growth of a species of creeping berberis which affects such localities. Over and over again, but for the instinct of my horse, I should have been precipitated into them. It is frightful to see these pits, often halfway across a frequented track, where thousands of men and animals, travelling too at night, and some of the nights none of the clearest, are continually passing. On horseback one has the advantage of the double lookout kept by himself and by the animal; but I fancy that many a score of poor foot-sore, half-blind old *hadjis* must annually find eternal rest from their earthly pilgrimage at the bottom of these dreadful pits. I have over and over again seen the skeletons and hanging ligaments of a camel wedged ten feet down in one of these apertures. They had doubtless stumbled in some dark night, and were perforce left there to perish."

What a striking commentary is this incidental statement on the brief but now pregnant words of that ancient narrative in Genesis, "And the Vale of Siddim was full of water-pits of earth, and the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled and fell there."¹

Scanty verdure is now to be seen in this same *Kikkar*, or Circular-plain, of Jordan, except when spring for a brief two months clothes it with a glorious spontaneous growth of wild flowers. But we may assuredly gather that it once presented a very different scene. To speak of one side of the valley only, that which lies to the west of the river, just opposite to the site suggested for the Cities of the *Kikkar*, for miles round *Ain es Sultan*, exist exceedingly extensive ruins of an ancient system of irrigation. Major Conder, R.E., in his report on this region, given in *The Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, April, 1874, points out no less than six springs used to irrigate this part of the plain by means of as many as twelve aqueducts.

The comparison of the *Kikkar* of Jordan with the land of Egypt, lying as Israel's principal river does, in a valley running north and south, bounded on either side by hills, enjoying a climate (owing to its being more than a thousand feet below the sea level) with little or no rain, as hot, if not hotter, than that of the Upper Nile, and with abundant irrigation, upon which it is wholly dependent for its life, is not only very natural and appropriate, but also aids us in forming an idea of the surpassing fertility of that fair scene which lured Lot well nigh to his ruin.

In after ages the *Kikkar* was still exceedingly rich. When Israel came to Jericho, it was famous as "the City of Palm Trees." It was the first region in the Promised Land that they beheld, and the first that they were permitted to conquer. May we not suppose that the Lord's purpose was to bring them at the beginning of the campaign to this extraordinarily fertile spot, and that in the spring-time, the best season of the year in which it can be visited, in order

¹ Gen. xiv. 10.

to display before them in an eminent manner the goodness of the "land which flowed with milk and honey," so that they might realize its excellence, and be strongly encouraged to make it their own?

It was the same when Josephus gives us a glance at the spot in his own time. "This country bears that balsam which is the most precious drug that is there, and grows there alone. The place bears also palm-trees both many in number, and those excellent in kind."¹ There seems every reason to believe that these famous irrigated lands around Jericho formed, in more ancient times, part of the garden-lands of Sodom and Gomorrah. After the awful destruction of the Cities of the *Kikkar* on the east of the river, the spot was probably held to be accursed, and thus became forsaken for the district of Jericho on the west.

It has been usual with many writers to speak of Palestine as far from a rich and beautiful country, and to allege as a foregone conclusion that it must everywhere have lacked verdure, and could have had no resources to supply a teeming population. A simple answer to this is afforded by the picture here presented of one large plain, which is said to have been "like the land of Egypt" for its exceeding productiveness and beauty. Visit it now, and who could believe in its former glory? Not a cultivated palm is to be seen. Dr. Tristram and Major Conder tell us of one or two wild ones, all that a diligent search in out-of-the-way nooks could discover—solitary and hidden survivors of all its splendid groves! Only a tiny patch of ground, here and there, is now under cultivation. The district that was like "a splendid garden, like the land of Egypt" is to-day, for the most part, a waste, pestilential wilderness, overrun with tangled thickets of deadly osher, thornbushes, and thistles. And is it not reasonable to suppose that what irrigation once accomplished for this wide district when "the Vale of Siddim was full of water-pits of earth," it must have done for many another part of the "goodly land"?

JAMES NEIL.

¹ Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, b. xv. c. iv. s. 2.

DEFINITIONS WANTED—MORAL.

THE unscientific vagaries of scientific men would form a very interesting psychologic study. For example, the study of nature is for the most part inductive; students are generally willing to take the facts of nature into consideration when they are framing explanations of nature; but when they come to the study of themselves the process is reversed: facts are ignored, principles are assumed, and from out their inner consciousness a theory of man is evolved, as unlike to man as can well be conceived. It is as though you set a botanist to construct a theory of the stars on one condition; that as he knows so much about matter already in the form of flowers, he must never look at the stars, but build his astronomy from his knowledge of botany. What a gain his astronomy would be to the advance of science! This is neither exaggeration nor caricature, but the simple fact of the case as regards those naturalists who consider themselves competent to explain all the phenomena of nature apart from a creative intelligence or foreknown design. We can easily estimate the value of a psychology that is based on the unproved and most improbable assumption that all phenomena are physical phenomena. Our materialist studies the doings of atoms and molecules in man, crystal, or cell, and his senses finding there nothing but matter, he boldly states that nothing exists but matter, and so the matter is settled. How useless, therefore, he thinks, to study the facts of man when about to describe man; his knowledge of a few facts about matter are sufficient to enable him to produce from his inner illumination a full, true, and accurate account of everything about himself! The first sweeping dictum of this irrationalism regarding our moral nature is that there is no such thing as a moral nature. All such words as "responsibility," "virtue," "rightness," "ought," mean something altogether different

from what they are supposed to mean. This, however, is a question of fact, and our appeal must be to the universal consciousness of man. Beyond that we cannot go, but we have a right to demand that every theory of human nature shall be based on the facts of consciousness, and be an interpretation of these facts. It is no interpretation of facts to deny their existence, or to present them in impossible aspects. But this is exactly what is done by materialists. We are told by them that morality is not morality, but utility, and utility is selfishness. We may, however, boldly assert, without fear of contradiction, that the most thorough-paced materialist, when he describes an action as moral, means one quality; when he describes it as useful, he means another; and when he says it is selfish, he is thinking of yet a third. The first two he regards with approbation, but surely he does not so regard the third. Not only, however, do morality and utility not mean the same thing, but they may in thought be parted widely as the poles. We can easily imagine cases where the most grossly immoral act might be of the highest utility to society. There are but few who would not say that suicide, for example, was immoral; and yet suicide might be highly useful to the community. Suppose the arch-criminals of the country decided to commit suicide, and did it. We can readily imagine the feelings of relief with which the news would be received, from a selfish point of view; for beyond all controversy this would be useful to the community at large. There are, it must be confessed, some utilitarians who do imagine cases where murdering, not oneself, but other members of the *same tribe*, might be a highly moral act! Mr. Darwin tells us in his *Descent of Man*, "If men were reared under precisely the same conditions as hive-bees, there can hardly be a doubt that our unmarried females would, like the worker bees, think it a sacred duty to kill their brothers, and mothers would strive to kill their fertile daughters; and not one would think of interfering." Talk about the scientific imagination after that! We had always liked bees, but after reading this, and thinking what we would have been had the bees developed themselves into ourselves,

we almost shudder at the sight of one. But those who so lightly brush aside God, the soul, and immortality, cannot find much difficulty in brushing aside reason, common sense, and morality. *No God, no morality.* Of course, we now speak of morality as a quality of action, and not as the character of a person's life.

We would with all earnestness ask "utilitarians" not to aid in the confusion of thought which exists by using useless and misleading words. If those words in the vocabulary of morality have exactly the same meaning as those in the vocabulary of utility, in the name of all that is consistent drop the former altogether, and use exclusively the latter. Let any utilitarian try to write a treatise on the conduct of life, employing only the terms to which he has a right, and it will be the death-blow of utilitarianism, so called.

We say "so called," because materialists have no right even to the word

UTILITY.

Utility is a noble thought in morals. It means that a moral action is full of use, primarily for the doer of it, and then for all with whom he comes into contact. For it is impossible to benefit ourselves without benefiting others; as it is impossible for us to injure ourselves without injuring others also. Utility in its highest significance does not mean something useful for a year or for a lifetime, but for the whole duration of the being who has given it birth; useful for all eternity. Can we imagine God giving a command, inspiring a thought, directing a course, whose issue shall not be useful both for time and eternity? God wishes His children to be happy, richly to enjoy themselves, to rejoice in Him, and has placed almost infinite resources at their disposal; but all these are means to an end, the end itself being benefit to the moral character. The highest utilitarianism is Godliness, for "Godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come." "Exactly," say our opponents, "it is just there the point comes in: you say Godliness is profitable, and therefore you are Godly; we say honesty is profitable, and therefore we are honest. Where

are we more selfish than you?" "In the motive," we reply, "the Christian is Godly because it is *right*, not because *profit* will follow; you are honest not because it is right, but because profit will follow; and this parts you from the Christian by the whole diameter of principle." We shall suppose two mothers each having a sick child. One loves her child in her own selfish way, and nurses it in order that she may have the pleasure of seeing it become healthy again. The other also loves her child, but differently, and nurses it also, but without thought of self. When her child becomes well, she, too, will have pleasure, more than the other; but while we may contrast the mothers, we cannot compare them.

It is clear, however, that this matter of motive has two aspects, the Divine and the human. The Divine aspect is from God to man, and means utility alone; all His doings are to benefit His children. The human aspect is from man to God, and means gratitude leading on to love of God Himself. As utility is, therefore, primarily, the Divine standpoint, we shall define *Moral Utility* as "*God's purpose in man's government.*"

Materialists can only claim

SELFISHNESS

as their basic principle of action, if they can have a basic principle, or philosophic principle of any kind. Mr. Bradlaugh put the matter very clearly in a recent debate, when he said, "The highest morality is to do good to others, knowing that that will produce good to you; and to do it *because* you know it will produce good to you means that by increasing the general amount of happiness you increase your own." Darwin very naturally recoils from "laying the foundation of the noblest part of our nature in the bare principle of selfishness," but he recoils in vain. He only lays the foundation-stone more surely when he distorts sympathy, one of our most beautiful faculties, into selfishness of the most heartless kind. "We are led," he states, "by the hope of receiving good in return to perform acts of sympathetic kindness to others." Such a statement, by whomsoever made, is a libel on human

nature and a parody on reasoning. This reluctance on the part of those who are without God, to boldly deny that within them which most strongly points to God, and to affirm that man has no more morality than a watch, is a grand testimony to the power of their better intuitions and the reality of their higher nature; and it gives hope that maturer thought may lead them to be true to themselves in the recognition of the great truth that they are not machines, but moral agents. Now comes the crucial question—

WHAT IS MORALITY?

In trying to ascertain the one answer to this much debated query, our better course will be to disregard all previous answers, not by reason of any disrespect to their authors, but that we may not be deflected from our own course by other influences, whether positive or negative.

It is impossible to ascertain the accurate meaning of so important a term as this, without some slight statement of the nature and circumstances of the being to whom it is so vital. When man was made, he was made in the image of God, and this was done by God breathing into his nostrils the breath of life. The soul thus given by our Creator, and so far like to Himself, possessed certain faculties, which may be roughly grouped as cognitive, emotional, volitional, and moral. Before the fall of man all these powers worked in harmony, and truly; that is, the cognitive would not reason falsely, the proper emotions would arise on the presentation of certain objects, and the will would submit itself to the guidance of a Being superior to itself. All this, however, changed too soon, and the image of God was no longer mirrored on the undisturbed surface of the soul. From that moment the aim of God has been to restore His image in us in all its fulness and perfection. For the attainment of this glorious object the Master lived and suffered, and still the Spirit strives. "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." But we can only *know* God as we are conscious of that within which comes from God, and is like to God. To see nature we look without, but to

see God we must look within. It will not be denied that every action which we call right is one that is in harmony with what we believe to be the will of God, and in the doing of which we are strengthened in God's likeness. It is perfectly clear that any quality of actions which polishes and purifies character, which brings more of heaven within the soul, which makes man more like to God, is the Kingly quality, and must claim authority over all the rest. By common consent this is true of morality, and of morality alone. Consequently, *Morality may be at once defined as God-likeness.*

Keeping this definition steadily in view, it will clear away many difficulties and give a precision to several words which they do not seem to have possessed. We see at once why "ought," or "owed," must outweigh all the universe but God; for all debts are as nothing compared with the debt we owe to God. The word "ought" is frequently used in a somewhat careless way, when the better expression would be "should," as you should turn to the right, rather than you ought to turn. It would be well to confine the use of the word "ought" to moral actions. The "*right*" is the shortest line from God-unlikeness to God-likeness, and any deviation from that right line must inherently be sin against God and our own soul.

From this relation to God emerge all our convictions regarding the authority of morality, and our responsibility to Him. Apart from God, there can be no authority but that of power, and no responsibility but that which is voluntarily undertaken. But in a true morality we at once see that we must give account of ourselves to God, and that is *responsibility*. There must be responsibility wherever there is duty, for *Duty is what is due by or to us*. Those to whom we owe have a right to demand that we shall not owe, if we have ability to pay. We owe to God by nature the service of creatures, and by grace the service of gratitude; we also owe to our fellow-men, as they owe to us, the service of brotherhood, and these are our moral duties.

There is one faculty of the mind specially concerned with these ethical subjects, called Conscience.

WHAT IS CONSCIENCE ?

Many answers have been given to this question, and many definitions stated, that altogether overlook the very essence of this most important faculty. Without pausing to examine these, conscience may be defined as "*that original faculty that affirms the existence of rightness or wrongness in choices, accompanied by consequent approval or disapproval.*" It does not, in its original condition, say what is right and what is wrong, but merely that something is right and something is wrong. Decisions as to what is right, and what is wrong are moral judgments, which may be either true or false, according to circumstances. One affirmation the conscience always and everywhere makes is that every man ought to do that which he honestly, and to the best of his opportunities, believes to be right. It, like every other faculty—as, for example, the æsthetic—requires to be cultivated. The æsthetic faculty does not tell us what is beautiful, but only that there is such a quality as beauty ; but were it not for this, we never could know the beautiful at all. So were it not for this simple primary affirmation by conscience, morality or morals could have no existence in society, or rather, there would not be any society existing ; for the common sense of unrestrained selfishness would soon tear to shreds and tatters the cobweb fancies of amiable visionaries, and convert, as by magic, the "greatest happiness of the greatest number" into the unspeakable wretchedness of everybody. But in conscience we have a germ that may be developed into a tree so wide-spreading that all the thoughts and feelings of our nature may shelter beneath its branches. In fact it must be so, because God-likeness is not limited to any one element of our being, but should extend over our whole nature. Every thought and every feeling to be right must bear the image or superscription of the King.

But if conscience is to help men back along the right line to God-likeness and to happiness, it must be taught what that likeness is, and the way to it. Reason alone, however, is incompetent for the task, so it is supplemented by the light of Revelation, which supplies the necessary information, and

tells the man who came from God how to return to God again.

We have now to consider some secondary terms that are concerned in the development of man's moral consciousness, and the first naturally in order is

VIRTUE.

It would seem an easy enough matter to define this familiar word, and yet it has given rise to bewildering discussions from the earliest times to the present hour. Many writers have made it almost synonymous with benevolence, arguing that whatever tended to what they considered the happiness of mankind was therefore virtuous. Bishop Butler, while assenting largely to this theory, could not accept it altogether, for he wrote, "Without inquiring how far, and in what sense, virtue is resolvable into benevolence, and vice into the want of it, it may be proper to observe that benevolence and the want of it, simply considered, are in no sort the whole of virtue and vice." This we feel to be true, for a man may be very benevolent, but not virtuous; or virtuous, but not benevolent. The definition by Paley is nearer the mark, but not wholly satisfactory, "The doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness." This is inconsistent with itself, if we do good because it is the will of God, it is not for future reward; if we do it for future reward, it is not because it is the will of God.

Why not let the word define itself? It means strength or manliness; and what is virtue but strength in going along the right line? Consequently, our definition of *Virtue* is "*strength in doing right.*" Vice in this case would be strength in doing wrong.

We do not call that man virtuous who feebly and but seldom does the right, or that man vicious who but seldom acts viciously. The two names point rather to the habit of the life, and ought to be used accordingly.

In close alliance with virtue—in fact, the direct result of it—is the state expressed by that much-abused word

HAPPINESS.

We read so much about the "greatest happiness" theory that we forget it is pleasure which is meant, and not happiness. For pleasure and happiness may be far apart. The word happiness comes from hap, or happening. Haps, or unexpected occurrences, takes place in all men's lives, but men use them differently, or rather, some men use them, some are used by them. To the former they are useful; to the latter hurtful. He who has himself so well in hand that come what may he is prepared for it, prepared to prove himself its master, and wrest from it whatever good it may contain, is surely the happy man; while he who is tossed to and fro by every gust of fortune is equally the unhappy man. We would, therefore, define *Happiness* as "*the preparation for all haps.*" But as this can only be had in the path of rectitude, we may regard happiness as the child of virtue. Truly are we told that "all things work together for good to those who love God."

That God has claims upon us is admitted by all who admit the existence of God, and that our duty to Him consists in paying these dues is equally undoubted. But has man also claims upon us? do we owe duty to him as well? In other words, are we justified in claiming from other men what we denominate as our

RIGHTS.

This is the same as asking whether rights exist; for if they do exist, we have a right to demand that they shall be acknowledged. The materialist claims them equally with others; but in so doing he is utterly inconsistent, for there cannot be any rights apart from the authority of a Being higher than man. We cannot of ourselves manufacture rights, nor can they spring from the nature of things. They emerge from the Divine decision regarding the brotherhood of man, that he who loves God shall love his brother also—which means that he shall help his brother as best he can. Our *Rights* are, consequently, *our inherent claims on the sym-*

pathy and help of others. This is acknowledged by all Christians, at least in theory ; and as for those who are not Christians, they have no concern with rights, but must abide in the colder regions of utility, prudence, or compulsion, according to their distance from the Christian standpoint. If our definition of rights be accurate, we see how much the word is abused, especially as regards parents and children. It seems to be assumed that the rights of parents are almost unlimited, while the rights of children are almost none. The exact opposite is nearer the truth. A parent cannot have any right to do anything that shall injure the child's character, while the child has every right to expect from its parents that they shall do all in their power to guard it from evil, and to elevate its character. The parents have great responsibilities, and the child has great claims. Parents have no specific rights as parents ; for their own pleasure they are parents, but that cannot confer rights ; while the child has very specific rights. It has by its parents been called into existence, and it has every right to demand that its parents shall do their utmost to make that existence a blessing, and not a curse. As, however, very beautifully in the order of God parentage mostly produces natural affection, sometimes of a very strong kind, it is only proper that those having this intuitive love should, in the first place, have charge of their own offspring. But if the result should be threatened ruin to the child, both body and soul ; if all responsibilities are disregarded ; then it is due to that child for its brethren in God to rescue it from danger, and it has a right to look to them for help. At least it is thus that this important question presents itself to our own mind.

The full acknowledgment of all rights, and the effort to discharge them, is

JUSTICE.

He who is just does his best to give to every one that which he may fairly claim as his due. He who is generous is willing to grant more than can be honestly demanded. It is justice on the part of God to forgive the sins of those who

comply with His graciously volunteered conditions ; it was generosity to volunteer those conditions when we had no right to demand, or even to expect, them.

The last definitions that space will permit to be noticed now are those of

REGRET AND REMORSE.

These seem so well understood that it appears almost superfluous to differentiate them, but modern "philosophy" has made this necessary. That there is such an emotion as remorse cannot by any one be denied. Some may say they have not felt it, though that is difficult of belief. But as there is colour blindness, so there may be moral insensibility. Materialists cannot deny its existence, but of course they are bound to deny any moral meaning in it. We, therefore, as might be expected, find Darwin teaching that remorse is nothing more "than an overwhelming sense of repentance." But as he uses repentance and regret as convertible terms, his teaching is that remorse bears the same relation to repentance [regret] that rage does to anger, or agony to pain. This means that remorse is to regret, as rage is to anger. If Darwin's biological observations had no more exactitude than his psychological, his system would not be worth the paper on which it is printed. It is not to be wondered at that he should stumble here, for this fact of remorse is almost the hardest that the materialist has to explain. Can it be denied that we may feel regret for the folly or sins of another ; but that *remorse is limited, without exception, to the sins we have ourselves committed?* It has no relation to the "judgment of our fellows," as Darwin asserts, but may be experienced for a sin unknown to any earthly being. *Regret* [regreet] is the weeping for that which should cause tears to flow for any one ; *remorse* is the soul biting itself again and again for its own sin against its God.

Humanity, morality, Deity, are a trinity in unity that cannot be disunited, without the destruction of the three.

JAS. MCCANN, D.D.

THREE CHARACTER-STUDIES.

III.—ST. JOHN.

TRADITION has preserved a very beautiful story concerning St. John. In his old age he lived at Ephesus. Too feeble to walk, he used to be carried into the assembly of the Church. There amidst the breathless silence of the congregation he preached his sermon. It was a very short sermon, consisting of less than half-a-dozen words: "Little children, love one another." Daily he repeated the same words. At length the elders of the Church began to weary of the constant reiteration. They asked the old man, "How is it that thou who knowest so much, and hast such stores of Divine truth, never sayest anything but the simple words, Love one another?" And the Apostle answered, "I bid you love one another, because if you do that, you will have done all?"

The sermon, and St. John's comment upon it, was worthy of the sainted Apostle who had leaned on the Lord's breast at that last supper at Jerusalem, and had listened as the lips of the Great Teacher had pronounced His new commandment, that His disciples were to love one another. In his old age the disciple whom Jesus loved had received into his heart the spirit of his Master. It had not always been so. The son of Thunder had been a man of fierce passions and strong emotions. If he knew how to love, he knew how to hate. In the early days of youth, when the blood flowed hot and swift through his veins, the younger son of Zebedee had not always found it easy to follow in his Lord's footsteps of meekness and forbearance.

But before proceeding to an analysis of St. John's character, a few words must be said as to the writings which bear his name, and which furnish the best materials for a study of his mind and disposition.

There is a very sufficient reason why, in these later days, controversy has always raged around the fourth Gospel.

By means of supposititious recensions and imaginary interpolations it may be possible to receive the three synoptical Gospels as giving an account more or less accurate of the life of Jesus of Nazareth without accepting the doctrine of Christ's divinity. But the language of St. John's Gospel is too precise to be so treated. In the prologue, especially, the Divine nature of the Son of God is stated in terms too precise to be easily explained away. The Gospel, as is allowed by all who receive it as authentic, was written in St. John's old age, and was, therefore, published and circulated considerably later than the Galilæan Evangelists. Consequently it is less easy to trace its use in the Church. The quotations from it are less numerous and less exact than those from the synoptic books. The first writer who actually quotes it as the composition of the Apostle St. John is Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, about 170 A.D. Furthermore, it is a Gospel which found greater favour in the eyes of the gnostics—as Marcion—than did the other Gospels. Hence it was comparatively easy for F. C. Baur, and others of the Tübingen school, to assert that the Gospel of St. John was a forgery by some unknown gnostic heretic towards the end of the second century. But when a more stringent criticism was applied to this Gospel, the daring theory soon found impugners, not only among the ranks of the orthodox, but among those whose sympathies were entirely with the opponents of the received opinion. So there is now a general consensus of opinion among all critics, the results of whose researches are worth quoting, that the date of the fourth Gospel goes back to the very beginning of the second century; and as those who receive the Gospel as being the work of the author whose name it bears believe it to have been published some considerable time posterior to the destruction of Jerusalem, it will be seen that orthodox and unorthodox critics are pretty nearly agreed as to the time of its publication. But to admit the date is practically to admit the authorship. In judging of the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the New Testament, what may be called the subjective evidence is too much ignored. The question is not whether the style and manner, the phraseology and

diction, are such as the supposed author would have used. We would rely rather on the negative evidence. It is most difficult to believe that a conscious forger, attempting for purposes of his own to palm upon the world his composition as the production of a divinely inspired Apostle, could have written the winged words which are found in the New Testament. The lie in his right hand would have left its evil impression on his pages. This bears with special force upon the Gospel and the first Epistle of St. John. In both are depths of spiritual insight, and an entering into the mind of God, which are hardly to be found elsewhere, even in the writings of inspiration. Is it possible to believe that a forger, with the consciousness of his own falseness within him, could have portrayed scenes such as are drawn in the fourth Gospel, or could have worked up the farewell discourses, or could have invented the high-priestly prayer, or would have written the burning thoughts of unimaginable beauty which we find, for instance, in the fourth chapter of the Epistle?

It is admitted by Renan and others that the author of the Gospel is also the author of the first Epistle. Men, like Bretschneider and Paulus, who do not believe that St. John wrote the first Epistle, yet hold that all three Epistles are by one hand. If the first Epistle is acknowledged as St. John's, there are no grounds for impugning the second and third Epistles. We need, therefore, have no difficulty in admitting that the three Epistles are by the same writer of the Gospel, that is to say, are the actual composition of the John who was numbered among the twelve Apostles.

The Book of the Revelation is one of the five books of the New Testament which Baur allows to be genuine. That Baur adopted the opinion that the Apostle John wrote the Revelations on critical grounds alone is very doubtful. The authorship of the Apocalypse is comparatively a matter of small moment; the authorship of the fourth Gospel is a matter of the very gravest importance. This it was on which Baur really wished to throw doubt; and he was shrewd enough to see the difficulties which lay in the way of supposing the two books to be the work of the same writer. There is

no question, however, that the external evidence in favour of St. John's authorship is very strong. Justin Martyr states that it was written by John, one of the Apostles of Christ. Origen, who made it his special business to inquire into the doubts and disputes which had been raised concerning the sacred books, does not cite any with regard to the authorship of the Revelations. He certainly for himself accepted the Apostle as its author. The first objection, raised by the anti-Montanists towards the close of the second century, rested on grounds purely subjective. Dionysius, the pupil of Origen, rejected it because he found its diction and language, and the tone of the book altogether, unlike that of St. John's Gospel. Eusebius certainly did not receive it into the canon as undoubted, although he speaks guardedly, letting his opinion appear, rather than stating it explicitly. Since the time of Eusebius its authorship has been always more or less impugned, especially in the Eastern Church. During the dark and middle ages criticism was dead, but with the revival of learning, doubts as to the canonicity of this book revived. Without entering into a controversy which would take us far beyond our present bounds, it may be briefly said that the external evidence points strongly to the conclusion that the Apostle John was its author. The internal evidence, especially what may be called the subjective indications, lead almost as forcibly to the conclusion that the author of the Gospel could not have been the author of the Apocalypse. For the purpose of this essay the book has not been referred to.

St. John, in common with the boys of his time and standing, would have been brought up in the school attached to the synagogue. Like all the Jews contemporary with our Lord, he understood and spoke Greek as well as the national Aramaic. A Galilean fisherman, he was not likely to have come into direct relationship with Hellenistic philosophy. But among the sacred books of the Jews there were several thoroughly saturated with the ideas of the new Platonic school. Beyond a doubt these books must have been constantly studied by St. John. They form part of the Apocrypha. Ecclesiasticus, and especially the Book of Wisdom,

may be taken as examples of this kind of literature, and it has been shown that the Logos doctrine may be deduced from these Apocryphal books ; it is to these, then, and not to any supposed gnostic sources, that the so-called gnostic terms in St. John's Gospel may be referred ; or perhaps he may have adopted them during his residence in Ephesus, where the very atmosphere was full of the literature of the Alexandrian school. St. John, unlike St. Peter, was a thinker. The moral problems, which were then exercising the thought of the world, would not pass him by as matters of no practical importance. St. John understood that it is thought which produces action ; that what a man does is the result of what a man thinks ; and that it is to opinions that the issues of life owe their origin. Neither in the Gospel nor in the Epistles does St. John, like St. Peter, content himself with laying down simple maxims or plain rules of morality. He traces morality to its source, which is God ; and holy living to its fountain head, which is Christ and Christ's love.

No critic has ever ventured to say that the fourth Gospel was lacking either in ideas or originality. The depth of the Apostle's mind may be gauged to some extent by measuring the void which would be left in the Church, and even in the world, if the Gospel of St. John, and the thoughts which have had their inception from it, were blotted out. In Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the Lord Jesus Christ is most truly represented as the Son of God. The Divine nature of the Son of Man shines from their pages with almost as clear a light as from the Judæan Gospel ; but the impression they leave upon the mind is the picture of a Man—in them the Godhead is veiled by the garment of the veil by which it is enclosed. In the fourth Gospel the Man Christ Jesus is revealed to us with equal clearness and distinctness. The Lord is weary ; He is faint with hunger ; He longs in His thirst for the cool refreshing water ; He sheds warm human tears ; He is troubled and disturbed. Besides there is a manifestation of Divine glory, a radiance of Godlike majesty, to which the synoptical Evangelists are strangers. This difference may be traced to the intellectual, as much as to the spiritual, bent

of St. John's mind which led him to form what may almost be called a science of theology. If he is not the author of the Apocalypse, at least he has a more than equal claim with the writer of the Revelations to the title of St. John the Divine.

Another point, which has its bearing upon the intellectual side of St. John's character, is the peculiar nature of some of the discourses which he has preserved in his Gospel. Plain men, like Matthew and Peter (Mark), would pass these discourses by a little impatiently, in something of the same fashion as modern critics show a disposition to do. They would be foreign to St. Luke. Not only was his Gospel intended for Gentile readers to whom rabbinical modes of expression would be incomprehensible, but to Luke himself, a native of Antioch, a Hellenist if not actually of heathen extraction, the dialectic reasonings, which his adversaries compelled our Lord to use in self-defence, would appear unintelligible subtleties. St. John, as is evident from many a passage in his writings, was predisposed to philosophy. But philosophy in its strict sense could hardly have entered into the training of a young Galilean who had to earn his livelihood by toil. Rabbinism, on the other hand, held sway in all the schools of the synagogue. And this rabbinism, poor substitute as it was, would, so far as it was able, supply the place of philosophy in a man given to observe and think. Philosophy is a tendency of the mind rather than any set cast of thought. We want to know more about St. John—more of the history of his life, more of the history of his mind. At every turn the student of St. John's character finds himself hampered by the meagreness of information, and the absolute absence of all details. Of his life absolutely nothing is known. We are confined to guesses more or less plausible, and have to draw inferences from data more or less incomplete and unsatisfactory. The rabbinical discourses give a certain amount of light. They did not find their way into the Gospel by accident. The reason is not far to seek why our Lord used these special forms of argumentative speech, especially in Judæa. But that is not the question before us. The point is, How came it about that St. John reported discourses which the other Evangelists

passed over in silence, and which differ altogether in form from those which they have reported? To say that the first three Gospels were Galilean Gospels is no answer; our Lord must sometimes have spoken in this style in Galilee, and, as a matter of fact, one of the rabbinical discourses took place in the synagogue of Capernaum. Nor is it any answer to say that these discourses were written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Doubtless they were so written; but inspiration does not override the natural idiosyncrasy of the inspired writer. The answer is to be found in the nature of St. John's mind, which, from its craving after philosophy, could appreciate and understand this skilful fencing with unscrupulous enemies better than the other writers of the memoirs of Christ. We owe much that is valuable in the fourth Gospel to the peculiar intellectual bias of the author's mental disposition.

The Galileans were restless, turbulent, and excitable; and St. John was a true son of Galilee. He was vehement and impulsive; in a different way he was almost as impulsive as St. Peter himself. But with St. John it was the impulse of thought; with St. Peter it was the impulse of action. When the news of the sepulchre being empty reached the disciples, although the younger and more agile John runs the faster and reaches the tomb sooner, the restraining influence of awestruck thought holds him back, and it is Peter, who without any waiting and guileless of any hesitation, enters immediately, the first. As they were fishing in the Lake of Tiberias after the resurrection, it was St. John who recognized in the Stranger on the shore the Lord Jesus; it is St. Peter who throws himself into the water to swim to shore. At first sight as we read the fourth Gospel, or the sublime words of the first Epistle, the title given by our Lord appears to sit with ill grace upon their author, or upon the Apostle who lived and taught at Ephesus. He had become an old man then. The fire of youth had been well nigh put out by the experience of a long life. And yet as we read his Gospel, how passage after passage flashes upon us, bearing witness that the writer had verily once been Boanerges, and that in

spite of all there was still much remaining of the son of Thunder. These passages have reference almost wholly to the Lord Jesus Christ. The disciple whom Jesus loved was quick to resent any dishonour or indignity done to his Lord, and the hot anger was always ready to burst forth. "Shall we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?" had been the sharp reply of James and John when the Samaritans refused their Master. And the old spirit was still there. His brethren had long ago repented of their early rejection of Christ; and as believing disciples ruled over Churches, and strengthened the hearts of the new converts by their Epistles. But St. John cannot forget that they had once rejected. There is a ring of the scorn and anger which doubtless possessed his soul at the time, as in his narrative he recounts the circumstance. "His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judæa, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest; for there is no man doeth anything in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly; if thou doest these things, show thyself to the world." Then follows St. John's comment, "For neither did his brethren believe in him." And he adds the Lord's reply: "My time is not yet come; but your time is always ready. The world cannot hate you; but Me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil. Go ye up unto this feast." Judas had long since expiated his sin. His dead body had lain for years in the potter's field, which was to have been the price of his treachery. But St. John finds it hard to forgive the traitor. He remembers that "he was a thief, and bore the bag," and put forth his care for the poor as a cloak for his avarice; and he recalls almost with an inward satisfaction his Lord's words; "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" If, however, St. John was quick to resent an affront offered to his Lord, he was no less quick to record acts of homage or deeds of love. It is St. John who narrates how Nicodemus came to Jesus by night; he records the words he ventured to speak in Christ's favour at the council; and he remembers how at the last, when hope had died out and faith had fled, love still survived, and came

to pay the only remaining duty to the mangled corpse. It is the same Evangelist who tells us that Joseph of Arimathea dared approach the Roman governor to beg the body of Jesus, and, having wrapped it with spices in fine linen, laid it in his own tomb. It is St. John, who recounting the anointing at Bethany, perceives again in thought the sweet perfume, and recalls how the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. It is St. John who relates the scene by the garden tomb, in which Mary Magdalene, filled with but one idea—love and sorrow at the loss of her Lord—turns her back upon the angels who would have comforted her, and forgets her own weakness in the desire to bear away the body of her Master. And, lastly, it is St. John who in his very last days takes up again the pen to transcribe the story which the Church already knew: how in the early morning, by the Lake of Tiberias which had witnessed his call to the Apostolate, Christ had reinstated the fallen Peter by His thrice-repeated question, "Lovest thou Me?" and the thrice-given command, "Feed My flock."

St. John, like many a Galilean, like many of his fellow-Apostles, had been a disciple of the Baptist. Of that band he was probably one of the youngest. I do not think that St. John would have been attracted by the asceticism of John the Baptist. I find no trace of asceticism in St. John's character, nor in his Gospel, nor in his Epistles. The only incident recorded which bears upon this matter points rather to an opposite conclusion. The prayer of the two brethren, that in the kingdom which they fancied their Master was about to establish, one might sit on His right hand and the other on His left, does not show an ascetic frame of mind. Doubtless the complete self-surrender of the Baptist must have exercised a very strong influence on the enthusiastic temperament of the son of Zebedee. I think it must have been the holiness of the Baptist's life, and his purity both of conduct and intention, which drew the youthful Galilean to this stern and somewhat harsh preacher of righteousness. Even if positive proof were lacking, we might well believe that the disciple, specially loved of the Lord Jesus, must have been

dowered with a nature of rare beauty and of exceeding purity—a purity not consisting merely in freedom from gross forms of sin, or from sensuous conceptions, but a purity pervading the whole mind and thought, a purity producing a delicacy in ideas and feelings which shrank from everything that might offend, and causing a refinement in word and act hardly to be expected of a provincial peasant. Of this mental beauty both Gospel and Epistles give abundant proof. Doubtless in the Gospel both words and thoughts are the words and thoughts of Christ. But here, as in all the other Scriptures, the idiosyncrasy of the writer shows itself. St. John's mind is the vehicle by which the mind of Christ is revealed to us. A very slight comparison of the Gospels proves this to be case. The portrait of the God-man as sketched by St. Luke is very different from that presented by St. Matthew ; and this latter, again, varies from the delineation given by St. John. In the Gospel the delicacy shows itself in the style and treatment of his subject ; in the Epistles it is St. John himself who speaks in his own person. St. Peter enforces purity of life ; but how different are his practical exhortations to righteousness from the enforcement of holiness by St. John. Both appeal to Christ's teaching ; but while the one lays down positive rules of conduct, the other refers ever to motives and principles. The light of God is the light which is to shine forth in His saints. The fellowship with God is to make any fellowship with darkness an impossibility. The life which had been manifested in them destroyed the very root of sin, which was life's opposite. God was pure, therefore they were to be pure, for they were to be like Him. The truth which was in them was incompatible with the falseness of wrong-doing. The ruling principle of all was love. Error in thought or deed, hatred which was the fruit of darkness, stumbling which could not happen so long as there is light—these are all excluded, because they are all contrary to the spirit of love. Each word of the disciple is an echo of the word of the Master. The new commandment which Christ had given is the keynote to which all the harmony of a life in God, and for God's honour, is attuned. It is no new commandment to St. John, but the

old commandment which they had heard from the beginning. It was a commandment which was to transform them into new creatures, exalting all their thoughts, changing all their being, bringing everything into conformity with the will of Christ. Here is no looking forward with dread, as in St. Peter, to a judgment which must begin at the house of God ; here is no terror of the Lord by which men are to be persuaded, as in St. Paul ; but loving Christ as a necessary result of His love—"because He first loved them"—the love they had received cast out all fear, because fear had torment. The very idea of sin is excluded, for he that abideth in God sinneth not. The love of God is the keeping of the commandment, and he that loveth dwelleth in God, and God in him.

If the Jews of Galilee were vehement and impulsive, they had also retained, notwithstanding their intercourse with Gentiles, much of the narrow spirit of Judaism. Perhaps this very intercourse, which was a matter of necessity, made them greater sticklers for Jewish observances and Jewish restraints. St. John was no exception. After our Lord's resurrection we find him observing the canonical hours of prayer in the Temple. Just as St. Peter needed a Divine revelation to teach him that the Gentiles were to be received into the Church of Christ and then could only with difficulty believe it, so St. John failed entirely to perceive the deeper truth for the sake of which St. Stephen died, that the religion of Christ and His kingdom were to be bounded by no external Temple, nor circumscribed by any outward or national ritual. Afterwards, indeed, when the preaching of St. Paul had been accentuated by the destruction of Jerusalem, and when his own sojourn in Ephesus had lifted his horizon, St. John's mind was prepared to receive the higher teaching which the Holy Ghost shed abroad. Christ then became to him the Light which lighteth every man who is born into the world ; the love of God was realized as universal, embracing in its fulness the whole world ; Christ died not for the sin of the Jewish nation only, but for that of the nations of all the earth ; Christ's fold consisted not of a single "out-selected" flock, but these others—the peoples of heathendom—were also His sheep, and were to be gathered.

in, so that there should be one fold under one Shepherd. But in former days St. John had not understood this. His intellect was contracted by early training. Even his heart, deep as it was in its capacity for loving, was bounded by the narrowness of his creed. He found it difficult to believe that any one could be a believer in Christ unless he formally enrolled himself among the disciples. "We saw one casting out devils in Thy name, and we forbade him, because he followeth not with us." Long after something of the old spirit of Jewish exclusiveness remained. The very love he bore his Lord begat in him a narrow jealousy, which did not reflect the perfect image of his Lord's perfect love. "Let us hasten from the baths that the falling roof crush not us together with the enemy of God," is the traditional account of his meeting with Cerinthus. This spirit is even to be discerned in his second Epistle. To put men outside of the ordinary civilities and courtesies of life, because they differed in their religious beliefs, was a survival of Judaism, and was not in sympathy with the broad ideas and teaching of the Lord Jesus Christ. "He maketh His sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and sendeth rain upon the just and upon the unjust." The Lord Christ regarded every member of the human race as the child of the Father who is in heaven.

The character of St. John was contemplative. He thought rather than acted. Or perhaps we should say, that his action was manifested in thought. His noble thoughts, reduced to writing and surviving him, have become the heritage, we may almost say the moving power, of the world. I should imagine his influence, so far as founding churches was concerned, or in the actual spread of the Gospel, to have been but small. We cannot think of him as going from place to place with the unceasing energy of St. Paul; nor can we picture him as ever ready to burst forth into the strong words of speech which were natural to St. Peter. He was full of quick sensibilities; his indignation was aroused at any act of wrong; he was very quick to resent. But action was left for others. He held the second place among the Apostles; yet neither during our Lord's life, nor in the early days of the Church, do we find

him, of his own impulse, taking any prominent part. The one or two things he did were either done at the command of Christ, or were the simple expression of his inward love. He was sent—if he were one of the two disciples—to fetch the ass on which Christ rode into Jerusalem. He was again sent to prepare the upper room where the last supper was to be eaten. It was the impulse of love which drew him to the Palace of Caiaphas, and led him to the cross at Calvary. Afterwards, although he is the companion of Peter and is present with him, it is Peter, not John, who preaches on the day of Pentecost ; it is Peter who heals the lame man at the gate of the Temple ; it is Peter who defies the Jewish rulers. St. John is there, but he is silent ; he leaves the words to his more active colleague. Throughout the narrative of the Acts, when the story touches upon the Judæan Church, he is there, doubtless a true pillar, adding to the support of the community, supporting and comforting many a weary soul. But there is no act recorded which he performed, nor any word specified which he spoke. Less even than St. Peter was he a ruler or commander of men. And yet, perhaps, he was the Apostle who could have been the least spared. Not till the day comes when the secrets of all hearts shall be disclosed will it be known what the fourth Gospel has been to the Church. And may not this be some measure of the usefulness and the good he effected during life? Silent, contemplative, withdrawn from the turmoil and bustle of noisy life, he did nothing that men noticed or thought worth recording ; but by the still, quiet power of his influence and loving nature, he would create an ever-growing circle of disciples ; and the pupils of St. John would go forth animated by his spirit, until that spirit—which was the Spirit of Christ—was diffused throughout the Churches. Thus the man of contemplation may even in his own generation have done a work as great and far-reaching as the man of action. It has assuredly been so in the generations which have succeeded, and which have learned to know and understand the Saviour through the writings of this Apostle—the disciple whom Jesus loved.

It is to St. John that we owe the preservation of the fare-

well discourses of Christ, and the high-priestly prayer. Their record by St. John affords one of those indirect indications of character by which we are able to present to ourselves the condition of the Apostle's mind. Their transcription points to a special oneness of sympathy between this Apostle and his Lord. At the time the words must have fallen with a strange sound upon the ears of the disciples. They did not understand. Notwithstanding the many indications which had been given, no thought of a coming doom was in the hearts of any of them. On the very night, an hour or two previously, they had been discussing with some warmth who should be greatest in that kingdom which they supposed their Lord was about to establish. Some trace of this feeling, or, at all events, of the thought which led to it, may be perceived in the frequent interruptions. "We know not whither Thou goest, and how can we know the way!" is the exclamation of Thomas. "Lord, show us the Father, and that sufficeth us!" is the interjection of Philip. "Lord, how wilt Thou show Thyself to us, and not unto the world?" is the puzzled interrogation of Judas. "A little while and ye shall see Me, and again a little while and ye shall not see Me, and because I go to the Father," was repeated in questioning bewilderment by nearly all. St. John is silent; at least there is no recorded interruption on his part. He was, I imagine, prone to be silent; he would listen, observe, meditate, and remember. More than the others he would drink in these words spoken with so much solemnity, and with such evident meaning. But at the time he would not understand them much better than the rest. His mind, too, was dwelling on thrones and principalities; he, too, was dreaming of high dignities and robes of honour. It was but a day or two ago that he and James had preferred their request to sit on His right hand in His kingdom. Only love would give insight. It would give insight to St. John, as a few days before it had given insight to Mary of Bethany. Not a very deep insight, but an insight which would awaken sympathy, and would cause the words spoken so to sink into his heart that he would never more forget them. He never did forget them. They came back to

him as he thought; they pressed upon his memory as he wrote; his Epistle is almost one continuous echo of these last words of Christ, and in the end he embalmed them as the most precious inheritance of the Church in his Gospel. It is impossible not to wonder at their absence from the pages of the synoptical Gospels. Doubtless in composing the Gospels men wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and the promise was given that by His aid the words spoken by Christ should be brought to remembrance. But neither the inspiration nor the remembrance was mechanical. It was not independent of the men themselves, but, on the contrary, was very dependent upon their natural character. These farewell words, then, might have left no very great impression upon St. Matthew, because his mind grasped more easily the positive and the practical. They would not be stamped more deeply on St. Peter's mind (for St. Mark), because he would be preoccupied with the warning words our Lord had lately spoken. If St. Luke wrote under the supervision of St. Paul, that may account for the absence of these discourses from the Gospel of one more likely than the others to have preserved them. In St. John there was the necessary preparation. Although the words may have fallen upon ears unprepared, yet the union between Master and servant was so far perfect that the heart of the disciple could not fail to receive them as an indelible impression. As events unfolded themselves, as the words grew into clearer light by the sufferings and death of Christ, as they were illumined by the glory of His resurrection and ascension, the full significance of these last utterances and of the last prayer would become plain, and they would grow precious, and ever more precious, as the dying words of the dearest and most beloved.

There is a line in the Gospel of St. Matthew, and a word in the fourth Gospel, which throws a good deal of light on the character of St. John. The sequel of the story has brought into very strong relief the fact that St. Peter followed Christ to the judgment hall of Caiaphas. What might otherwise have passed almost unnoticed is impressed upon the mind, because it led to St. Peter's denial. John, as well as Peter,

followed Christ to His trial. None were exempt from the first panic which overtook the disciples. When they realized that their Master was apprehended, St. John was the first to recover from the demoralization. Almost immediately he followed. When the apprehending band turned upon him, he yielded to fear, and fled, leaving his cloak in their hands. But only for a moment; love was stronger than fear, and love conquered. Once more he followed. He reached the high priest's palace; he was known to the high priest. In Judæa class distinctions were almost unknown, and the simple fisherman might without difficulty have formed such a relationship with the high priest that the entry of the palace would not be forbidden. It is possible that nothing more is intended than that the servants knew him, and so allowed him to enter, and later on to introduce his fellow-disciple. The two disciples did not remain together. So much is quite clear from the narrative; but the narrative implies much more. It implies that St. John sought and obtained admittance avowedly as a friend of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prisoner. On such a night there must have been a good deal of confusion. Many would be going and coming. The keeper of the door did not seem at first to have connected the presence of St. Peter with that of St. John. Afterwards, when she had had time to think, she remembered it, and knowing St. John to be a disciple of Christ, she asked her question in perfect simplicity and good faith, "And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth?" The first denial seems to have struck the woman; she would express her surprise, and mention the circumstance to her companions. Thus the question is put by the second maid, and eventually by the rest of the servants as they stood round the fire. I do not think it is straining the narrative to deduce from it that the same temptation was presented to St. John, or rather would have been presented, had he not made it impossible by letting it be seen from the first that he was a disciple of Christ. Again, while St. Peter hesitated, while he remained loitering by the door, and afterwards mingled with the servants, St. John at once proceeded to be as near as he might to his Lord. It was from St. John, in all likelihood, that the account of this

trial before Caiaphas was made known to the Evangelists. But concerning the part taken in it by John himself there is silence. He was not like St. Peter; he chose to be reticent about his own doings on that eventful night. Thus we have only the fact, and that implied rather than stated explicitly, that when Christ stood before the tribunal of Caiaphas one of the disciples was present—the disciple whom Jesus loved.

The love which led St. John to the hall of Caiaphas would not fail to carry him to the prætorium of Pilate. No word records the circumstance. Yet it is impossible to doubt. The others may have been there too. That they mingled with the crowd may be taken for granted. But I like to think of St. John as not far from his Master's side. That he should have been there was only consistent with his character—a warm, loving nature, given to prove its devotion by act rather than by speech; and a reticent nature that would be little likely to parade itself by vaunting its affection. Hence it is not strange that no hint should be given in the synoptical Gospels. Nor would such a hint be found in that written by himself. It was only for the purpose of explaining how Peter came to be there that any notice is given of St. John's presence on the Thursday night. No such cause necessitated an explanation on the Friday morning.

We know that at the crucifixion St. John was standing beneath the cross. We may infer that none of the others were there by the women only being mentioned. Peter was weeping in shame and repentance. Thomas had forgotten the brave words he spoke in *Peræa*. What was it that had turned these men into cowards? Doubtless the multitude were athirst for blood; doubtless shame and taunts would be the portion of the Victim's friend, as they were poured upon the Victim Himself. But men have faced death and fronted ignominy from motives less strong than of being present at the last death agony of the Son of God. It is hard to explain. It can be explained only by the ruin of all their hopes, and more especially by their being left without the support of Him to whom in every emergency they were

accustomed to look. These men could not have been without courage. The Galileans were all brave; and these hardy fishermen were not likely to be less fearless than the rest of their countrymen. In after times one certainly was willing to die for the sake of the Lord whom he now forsook; and, if tradition may be relied on, James was not the only one among the twelve who proved his devotion by the terrible ordeal of martyrdom.

So the fact of St. John's presence by the cross leads us to mark in him a distinct mental characteristic—the characteristic of courage. Not mere animal courage. Peter possessed *that*. Peter would have made a better trooper than John. St. John's tenderness of character, his ideality, his fine sensibility, would have interfered with his courage in that form. But when it came to a passive courage, to a courage which would dare to endure, which, apart from all excitement, could look on possible death without flinching, and could calmly bear insult, then the higher mental qualities came into play. The very sensitiveness nerved to bear, and, above all, love provoked to a dauntlessness which could not flinch, and never dreamed of deserting.

It is only an accident, as we say, which causes us to know as a certain fact that St. John stood beneath the cross. He himself, we must believe, would have passed over the circumstance in silence. But the dying Christ spoke; and, in recording the word of Christ, St. John has necessarily recorded his own presence. And what a testimony this word is on the part of Him who could read all hearts to the nobility of St. John's character! In life, perhaps, there had not been that deep love on the part of the Virgin Mary to her Divine Son which might have been expected. But the mother's tenderness revives at last, and among the women who were true to the very end is Mary of Nazareth. Christ, as ever, forgets His own dire pain in thought for another. Mary was not destitute of natural supporters. The Lord's brethren—whatever their actual relationship may have been to the Virgin—had ever formed with her one household. In the natural course of things they would have continued to

form one household to the end. But Christ willed it otherwise. As a last legacy He left His mother to the disciple whom He loved. Her declining years and her old age were to be his care: "Woman, behold thy son; son, behold thy mother!" And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home.

Of the later history of St. John nothing is known. Tertullian says that he was never married, but lived a celibate life. A tradition based upon the Revelations, and regarding John the Apostle as one with John the Divine, narrates that he was banished to the Isle of Patmos. Another tradition, intending probably to exalt St. John by crowning him with the glory of martyrdom, tells that he was thrown into a cauldron of boiling oil, but that Christ worked a miracle to preserve His favoured servant from the pains of a cruel death, and he was taken out unhurt. Clement of Alexandria narrates a story which one likes to think true, that St. John met a robber chieftain whom he had formerly baptized, but who had fallen from the faith, and that by his loving words the old man won him back to repentance and to Christ. It is evident, from passages in his Gospel, that the Apostle survived the destruction of Jerusalem, and he probably attained to a great age. There seems little doubt that he passed his declining years at Ephesus, whither, tradition says, he betook himself after the death of the Virgin Mary. There he wrote his Gospel. A report, originating from a misunderstood word of Christ, had caused it to be reported that he should not die, but should remain alive until the final coming of the Lord. This report St. John took the trouble to correct by adding an appendix to his Gospel in which he gives the true account of what had taken place. It is almost certain that St. John did not suffer martyrdom; but in the quiet restfulness of a calm old age there passed peacefully away from earth to the mansions of the Father's house the disciple whom Jesus loved.

The study of a man's character, if it be a true and faithful study, will lay bare faults as well as bring excellences into

relief. These men whose characters we have been considering, Apostles of Christ as they were, were not perfect. St. Paul was overbearing, proud, and masterful ; St. Peter was weak and unstable through impulsiveness and want of moral control ; St. John, notwithstanding his affectionate disposition and faithful love, was, at all events till the Holy Ghost taught him better, narrow in his ideas, and inclined to be harsh in his judgments. We call these men saints, and affix the word as a title of honour to their names ; and truly they were saints—saints chosen of God to do His work ; saints sanctified and made holy by the Spirit of God. But they were sinners who, being sinners, became saints. They were not saints inherently, they had to contend with the corruption of a fallen nature ; they had to struggle with the temptations attendant upon life ; they were sometimes quarrelsome : they were sometimes untrue ; they failed sometimes in charity ; they became saints, because in the strength of Christ they fought, and through His grace they conquered. It is this fact which makes it worth while for us to study their characters. Had they been perfect, then nothing would have been gained by considering the idiosyncrasies of their minds, or by reviewing the failings or the virtues of their lives. But because they were sinners, and, being sinners, became saints, we may learn the lesson which the workings of their minds and the issues of their lives teach, and may lay the lesson to heart for our own individual benefit. For as they were, so are we—sinners ; and as they became, so do we hope to become—God's saints. In the kingdom of God which shall be revealed all those who are found worthy to become its members will be saints ; but they will be saints who, like these Apostles of Christ, were once sinners. Around the great white throne of God in heaven, from the lips of His ransomed people, shall one hymn of praise resound unceasingly, ascribing love and adoration to Him who by His blood has redeemed them from the power of sin : "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing."

H. N. BERNARD.

THE EARLY RELATIONS BETWEEN JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE increasing intellectual power of man with its increasingly comprehensive grasp is ever pointing us to the inner connection, interdependence, and unity of all things—intellectual, moral, and spiritual. There is nothing isolated in the world: in our present atmosphere of thought we feel this to be an axiomatic truth, an intuitive necessity. For us nothing can stand alone. For us there are no prodigies, no anomalies, no enigmas, but every fact in life or movement in thought has had its sufficient ground and exciting cause in some preceding circumstance or order of things which it is not theirs to create, and ours only to discover and to explain.

Under the dominance of this guiding principle every generation sees the circle of the inexplicable more narrowed, and the limits of the wondrous and the miraculous more and more contracted, so that it would already seem to many minds a foregone conclusion that the religion of Christ must like all else finally merge itself in the universal chain of natural causation. It is said there can be no break in nature; there can be nothing which is not the effect of a preceding accumulation of material causes: inspired with this truth, man has marched into every field of knowledge, battled with superstition and prejudice, and, laying aside an unmeaning awe and reverence, has cut deep into ignorance, and has sought to lay bare the very vitals of our being. But in the natural sphere there is a point at which he has come to a standstill: he cannot explain life—the origin and very essence of that continuity and progress which he finds in nature; and the case seems in the world of sense to stand thus, "Grant life, and all else is natural." This seems the final conclusion of every effort—*we seem to be left with something supernatural, as the origin of the bodily and animal life.*

And if it be so, may it not finally be that, after divesting us of all that is spurious and untrue, the present sifting shall leave us with a supernatural something, as the origin of that moral and spiritual life which is now heaving in the breast of humanity? It must of necessity *seem* so until body and spirit are proved to be substantially and identically one: at present no measure of assurance from without can still the conviction of our souls within, that body and soul, whilst acting and reacting on each other, are not one and the same. If therefore we are compelled to regard the origin of the life of the former as supernatural, shall we not finally, when the adjusting process of present thought has fulfilled itself, be forced by the very necessity of the conclusions of our investigations to regard the origin of the true life of the spirit as supernatural and Divine? It seems to us so; and in the spiritual and moral life of the individual and of the world the case will finally be found to stand thus, "Give us Christ, and all else is natural."

We, however, mistake the nature of the supernatural and the supernatural worker, if we suppose it to be super-induced arbitrarily or suddenly upon human thought. It is not thus we read God's work in history, it is not thus in nature: it is not without preparation the husbandman grafts the twig: it is not to every tree he grafts it, but to one previously known as suitable to the growth. But once the graft is made, there follows what may very well be termed a conflict—a conflict between the life in the graft and the life in the tree—with the result either of perfect assimilation, or of antagonism ending in the survival of the fittest.

This was exactly the case with the introduction of Christianity. Supernatural though we are forced to regard it, still it was not introduced until a fulness of time. It was not introduced until the soil was prepared for its reception: it was not introduced until men were ready to regard it in relation to a previously existing order of things. And in all this it was kept in conformity with the natural law which governs all thought. Every great movement of thought arises either as the product and culmination of what precedes, or as a re-active antagonism and opposing assertiveness of the true being:

the peculiarity of Christianity is that it can be viewed at once as the culmination of the order of thought which preceded it, and at the same time as in conflict with it. *Judaism was necessary to the origin of Christianity, but in its growth Christianity was antagonistic to Judaism.* It was something more than Judaism. Its life-blood was different from that of Judaism, and sooner or later the varied element must manifest itself in the outer life, and bear its fruit in the relations one to another.

It was *necessary* that a conflict should arise. Two forces, which are in essence conflicting, can never remain long apart. Each day brings them nearer each other and nearer that struggle which will determine the survival. Once Christianity is ushered into the world, it is subject to this and to every other natural law: it must by its own strength fight with every opposing spirit in the world. And the history of its struggle with Judaism must ever be of interest, both on the ground that Judaism was the first challenger of Christianity, and more especially because in wrestling with Judaism Christianity was entering on a conflict with the mother that begat it.

But though the conflict, from the nature of the case, must evolve itself in time, it is to be strictly observed that this evolution was slow and gradual. There was at first no conscious opposition between Judaism and Christianity. Christian thought was not so exclusively severed from the past that Christians felt themselves dominated by a principle which required the renunciation of, or opposition to, their past. Had they felt so, violence were done to the free will of man. It could not be so; it was not so. The two principles now side by side were *Judaism versus Judaism impregnated with the germ of Christianity.* The one was old and apparently lifeless; the other was new and apparently lifeless. By contact each vivified the other. The question was, Which was possessed of the endless life? which should grow? As yet they were unconscious of each other, and the history of their growing consciousness of each other is at the same time the history of a conflict. As the germ of Christianity developed, Christian thought came

to realize more and more the opposition between itself and Judaism; whilst on the other hand, Judaism, feeling itself drained of its life-blood, wasted its energy in vain effort to destroy what it deemed a parasite in its heart.

There are two points of view from which we can look at the life of Judaism in its early relation to Christianity. We can view it from the active side, and from the passive side.

In examining the history of the conflict for the mastery, we should be examining the survival of Judaism on its active side. A full examination would involve a history of Judaism down to the present day; for even yet there is a remnant of Judaism conflicting with Christianity. Meantime, we shall confine ourselves to the period during which they were directly grappling with each other: *we shall treat of the survival of Judaism on its active side down to that time when the full opposition of Judaism and Christianity was recognized by the former in a practical cessation of conflict.*

On the other hand there presents to us the view of Judaism as a latent power in the life and thought of Christianity. Here the survival of Judaism may be said to be passive. It tinged their thoughts and evolved itself in the acts of the primitive Christians. It showed itself in the development of doctrine in the early Church, and in the ritual and festivals which marked that era. This aspect of Judaism is more limited in its range; in fact, it is a crucial question to determine down to what period *Judaism as a latent power* influenced the Church. It would be a mistake to attribute to the survival of Judaism *all* those materialistic tendencies which manifest themselves time after time, inasmuch as materialism seems a natural proclivity in the mind of man, confined not to one country, race, or age.

These two lines of investigation are *distinct*. The passive influence of Judaism cannot very well be said to exist until the full opposition of Judaism and Christianity was realized; until the active antagonism of Judaism had ceased practically to exist. Down to this time any influence which bore on the alteration of the thought or mode of life of the disciples was the influence of Christianity on Judaism, not the influence

of Judaism on Christianity. Up to the time in which the full antagonism was realized it was Judaism that was positive in the thought and ritual of the Church ; it was Christianity that was negative. Judaism was the "measure of meal ;" Christianity was the "lump of leaven." Our task is clear : it is to the chemical analysis of such a combination that our investigations are to be directed. We have to observe and record the history of the action and reaction of the two elements whilst in the actual process of assimilation, or rather repulsion. Thereafter we shall take up the resultant, when the action between the molecules has ceased, and discovering its composition, trace to its source any element which is distinctive of one of the originally combined elements. This is our task. In its fulfilment we are called upon to investigate the inner movements of the life of an age long past, and of which the historical evidences are but partial and imperfect.

I.—Let us view the life of Judaism in its active relations towards Christianity.

If we look at the history of the origin and development of any great movement, be it political, intellectual, or spiritual, we discover that it is met not by one kind of opposition only, but by two, totally diverse in their source and different in their workings. There are men who do not try to understand the movement, but who will oppose it on some external grounds and by external force. On the other hand, there are those who enter into the understanding of the inner life of the movement, but who from partial knowledge of its meaning, or of prejudice in favour of the *status quo*, fail to discover its full significance, and who accordingly oppose its perfect work in themselves and others. *In its origin Christianity met with both of these forms of opposition from Judaism.* Of the former it need only be said that it has no real historical development, simply for the reason that such a form of opposition is essentially irrational. It is as irrational to oppose as to approve any movement except from conviction based on judgment of its merits. Be the judgment imperfect or prejudiced, it is still the judgment of the individual, and for the individual ; and the only course compatible with reason is

that he be guided by that judgment. To act otherwise is to act from caprice, and to divorce action from all connection and continuity. We cannot tell what an individual acting thus will do ; we can only tell what he has done. The opposition of the Jewish Sanhedrim was of this type. There was no continuity about it, or principle in it ; but a series of erratic manifestations of force, wanting in that consistency and persistency which arise from confidence of purpose, or conviction of soul. By reading the Acts of the Apostles we can see how Christianity was fought by this Judaism. Repression and violence, imprisonment, torture, and death marked this opposition ; the clashing of the outward form with the outward form ; continuing down to the time when Judaism was exhausted. But the pursuit of this form of surviving Judaism is as uninstrucive as it is irrational, and we leave it thus.

On the other hand, when we turn to the second form in which Judaism was active in its opposition to Christianity, we are met by a problem of intense interest. No longer the struggle of form with form, but a struggle of soul with soul ; we are face to face with the workings of eternal laws of the human mind and the contendings of diverse elements in a struggle for the mastery over the human spirit. We have a living germ implanted in human soul, and what we have to do is to trace the conditions which tend to stifle its life, and to observe the history of the conflict between the living germ and its environment. The germ is Christianity, the environment is Judaism. To say that a seed is sown in a certain soil is to suppose that the soil is suitable to the growth of the seed. But it is not to declare that there may not be conditions, even in the adapted environment, which, if they gain the mastery, may not even yet destroy the perfection or very life of the seed. So it was with Christianity. It was true that it was deposited in a soil which had much that was congenial to its nature, but there were elements in that environment which conflicted with its life, and with which it was necessary, by the laws which regulate existence, to engage in deadly struggle. What were these ?

To us there seem only two elements in Judaism which

were incompatible with the distinctive character of Christianity, and therefore fatal to the existence of Christianity: round these Christianity wages its first conflict for life.

Judaism. { Particularism *v.* Universality. } Christianity.
 { Materialism *v.* Spirituality. }

(1) The former comes first into contact with the life of Christianity, and its fate is practically sealed; whilst as yet the latter has comparative life and vigour (see the Resolution of the Council of Jerusalem). But as has been already observed, the opposition of these two elements is at first unconscious and inapparent, even to the minds of the first preachers of Christianity. They preach Jesus is the Messiah, but they do not yet recognize the full import of that preaching; nor are they able, nor could they be expected as yet to be able, all at once to adjust the relations of that truth and to see its full significance in all its bearings. The old spirit was as yet lying still. They thought Christianity was for Jews, as Judaism had been. They were yet Jews in Temple observances, in ideas, in hopes; they were Jews in their distinctive confession; they believed Jesus was the Messiah—that was a Jewish hope. But yet there was superadded to their Judaism a leaven which should soon supplant Judaism. They had observances, the cultivation of which must gradually arouse the consciousness of distinction and divergence from Judaism. Their private assembly in the upper room, their observance of the *ἀγάπη*, their peculiar participation of the Lord's Supper, were testimonies, if as yet *unconscious* testimonies of conflicting dualism.

As the deepening of the ideas and life of the Apostles advanced, this dualism evolved itself into prominent relief. We can trace its development and growing consciousness in the historical narrative of that period.

In chaps. i. to v. of the Acts of the Apostles the Christian spirit lies side by side with the Jewish, unconscious of any *direct* element of antagonism. The Hellenistic dispute indicates that the narrowness of Judaism is still there. In chaps. vi. and vii., the contradiction between the Judaistic particularism and the Christian universalism comes to the surface in a

striking and extraordinary way. In chaps. ix. and x., the absolute antagonism between the Jewish spirit and the Christian spirit in respect of the destiny of Christianity is for the first time recognized and enunciated as a distinctive truth.

But to recognize a dualism is not to overcome it. Nevertheless it was a step gained for the fight, to have the issue made clear and definite. And the full recognition on both sides of an absolute antagonism is usually the last step to an adjustment of relations, permanent, if not satisfactory, to both. From this point onwards the deeper vitality of Christianity determined its ultimate victory in this definite struggle. At last we receive an *official recognition by the Church* of the *universal* element in Christianity as opposed to Judaistic *particularism*. This is acknowledged at the Council of Jerusalem, and though there could not yet be absolute agreement and perfect insight to all, still the die was cast. *It was there declared officially that particularism was defunct, and that universality was the necessary character of Christianity.* There is no need here to marshal the instances and proofs of the tremendous upheaval and bitter strife which agitated the Church in the struggle. Every one knows them. They are to be found in Acts. Sufficient to say that prominent in the whole struggle on the side of Christianity is Paul of Tarsus. He was the embodiment of the Christian principle.

On one side Christianity had asserted its true character; but you cannot turn men's minds all of a sudden: every one was not ready to give heed to it. Nevertheless it had spoken and the force which had set up the principle would, though the struggle were long and wearisome, finally ensure and obtain for it absolute conquest. And so it did. Gradually it possessed individuals, and through them Christianity *as a universal religion* marched on to the conquest of the world. But the force which was to deal the last blow to Judaism in its active relations to Christianity (so far as its particularism was concerned) was to come from without. It came in the person of Titus and in the downfall of Jerusalem. No longer was Judaism on the same plane with Christianity: it was knocked off the stage. *Christianity came off the victor in*

its struggle with its environment, so far as universality v. particularism was concerned. "The Gospel and Epistles of John are as catholic in their tone as the Epistles of Paul."

Thenceforward such as cling to Jewish exclusiveness no longer occupied the position of parties *in* the Church, but were *outside*—isolated and destined to extinction.

(2.) Let us now turn to the history of the conflict with the other element in Judaism which we have recognized as antagonistic to, and in conflict with, the true life of Christianity—viz., the materialism of Judaism. In this case we shall not find the struggle so bitter nor so violent, neither shall we find the results so satisfactorily conclusive. The materialism of Judaism did not come in such close and deadly conflict with the life of Christianity as its particularism had done. On this side Christianity and Judaism were not so intolerant of each other, and that for many reasons. One is that it was not so practical a question, it entered more into the inner life. Another is that from the nature of the two elements and from the nature of man there could not arise so final and definite a struggle, ending in the repression of one. But the chief reason was that the line of demarcation between the two was not on this side so deeply cut. The antagonism was not so absolute, inasmuch as Judaism had been developing in the same direction, and was in some degree and in some aspects advanced to the position which Christianity was to take up absolutely. The synagogue worship manifested the rise and fostered the growth of the spirit; and the necessities of the *diaspora*, more than anything else, helped to form a bridge between the two irreconcilable elements in the different systems, and to pave the way for a spiritual worship.

This was a case in which the struggle, if of longer duration, was less convulsive and distinct, and in which the conflicting element perished, if it perished at all, by natural decay rather than by violent, definite effort. The same unconsciousness of antagonism as we have marked in the former case is also present here. There was no idea that the materialism of Judaism had been superseded. No idea that,

instead of external observances, there was to be substituted absolutely mystic union. The first Christians celebrate the national festivals of Judaism. Pentecost retains its importance. They take part in the service of the Temple. They observe fasts. They take vows. They avoid meats and legal defilements, and they have their children circumcised. Nor was there any outward recognition or declaration that the observances necessary to Judaism were unnecessary as a constituent part of the new dispensation. Their disappearance was due to natural causes rather than violence. As the life of Christianity became centred in the Gentile world these characteristics of Judaism ceased to exist for Christianity, and ceased to form an element in its practice. At the period in which this local transition was taking place we have the first indication of a conflict between materialism and spiritualism. It was only after Christianity had asserted itself as universal that the incompatibility of Judaism with Christianity on the side of materialism came to the surface: *it was only as Christianity was growing that it was becoming conscious of all its environment, and accordingly adjusting its relation to that environment.* When Judaism was vanquished in its particularism, it fell back and took up a position behind its materialism. If Christianity is open to all, it is only open to all if they pass through the gate of Judaism, and the complementary dicta were laid down: "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved;" and, "It is needful to circumcise them and to charge them to keep the law of Moses." On this secondary position Christianity practically closed its struggle with an expiring Judaism. At the Council of Jerusalem so much of the *spiritual* nature of Christianity was felt as to afford a *modus vivendi* for all parties. Its resolution is an impress of a stage of Christian thought—and that a very elementary stage—in the recognition of the purely spiritual nature of Christianity. The Jewish Christians still insist upon the observance for themselves of the law of Moses, and, though granting an important though gratuitous concession to their Gentile brethren, they endeavour to saddle them, too, with materialistic observances which have

no ground in Christianity itself, but are the surviving elements of a dying Judaism, foreign to true and undefiled Christianity—"Abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled . . . from which if ye keep yourselves, it shall be well with you."

Around this forlorn hope any Judaic vitality that survived, rallied and fought. But the issue was never for a moment doubtful. If its strongest fortress gave way before the onset of Christian vitality, it was not likely that it could hold out against the same force in a fortification of secondary position and of inferior strength. The history of the struggle is well known—the timidity of Peter and the fearlessness of Paul. We need not enter into the facts here. Of its final settlement we have no record. Nor, indeed, was there ever likely to have been a definite resolution on the part of the Church. Any victory in this respect was gained through an imperceptible process, and, as has been noted above, through the gradual transference of the centre of Christian life to Gentile soil. And again, the victory of spirituality over materialism can never be complete in this world. At what point the materialism of Judaism ceased to conflict with Christianity we cannot say, for never yet has Christianity ceased to appear in materialistic garb. When the survived materialism of Judaism gave way, it but gave place to another materialism from another source, but with the same distinctive characteristics. We are still in the heat of the battle with materialism, and as bitter a battle as Paul ever had to fight; but the Christianity of the day is awaiting perhaps in the energy and uncompromising attitude which result from intense conviction and enthusiasm of soul. As an example of the power which Judaic materialism exercised over the early Christians, we may point to the fact that one whole Epistle of the New Testament is devoted to the task of controverting that materialism and of showing the present insignificance and supersedure of the ceremonial of Judaism.

Yet in spite of all tendencies to materialize everything, the first Christians were able to rise above that materialism and to arrive at a distinct recognition of the essence of the nature

of Christianity, and to leave to us a record of the eternal significance of the truth of the teachings of a religion in whose universality and spirituality there is "neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all and in all."

II.—Turning now to the second great mode in which the survival of Judaism manifests itself in relation to Christianity, we take up a new standpoint: we are face to face with a new problem. We have just examined Judaism in its active relations to Christianity in the process of the development of Christianity: we now take up, so to speak, a completed system, and we ask what elements in it, or in its workings, can be traced to the influence of that Judaism in which it was first implanted, and with which it has wrestled, and over which it has just gained the victory.

Meantime we shall not enter into an examination of what elements Christianity may have *absolutely* assimilated from Judaism, or how far, if at all, their teachings are in any degree vitiated thereby, and if a Jewish complexion of thought characterizes the teachings of several of the writers of the New Testament, *e.g.*, Paul's view of atonement. We shall only deal with the distinctly Jewish thought which led to *aberrations* in Christianity.

After the struggle we have just seen we shall not expect Judaism to have any latent remaining influence on Christianity in respect of those special peculiarities and characteristics of Christianity in which no compromise was possible. And if there still remain anywhere in the life or work of the completed Christianity traces of Judaism, it must be either *in respect of elements which Judaism possessed in common with Christianity, and as a preparation for Christianity, or in respect of elements which are non-essential to Christianity.* On both of these lines we shall find influences.

A. To the influence of the former elements we shall attribute much that we find (1) in the development of doctrine, and (2) in the organization of the Church.

B. With the latter set of elements we associate a growth of *external observances* which gathered around Christianity, and which tended to stultify its true life and growth.

A. (1) Let us consider the influence of the survival of Judaism upon the development of doctrine.

Though there were points on which Judaism and Christianity showed themselves in absolute antagonism, there was yet at the root of both a mass of positive truth on which they both agreed, and in the maintenance of which they battled side by side against all the other religions of the world.

(a) The most important of these truths was the *oneness of God*. With an almost fanatical rigidity the Jews had held by this belief. "It was burned into their souls." The discipline of the captivity "had not to be repeated," but its lesson was becoming more clear and vivid to the Jews down to the time of the introduction of Christianity. The belief in one God was the very basis—the only one on which Christianity could be founded. This was their common ground: Christianity and Judaism differed only in the teachings which each superadded. Jews on becoming Christians carried it with them; and held by it with a Judaistic fanaticism.

It is this survival of Judaistic conception that accounts for the rise and full significance of those disputes which, in the early Church, clustered round the person of Christ. God was essentially and indivisibly one: how could Jesus be God the Infinite? It was this question, arising from a Judaistic rigidity of conception, that led to all those Ebionitish and Monarchian sects which stud the early history of the Church, and which culminated in and received their quietus in Arianism. All these sects were endeavours to explain the person and dignity of Christ, and still hold by the absolute indivisible oneness of God in a Judaistic sense.

Their origin and extraordinary prevalence and persistence is an index to the power which Judaism still exercised over the thought of Christianity, and a testimony to the far-reaching influences of heredity upon the mind of Christianity.

(b) Akin to the rigid conception of monotheism was another idea which transferred itself to Christianity, and which gave occasion to much rupture and convulsion in the Church. Whatever other influences were at work in the rise of Gnosticism, and whatever different forms of Gnosticism there

did arise (and there were many), *there was this common backbone to all—the idea of the separateness of God from the world.* This idea was derived neither from Oriental pantheism, nor from Hellenic and Occidental anthropomorphism: the Hebrew religion *alone* drew a line clearly distinguishing God and the world. The Gnostics in their attempts to maintain and to explain this idea *in conjunction with the other idea of the God-man*, fell into all those absurd ramifications of their systems. They failed to adjust the relations of the two ideas inasmuch as they failed to hold the even balance between them. They gave exaggerated weight to the conception inherited from Judaism. True, it was an exaggeration of Judaism; but what is to be observed meantime is that it *was from Judaism* that the conception which gave rise to such systems sprang. For example, to take but one illustration—the system of Marcion hinges upon a Judaistic conception of the character of God. Marcion could not hold a balance between what he deemed the Judaistic and the Christian conception, the result was that he elaborated a system in order, as he thought, to reconcile the antagonism between the two. His whole system arose out of his Judaistic conception of a retributive God, conflicting with his Christian conception of a gracious and forgiving God revealed by Jesus Christ.

(c) Once more on this head. In the rise of and hopes connected with that widely diffused Chiliasm and immediate expectation of the *Parousia*, which so powerfully influenced the early Church, we can discover *the lively Messianic expectation of the Jews now become an habitual and chronic projection of the mind into the future.* We find also in the special elements which the Christians hoped would distinguish that advent a trace of the materialistic conceptions which the Jews had previously associated with the Messiah's coming. In fact, this seems the definite characteristic of the early life of Christianity; *its head was Jewish, its heart Christian.*

(2.) Let us turn to Judaism in its relation to the organization of the Church. On this point it is needful to note (as has already been done) that ceremonial Judaism was in a

degree superseded by moral Judaism. This had been brought about through the law of adaptation to environment, *e.g.*, distance from the Temple. The moral principle had seized a firm hold of the Jewish mind before the introduction of Christianity, and its working as a subtle force in the organization of the Christian Church has to be taken into account. The actual organizations which Christianity derived from Judaism may not be many (and they are not), but the law upon which they should be founded is one which had been working long in the thought of Judaism, and which was thus inherited by Christianity. As an illustration of this law in Judaism, we have the institution of the synagogue. *It was the ritual of the synagogue which formed the basis for the ritual of the Church.* It was the constitution and composition of the synagogue which formed the basis for the early constitution and organization of the Christian Church; *e.g.*, its elder was the Christian presbyter.

But the inherited principle is of vaster significance, power, and influence in the development of any organism than any present type. And the Christian Church soon made an organization of its own. For the present its ministers had no analogy to the priestly caste of *legal* Judaism; they were teachers, not mediators. They were of the world, not separated from the world. They laboured for themselves; they pursued the customary employments of society; they followed some trade or learned some handicraft. And if at a later period we find the growth and rise of a strong hierarchical organization arrogating to itself sacerdotalism as extreme as that of Judaism, we regard it as an example of atavism manifesting itself in the organism when the life of the Christian element was very low, rather than as a progression. It was a reversion rather than a progression; and to this day Christianity has failed to re-attain to the true conception and the true type of the Christian Church and the Christian organization, though, happily, through many upheavals, it is on its way towards the reassertion of that ideal.

B. It was with this *revival* of Judaism (when the life of Christianity was very low) that there arose observances

which, fostered and ever sustained by the materialistic instinct in man, are at work in Christianity to the present day.

There arose a mass of ritualistic observances and materialistic conceptions which have all along tended to hide the true meaning and stultify the true life and play of Christianity. There arose a Judaistic desire to materialize and symbolize everything. There reappeared the distinction of secular and sacred ; of times, places, and seasons ; of forms and ceremonies ; of festivals and holy-days, and all the paraphernalia and encumbrances, distinctions and processes of thought which marked Jewish materialism—even to an imitation of the dresses worn under the Old Testament dispensation. The influence of this revival has been fatal to true Christianity and to true religion. Internal has given place to external ; communion has given place to observance. Its history we need not follow. We only point out such a state of things could not and cannot last. In formalism and sacerdotalism the true soul cannot find God. Man seeks face to face with Him : “ He is restless until he finds rest in Him.” Judaism could never satisfy a soul in its earnest yearnings and devout aspirations after the Father : it gave no answer to the prayer, “ Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us.” *It was on this account supplanted.* And if there is any remnant of Judaism which still survives, anything which separates a soul from God : any bondage preventing the free communion of a soul with God and mystic union with Him—*this patching up of the Rent-veil*, wherever it is found, but awaits the reassertion of the power of the life and thought of Jesus Christ.

The true outward form of Christianity will one day appear. And every mode of thought and every form of government in which this trait of Judaic inheritance prevails is destined to disappear when, in the fullest impulse of its truest nature, the soul rises from its lethargy and demands what is its right—to enter for itself into the presence of Him “ in whose presence there is fulness of joy, at whose right hand there are pleasures for evermore.”

EWEN ARCH. RANKIN, B.D.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Apologetics. Mr. Bindley with the aid of the Clarendon Press has given us a capital edition of Tertullian's Apology "*adversus gentes pro Christianis*" (1). He has consulted most of the authors on this matter, and has issued a text in which he has incorporated all the readings which by common consent are to be preferred; the basis being that printed in Migne's Patrologia. A life of Tertullian is given, then an analysis, a synopsis, and a chronological table. Notes are given at the foot of each page, which are fairly sufficient for the ordinary student, and there is a very good general index. The editor and the publishers are to be congratulated on this production.

In the Nineteenth Fernley Lecture, Professor Beet takes for his subject the *Credentials of the Gospel* (2). Sad though it seems in one sense that so many works in defence of the Gospel should be required, we can but rejoice when such men as the author of this lecture take the matter in hand. "If," he says, "the Gospel be true, it is the greatest truth ever grasped by human thought. If it be not true, the Christian hope is the strangest delusion that ever led astray the mind of man. This alternative, the only possible alternative, I purpose in this lecture to discuss." The subject, therefore, is of the deepest importance, and is handled within the limits at command with great skill. Mr. Beet knows well what is said in opposition, and he has given the ordinary reader an excellent reason for the commonly received opinion; and the thoughtful reader will find suggestions which will be most serviceable. Professor Beet's remarks on the Evolutionary Doctrine of Spencer and Darwin, on the Agnosticism of Haeckel, Huxley, Clodd, and others, on the Rationalism of Keim and Pfeleiderer, and on the doctrine of Necessity as stated by J. S. Mill, are very good indeed; and, in fact, the little work is one eminently suitable to place in the hands of a doubtful disciple who wishes to go the right way.

The *Language of the New Testament* (3) is a volume of the Theological Educator Series which will be of considerable service to the student. Mr. Simcox's learning and reputation as an exegete will be a guarantee for the accuracy of the remarks he has here brought together. The work does not pretend to compete either with Winer, or with Thayer's edition of Grimm's work, which Mr. Simcox evidently knew very thoroughly; but yet it is tolerably complete, and

any one who is familiar with the contents of this volume, cannot help being a much better New Testament scholar than he otherwise would be. Mr. Simcox takes each part of speech and considers it with considerable thoroughness. There is added an Index of Texts, so that the author's remarks on any passage may be easily turned to. Mr. Simcox did not live to see the work through the press, so the final revision was completed by his brother.

How to Study the Bible (4) is a little book of essays in which eight divines of different denominations have set down their ideas of the way in which the study of the Scriptures should be approached and conducted. They are probably the methods which the authors have themselves found useful; and no doubt great benefit will be derived from pursuing the study of the Bible in the manner here advocated. Dr. Clifford recommends "detachment of mind"; Mr. Waller, "enthusiasm"; Mr. Dawson, "common sense." Mr. Horton says he keeps two Bibles by him, one for devotional reading, the other for critical study. Mr. Moule holds up Christ as a Bible student and expositor. Mr. Berry advises students to let the Bible speak for itself, &c. So there being such considerable latitude in the mode of study recommended, it will be hard if every one who wishes for a clear and useful knowledge of the Scriptures cannot find some method here suggested which will be suitable for him. But this book only recommends methods of study, and does not go greatly into particulars. It is an excellent little work in its way.

Growth of Grace (5) is the title of a little work in which a great subject is handled. We think the author's intention is better than its execution. He has apparently not a very logical mind, and has not arranged his matter so well as he might have done. The chapters have something of the cast of sermons, and this is, to some extent a drawback. Still, the little book may be profitably read, for it will probably set people thinking on a subject which every one must admit is of the highest importance.

(1) *The Apology of Tertullian*. By J. Herbert Bindley, M.A. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

(2) *The Credentials of the Gospel*. By Joseph Agar Beet. London: Wesleyan Methodist Book-room. 1889. Price 2s. 6d.

(3) *The Language of the New Testament*. By the late Rev. Wm. Henry Simcox, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1889. Price 2s. 6d.

(4) *How to Study the Bible*. By "Various Authors" London: J. Nisbet & Co. 1890.

(5) *Growth of Grace*. By the Rev. R. G. Ambrose. London: Messrs. J. Nisbet & Co. 1890.

Books on
Intemperance

In a volume of 471 pages, Dr. Norman Kerr has discussed the etiology, the pathology, the treatment, and the jurisprudence of *Inebriety*; (1) and the book, altogether, reminds one of the full and complete articles on the various subjects in the French medical encyclopædia.

Dr. Kerr's work is apparently intended for members of the medical profession, though it is not without interest for other people. He considers inebriety, or narcomania, to be a disease, the tendency to which may be inherited; he does not say it is contagious or infectious; and of course everybody knows how dangerous it is. Dr. Kerr has but little faith in the remedies which are by some supposed to be beneficial for this disorder. Vegetarianism is not an antidote; the bark cure and the kola-nut cure are inefficient; nor is strychnine always effectual; cinchona has some virtue this way; but there is no remedy equal to total abstinence. Dr. Kerr discusses the value of homes for inebriates, but he does not go the length of saying that all inebriates ought to be treated as lunatics, and taken care of for the safety of society. Dr. Kerr treats the subject in a learned and serious manner, and he gives value to the power of religion as a remedy for this sad sort of excess. The subject is one of great importance, and of immense difficulty, but this work will do much to its elucidation, and let us hope it will be powerful in doing battle with one of the greatest evils of our time.

Should there be any speakers, whether in the pulpit or on the platform, who are not fully equipped for the task of addressing assemblies on the subject of intemperance, the little work of Mr. Legh, noted below, (2) is intended as an assistance. Mr. Legh has been Organising Secretary for the Church of England Temperance Society for several years in the dioceses of Winchester and Chichester, and having delivered some 600 addresses, may be considered a practised hand at this work. He claims that the views he expresses are "such as any reasonable person might hold without incurring the charge of bigotry or intolerance." There are twelve outlines of addresses for the platform and six for the pulpit; and any one who is skilful in clothing skeletons may make telling speeches or sermons by their aid; but there is the difficulty. There is an appendix of illustrations and blank pages for notes. The little work will not add greatly to the weight of a temperance lecturer's luggage; we wonder if it will add much to the power of his usefulness.

The Temperance Mirror (3) is an illustrated magazine for the home circle, and is an interesting periodical consisting of short stories and sketches, pieces of poetry and varieties, all tending in the healthy direction of temperance. It is nicely printed and adorned with many pretty pictures, which ought to make it a welcome guest in many a home where English is spoken; its tone and tendency we cannot but admire, and we therefore wish its success may be even more marked in the future than in the past. The present volume has a very good portrait of Archdeacon Farrar as a frontispiece.

The Truth about Intoxicating Drinks (4) is a prize essay, a book written to order, and therefore, perhaps, it can hardly be treated by the ordinary canons of criticism. The author has evidently got up his subject with thoroughness, and his essay is fairly readable; but its conclusions are somewhat strained. One argument against alcohol is that it is a manufactured article, and is never found in a native state. But surely if that be an objection, it applies to all manufactured articles, whether of food or clothing. We should be inclined to call milk a manufactured article; water must, in most cases, be treated by some process to be made fit to drink; and fruit can hardly be said to be universally available. We consider the author's argument from Holy Scripture to be weak, and his objection to wine being administered in the Sacrament is a very serious stricture upon Christianity. The moderate drinker comes in for Mr. Barrett's severe denunciations; and indeed he is loath to admit that alcohol has any virtue whatever under any circumstances, though why it should be so widely procurable in nature, existing, as it seems to be, almost all through the vegetable world, is a problem he does not undertake to solve, and yet it is quite worth considering; for there must be a reason which, if found, would be both instructive and efficacious.

(1) *Inebriety*. By Norman Kerr, M.D., F.L.S. Second Edition. London: H. K. Lewis, 136, Gower Street, W.C. 1889.

(2) *Platform and Pulpit Addresses on Temperance Topics*. By the Rev. H. Edmund Legh, M.A. London: Wells, Gardener, Dalton & Co.

(3) *The Temperance Mirror*. Vol. ix. London: National Temperance Publication Dépôt. 1889.

(4) *The Truth about Intoxicating Drinks*. A Prize Essay. By E. R. Barrett, B.A., Liverpool. London: National Temperance Publication Dépôt.

Magazines. THE *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1) has entered upon its sixtieth year, but far from showing any signs of decrepitude, it evinces, if possible, increasing vigour. Ably edited and beautifully printed, it is a credit to the country that produces it. In the number under review Dr. Wright discourses learnedly on the Ice Age in North America; Dr. N. E. Wood writes hopefully of the Coming American Philosophy; and the Rev. J. W. White kindly, but keenly, criticizes the latest phase of the Anglo-Catholic Movement. The whole number is full of interesting matter.

The Homiletic Review (2) pursues its usual course with unabated ability. In the March number there is an especially good article on the Song of Songs by Dr. Griffis. In that on High Licence, by Mr. Fernald, Monaco is said to be in the Pyrenees instead of the department of Alpes Maritimes; but that slip of the pen does not at all detract from the value of his argument. The rest of the number is also replete with interest. The energetic publishers deserve ample recognition from the British clergy for having brought this excellent magazine within their reach.

The Preachers' Magazine (3) is a new venture edited by Mark Guy Pearse and Arthur E. Gregory. Though apparently intended primarily for the use of ministers of their own denomination, it may find its way beyond those precincts. There are no especial features to distinguish it from other similar publications, but it is not wanting in freshness and vigour; and we wish it success.

A new series of the *Weekly Pulpit* (4) has been just begun. In it are two sermons, and two outlines on the Resurrection; and another sermon sketch called "Purple Patches." The whole is no better and no worse than ordinary, but we suppose this weekly issue is intended to be quite up to date, so that those who seek its aid shall not be at all behindhand. In this it may be successful.

The Anglican Church Magazine (5) for March is a good number. Mr. John Lomas discourses very sensibly on Church Finance. There is an interesting account of the Stuttgart Chaplaincy with an illustration, and Mr. Harrison continues his genial dealings with sceptics. Let us hope many sceptics at home and abroad will read them.

The Foreign Church Chronicle and Review (6) is a daintily printed little quarterly; and the current number is even more than usually attractive. The greater portion is taken up with notices of Dr. von Döllinger; but there is a very interesting article on Confucius, another on the Oriental attitude towards Protestantism, and a notice

of the now famous *Lux Mundi*, in which Mr. Gore's views are, to some extent, rebutted. In both this and *The Anglican Church Magazine* there is an appreciative account of Professor Watterich's new work, *The Passover of the New Testament*, which, we expect, will shortly make itself known to English readers.

(1) *The Bibliotheca Sacra*. March, 1890. Oberlin, Ohio: Published by E. J. Goodrich. Price 3s. 6d.

(2) *The Homiletic Review*. March, 1890. New York and London: Funk & Wagnalls. Price 1s.

(3) *The Preachers' Magazine*. March, 1890. London: C. H. Kelly, Castle Street, City Road. Price 4d.

(4) *The Weekly Pulpit*. A Magazine for Preachers. London: Elliot Stock.

(5) *Anglican Church Magazine*. March, 1890. London: Harrison & Sons, Pall Mall. Price One Franc.

(6) *The Foreign Church Chronicle and Review*. London: Rivingtons.

**Works of
Shakespeare.**

We eagerly await and heartily welcome the arrival of each volume of *The Henry Irving Shakespeare* (1). In no other edition are there so many useful and happily combined features. In the short introductions under the heads of "Literary History," "Stage History," and "Critical Remarks" is admirably condensed and elegantly expressed all the preliminary information really requisite for the intelligent and pleasant reading of the play which follows. The woodcuts are masterpieces in their way, the subjects of them well selected and so judiciously distributed that you are enticed to keep on reading until the end is reached, and you long to make a fresh start. The first notes explain with brevity and skill all the words and phrases which call for immediate elucidation, while there is reserved for the appended notes what is suitable for purposes of more leisurely conducted and thoroughgoing study. The sketch maps and plans which accompany are a real luxury. A list of words peculiar to each play is given with references. The clergy and theological students would do well to keep this edition of Shakespeare within easy reach as being one which is especially suitable to afford relief and refreshment to the mind during periods of severe study.

(1) *The Henry Irving Shakespeare*. The Works of William Shakespeare, edited by Henry Irving and Frank A. Marshall, with Notes and Introductions to each play by F. A. Marshall and other Shakespearian scholars, and numerous illustrations by Gordon Browne. Volume VII. Blackie & Sons. 1890.