

strong dramatic sense, skilfully related. And these characters are probably no less effective because they are obviously the creations of a feminine mind. Women have perhaps been rather too much praised for writing books that sound as though a man had written them. It is never the least interesting feature of Miss Brown's work that her stories unmistakably reflect a woman's view of the world.

OLIVIA HOWARD DUNBAR.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER.*

ONE reads a book like this with regret and misgiving. Not only is one forced to disagree with very much that it contains, but one is also compelled to think that it will inevitably cast a shadow on Mr. Campbell's earlier work, with its very genuine liberalism and spirituality, and will furnish a weapon to the forces of dogmatism and reaction, which will be used with vigor and effect. In his earlier work, Mr. Campbell again and again insisted that spiritual well-being, spiritual life, all that is meant by "salvation," depends not so much on verbal and mental assent to certain formulas, as on inward spiritual awakening, growth in spiritual life and a gradual raising of the interior consciousness until it reaches and becomes one with the divine consciousness; that thus through "the new birth from above," the spiritual man comes into being, and that this spiritual man is of his own nature, or rather through his sharing in the divine nature, immortal, a habitant of eternity; in a word, the mystical teaching of the saints in all ages.

It would seem that Mr. Campbell has lacked something of the courage and aspiration needed for further spiritual growth; that he has drawn back, appalled by the silence and darkness of the invisible worlds: that initial darkness to which all saints have borne witness; and that he has sought refuge in a materialism, which is all the more to be regretted because it is covered up by the phrases and emotions of idealism. He no longer finds true spiritual well-being in the development of spiritual life and the spiritual man, the present immortal; but rather in a purely material security, whose merely sensuous appeal is veiled by the assurance that something great and beautiful is being sought for

* "Christianity and the Social Order." By Rev. R. J. Campbell.
New York: The Macmillan Co

all mankind. As if what is undeniably injurious for one becomes less so when it is shared among all. And no one with a broad view of history and religion can deny that to set the affections on things of earth is injurious, whether for one or for many.

But it is not the earthward tendency of this new book which is its most regrettable feature. After all, hedonism, whether frank or sentimental, has never lacked its prophets. What is to be regretted, and deeply regretted, is the fact that Mr. Campbell has tried to bring down to the level of his hedonism the Founder of Christianity and the whole teaching of the Apostles. This attempt fills the first part of the work, and it is this part which is likely to be decisive in giving the book its final place.

Mr. Campbell's critical procedure is at least simple. He wishes to show that Jesus taught primarily the establishment of an earthly kingdom. He finds obstacles to this view in all the purely spiritual teaching, which is most characteristic of the Master, the teaching, for instance, as it was understood and set forth by the beloved disciple. Therefore Mr. Campbell decides to discard the Fourth Gospel as an historic record, and simply rules St. John out of court. But there is a growing opinion among the most enlightened students of the Christian documents that not only is the Fourth Gospel not what Mr. Campbell assumes it to be, a religious romance of late date, but that it is, in part at least, the oldest and earliest document in the New Testament; the first-hand evidence of the beloved disciple himself, written within a short time, perhaps a few weeks, after the Crucifixion. Two-thirds of the Fourth Gospel refer to the last few weeks of the life of Jesus, and one-third refers to the last twenty-four hours before the Crucifixion. And this whole part has a freshness, a minuteness of detail, a directness, which speak of a record made at the time of the events themselves, or immediately after. It is possible that the opening chapters were written many years later, and it is certain that the whole was gone over, very probably by John himself, then an old man, who added notes to make certain Jewish customs more intelligible for non-Jews, probably the disciples of his church of Smyrna; and it is these notes which have been used to throw doubt on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But we must remember that this too sceptical criticism was simply the reaction from a too emphatic dogmatism, and is now giving way to much more conservative

views. There is little doubt that before long John will be universally recognized as the author of the Fourth Gospel, and that the greater part of it was written very soon after the events of which it gives such a living record. And with John's record thus established, as a first-hand account of the life and teaching of the Master, the spiritual nature of the Master's message will come out clear and inspiring, and it will become increasingly difficult for any one to assert that Jesus sought primarily to establish a reign of material well-being on earth, as Mr. Campbell would have us believe. It is hardly necessary to criticise his views of the Apostolic age, and particularly of Paul. We may content ourselves by letting Paul speak for himself, as he does in two of the "uncontested and incontestable" epistles. His phrases are at once quaintly characteristic and drastic, and give little countenance to the new sentimental hedonism. The first sentence is this: "Meats for the belly, and the belly for meats: but God shall destroy both it and them." The second phrase goes farther, and is more constructive: "Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting."

CHARLES JOHNSTON.

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: ST. PETERSBURG: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, June, 1908.

QUESTIONS of foreign policy have more than held their own during the last few weeks in interest and importance against the competition of domestic events. The visit of M. Fallières to London in the last week of May—one of the most successful and enjoyable visits, I should judge, ever paid by the head of one state to the ruler and the people of another—was something more than a ceremonial exchange of courtesies. It was a political demonstration of real and deep significance. It coincided, moreover, with an announcement even more auspicious and momentous, the announcement that King Edward, for the first time since his accession, was about to visit the Tsar of Russia. Two such events, so closely connected not only in time, but in the weightier relationship of political cause and consequence, greatly moved and impressed England, and indeed all Europe, and started a discussion on the aims and possibilities of British foreign policy that is raging, as I write, from the Thames to the Neva.

It may, perhaps, be useful to American readers if I recall very briefly the history of the Anglo-French *entente*. It was born of the union of three streams of tendencies: (1) Of the reaction in England against the Philo-Germanism of British foreign policy; (2) of the desire of France to simplify and co-ordinate her external interests; and (3) of an accession of weariness and disgust among the French and British peoples with the furious scoldings and recriminations of Fashoda, the Dreyfus case and the Boer war. Almost up to the moment of the Kaiser's telegram to President Krüger, Great Britain, as between the Dual and the Triple Alliance, had tended rather to side with the latter.