

maritime undertakings, heedless of the nation's welfare. The same words, *by the shore of the sea* [Heb. *seas*], are used in Genesis xlix. 13 of Zebulun: "Zebulun shall dwell by the shore of the sea."

But in contrast to the lethargy and indifference shown by these tribes, the gallantry and bright example of Zebulun and Naphtali are warmly praised—

¹⁸ Zebulun was a people that contemned its life unto death,
And Naphtali upon the high places of the field—

i.e., probably, on the mounds and hillocks of the Plain, used as rallying-points by the hard-pressed Canaanites, but stormed and carried by Zebulun and Naphtali with reckless hardihood. "So at least we may imagine it; a certain interpretation is hardly to be given" (Moore).

But I must break off here; and reserve the sequel for another occasion.

S. R. DRIVER.

TWO AMERICAN BIOGRAPHIES OF LUTHER.¹

THE year 1911 will be memorable in the annals of the Luther literature. At the moment when German experts are discussing the volumes of the Jesuit Professor Hartmann Grisar of Innsbrück, two American scholars have written on Luther from the Protestant point of view. Professor McGiffert's book, reprinted from articles in the *Century Magazine*, is an unambitious effort to introduce the personality of the Reformer to the general public. Students who know the thoroughness and competence of Dr. McGiffert's work in other fields will learn with disappointment that he ignores their needs entirely. What are we to think of a *Life of Luther*, published in 1911, which is without

¹ *Martin Luther: The Man and his Work*, by Arthur Cushman McGiffert (T. Fisher Unwin); *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, by Preserved Smith, Ph.D. (John Murray).

preface, notes, bibliography, or the briefest list of authorities? Our first indignant thought is that only a literary style comparable to that of Max Lenz, Gustav Freytag, or Adolf Hausrath, could excuse such negligence. But after comparing the translations of Luther's letters with the originals in De Wette and Enders, we gratefully acknowledge the scrupulous accuracy of the author's renderings. If his boat never ventures into dangerous waters, it is seaworthy for all purposes of the land-locked bay.

A very different study of Luther is offered us by a younger scholar, Dr. Preserved Smith. His admirable bibliographies have been compiled with the help of Dr. Kawerau and Dr. Harnack. Whatever may be the faults of his book, it is not a careless or a lazy production, and the only German work of recent years to which it owes a heavy debt is Dr. Kroker's *Katharina von Bora*.

We hear the ring of hammers in the Luther workshops of Berlin, Leipzig and Weimar, and meet the craftsmen who are toiling at the great Weimar edition. English admirers of Dr. Kawerau will read with pleasure in the preface a grateful acknowledgment of the kindness shown by him to the author.

The American biographies cover partly the same ground, and the unlearned reader who compares the two books will be surprised to notice discrepancies in translation. We take an example from Luther's letter to Prince Joachim of Anhalt, dated June 12, 1534.

Dr. Preserved Smith gives the closing passage as follows (p. 324):

"Your Grace must really look out for that marvellous chess-player, Francis Burkhardt, for he is quite sure that he can play the game like a professional. I would give a button to see him play as well as he thinks he can. He can manage the knights, take a castle or two, and fool the peasant-pawns, but the queen beats him on account of his weakness for the fair sex, which he cannot deny."

Professor McGiffert prefers the following (p. 299).

"Your Grace must look out for Master Francis at chess. He thinks he can play very well, but I will wager a beautiful rose he cannot play as well as he pretends. He knows how to assign their places to the knights, to seize the castles, and to hoodwink the peasants (pawns) but the lady is his master in the game, perhaps elsewhere as well."¹

Here, as elsewhere, Dr. McGiffert translates with watchful accuracy. An occasional pawn is all that the critic will capture from him. Dr. Preserved Smith, on the other hand, often goes astray in his renderings. Take, for example, Luther's letter written to Melanchthon from Coburg on May 12, 1530.² We print in parallel columns some sentences from the original, with the American biographer's translation. He professes to give the letter in full, except at one point, where he marks an omission of a single sentence.

Luther's Words.

"Mi Philippe, a die octava Maji coepimus vobis respondere ad literas vestras Norimbergae datas, sed intercidit negotium, ut haecenus distulerim, et interim etiam ex Augusta recepimus fascem literarum vestrarum."

Dr. Smith's Translation.

"Dear Philip, I began to answer your letter from Nuremberg on May 8, but business interfered to prevent me finishing my reply" (p. 253).

The last part of the Latin sentence, "and in the meantime I have also received a packet of your letters from Augsburg," is omitted by Dr. Smith without any explanation. A few lines further on Luther tells about his work on the Prophets.

Luther's Words.

"His absolutis Prophetas in manus sumpsi, et impetu magno rem aggressus, statuebam ante Pentecosten omnes Prophetas versos habere. Post Aesopum et alia. Et fecissem certe, ita procedebat opus."

Dr. Smith's Translation.

"Then I took the Prophets in hand and attacked the labour with such ardour that I hope to finish it before Pentecost, and after that turn to Aesop and other things."

¹ For the original German see De Wette, vi. 149.

² Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel*, vol. vii. pp. 332, 333.

For "hope" we should of course read "hoped" or rather "planned." This error is no doubt a misprint, but why is the sentence "And I should certainly have done so, as the work was getting on so well" omitted without mark or sign?

In the middle of the letter, after telling of the trouble in his head which had compelled him to stop work, Luther breaks out into the pathetic complaint, "Es wills nicht mehr thun, sehe ich wohl, die Jahr treten herzu." "I get worse as the years go on" is scarcely an adequate translation. Did not Luther—then aged only forty-seven—mean rather, "My head won't work any more, I see well. Years are growing upon me"?

Take another passage from the same letter :

Luther's Words.

"Libentissime scripsissem Principi (ut tu vis) juniore de Macedone, et seniori, vobisque omnibus, sed faciam suo tempore."

Dr. Smith's Translation.

"I would most willingly write, as you suggest, to the Landgrave of Hesse and to the Elector and to all of you, but I must take my own time."

Here Dr. Smith has missed the point. The sentence should read : "I would most willingly have written (as you desire) to the younger Prince¹ about the Landgrave, and to the elder,² and to you all," etc.

Luther's Words.

"Haec nostra interna; foris alia, inter quae mihi etiam Geckium significas denuo bellare una cum Billicano tuo. Was hat man sonst zu thun auf dem Reichstage?"

Dr. Smith's Translation.

"Such is our domestic news; other news comes from abroad, such as that you mention about the strife between Eck and Billican. What is happening at the Diet?"

The latter part of this passage from the word "mention" does not mean that Eck is striving with Billican, but that

¹ John Frederick, afterwards Elector of Saxony,

² John the Constant, the reigning Elector in 1530. Melancthon, writing on May 4, had requested Luther to write to the younger prince. On May 22 he advised that the letter should not go.

“Eck is again on the war-path along with your friend Billican.” “What else,” adds Luther, “is there to do at the Diet?” Dr. Smith has forgotten to refer to Melancthon’s letter of May 4, to which this letter of May 12 is a reply. There we read of Eck :

“Postulat a Principibus, ut instituatur disputatio contra Lutheranos. Habet subscriptorem meum veterem amicum Billicanum : is vero horribiliter minatur nobis.”¹

We give one other very well-known passage from the letter of May 12 :

Luther’s Words.

“Sed heus tu, quod unice volebam, vide, ut meo exemplo caput tuum perdas. Itaque ego mandabo tibi et universo sodalicio, ut sub anathemate cogant te in regulas servandi corpusculi tui, ne fias homicida tui, et fingas postea obsequio Dei id fieri.”

Dr. Smith’s Translation.

“Give heed to my example and be sure not to lose your head as I have done. I command you and all my friends to keep regular habits for the sake of your health. Do not kill yourself and then pretend you did it in God’s service.”

This passage was rendered more accurately in Köstlin’s biography. “Luther warned him [Melancthon] by his own example, against injuring [not losing] his head by immoderate exertion. He wrote to him on May 12 : “I command you and all your company, that they compel you, under pain of excommunication, to keep your poor body by rule and order, so that you may not kill yourself and imagine that you do so from obedience to God.”²

The biographers differ in their version of Luther’s epigram, written with chalk on his dining-room table :

Res et verba Philippus,
Verba sine re Erasmus,
Res sine verbis Lutherus,
Neque rem neque verba Carollstadius.³

¹ Enders, vii. 323. For the changing conduct of Billican and his return to the Roman Catholics in 1530 see Enders, vii. 325, note 11.

² We quote in this case from the standard English translation published by Messrs Longmans, p. 347.

³ We take the original as given by Kroker, *Luthers Tischreden in der Mathesischen Sammlung*, No. 786, p. 427.

Professor McGiffert writes (p. 265): "Of a different kind was Luther's somewhat amusing judgment expressed in the following epigram: 'Philip has both matter and words, Erasmus words without matter, Luther matter without words, Carlstadt neither matter nor words.'"

Dr. Smith says: (p. 286): "August 1, 1537, Luther wrote on his table:

Deeds and words, Melanchthon;
Words without deeds, Erasmus;
Deeds without words, Luther;
Neither words nor deeds, Carlstadt."

Surely the contrast in Luther's mind was not between deeds and words, but between "substance and style," or, as Dr. McGiffert puts it, "matter and words."

Take a passage from the *Table-Talk*, in which Luther is speaking of Melanchthon.

Text in Kroker's edition.

"[Er hat aber mit seiner weiss nicht vil ausgericht und seine bucher ubel dedicirt."]¹

Dr. Smith's Translation (p. 287).

"In his way he has accomplished much, but he has often been unfortunate in the dedications of his books."

The omission of the word "nicht" makes nonsense of the passage. Luther's point, as the context shows, is that Melanchthon had not accomplished much by his extreme moderation.

We pass from comments on translations to consider a few passages in which Dr. Preserved Smith, as it seems to us, is not strictly accurate in his statement of facts.

(1) Has he not missed the point of Luther's little joke on Bugenhagen, parish minister of Wittenberg, which is given as follows by Kroker:²

"*Jocus de Pomerano.*

"Cum mulier non bene coctum cibum-proposuisset marito, dixit, 'O, ich meinte, es wurde Pommer heut predigen.'"

¹ *Op. cit.* No. 236, p. 154.

² *Op. cit.* No. 99, p. 106.

("When a woman set badly cooked food before her husband, she said, 'O, I thought Pommer was preaching to-day'.")

Dr. Smith writes (pp. 326, 327): "Another joke on Bugenhagen, who, notwithstanding his dignified position in both the upper and lower worlds, seems to have been unable to deliver a palatable sermon, was made about the same time as the last:—When a woman put badly cooked food before her husband, he said, 'Oh, I expected that Bugenhagen would preach to-day'."

Dr. Pommer was in every sense a "palatable" preacher, but his sermons were notoriously lengthy. Köstlin, in his article on Bugenhagen in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, says, "As a preacher he ranked next to Luther in his simple, vigorous, popular style," but notes his tendency to long-windedness. The woman meant 'I thought Dr. Pommer would keep you so long in church that I should have time to cook the dinner'."¹

LUTHER AT WEIMAR IN JUNE 1540.

(2) On page 380 Dr. Smith says that the Elector "invited Luther to Weimar, where the Reformer arrived on June 28." The date ought to be changed to 22 or 23. The most recent German authorities seem to have overlooked the important letter from the Elector to the Landgrave of Hesse, printed by Dr. Max Lenz in a note to Part I. of his "Correspondence" of the Landgrave with Bucer. John Frederick, writing from Weimar on June 27, says: "At our request Dr. Martin Luther arrived here four days ago."²

¹ Professor Hermann Hering, in his excellent short biography of Bugenhagen, notes that Luther used to find fault with the length of his friend's sermons. See p. 138.

² *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen von Hessen mit Bucer*, part i., page 338, note. We give this important passage in the original. "Am 27 Juni schreibt der Kurfürst dem Landgrafen über Melanchthons Krankheit so: 'Auch wissen wir E. L. nicht zu verhalten, dass ihne, Meister Philippen Melanchton darob solche bekummerliche Gedanken zu

The months of June and July, 1540, marked a critical period in the lives of Luther and Melanchthon, for it was then that they suffered the worst consequences of their ill-fated "confessional counsel" to the Landgrave. Köstlin has truly said that the scene in Melanchthon's sick-room at Weimar, which is described by Ratzeberger, was one of the most important incidents in the latter part of Luther's career.¹ Hausrath says it is like the story of an awakening of the dead.² In German Protestant circles, the restoration of the sick man was regarded at the time and long afterwards as a miraculous answer to prayer. Mistaken dates for these weeks are supplied by more than one recent German authority, and we venture to set out here the Reformers' itinerary between June 11 and July 7, 1540.

Friday, June 11 (St. Barnabas' Day).—Melanchthon left Wittenberg to attend the conference at Hagenau.

Monday, June 14.—Melanchthon wrote Luther a very short letter from Weimar, in which he said: "I am still doubtful about my journey. My health is growing weaker, because each day I hear worse news about the Landgrave's business."³

Tuesday, June 15.—Luther wrote to Anton Lauterbach,

Gemuert gezogen, dass er nun fast bis in den vierzehenden Tag allhier bettriess gelegen und noch liegt, und man kann auch nit achten wie [es der Allmächtige mit ihm zum Leben oder Sterben schicken]will. Haben auch derselbigen seiner Schwachheit halben andre an sein Statt gegen [Hagenau vorfertigen]müssen. So ist Dr. Martin Luther, uf unser Erfordern vor vier Tagen bei uns allhier ankommen." For further references to the text of the Elector's letter, see the Life of John Frederick by Professor Georg Mentz of Jena, part ii., p. 261, note 4; and W. W. Rockwell, *Die Doppelreihe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*, p. 181, note 4. The letter was written from Weimar, as we see from the use of the word "allhier." Melanchthon was lying ill at Weimar on June 27.

¹ *Köstlin-Kawerau*, vol. ii. p. 527.

² *Luthers Leben*, vol. ii. p. 402.

³ The original has been lost, but there is a copy in the archives of Zerbst. The letter is printed in Kolde's *Analecta*, page 351, and in Enders, xiii. 84, 85.

asking him to pray for Melanchthon, who had been "sent into the midst of the enemies."¹

Wednesday, June 16.—The Elector wrote to Luther from Weimar a cautiously worded letter,² announcing Melanchthon's breakdown, and asking Luther to come to Weimar for consultation about affairs at Hagenau.

Friday, June 18.—In the earlier part of the day Luther answered Melanchthon's note of the 14th in a long consolatory letter.³ He had not yet heard of his friend's actual collapse.

Later on the same day he must have received the Elector's summons to Weimar, and probably also a letter (now lost) from Chancellor Brück, in which it was suggested that Melanchthon's illness was a tertian fever.⁴

Monday, June 21 ?—Luther left for Weimar. The date may have been Sunday the 20th. As Dr. Kawerau points out, the exact date cannot be definitely fixed.

Tuesday (22) or Wednesday (23)—(probably the latter).—Luther reached Weimar, and was taken to Melanchthon's sick-room, where he found his friend at the point of death. The historic scene described by so many biographers must have taken place on this day.

Sunday, June 27.—The Elector wrote the letter to the Landgrave (mentioned above) in which he states that Luther had been four days at Weimar.

Monday, June 28.—The Elector, who had moved to the neighbouring town of Gotha, wrote a letter of encouragement to Melanchthon, whose condition was still serious, though hopeful. In the letter he mentions that Luther and

¹ Enders, xiii. 86.

² *Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. iii. col. 1045.

³ Enders, xiii. 91.

⁴ Kroker, *Luthers Tischreden*, No. 241, and see also the important note on p. 158. Dr. Kroker thinks the Elector's letter cannot have been received later than the evening of the 18th.

Jonas were with the patient, and that he wishes all three to come to Eisenach as soon as Melanchthon was fit to travel.¹

Saturday, July 3.—Joachim Moller, a boarder of Melanchthon's, who had accompanied his professor to Weimar and helped to nurse him, wrote to Westphal at Wittenberg: "Philip is gradually regaining strength, having dismissed from his mind all sadness and anxiety. . . . He is so much stronger that he wishes to go to church to-morrow with Luther."²

On Monday, July 5, or Tuesday, 6 (almost certainly Monday) Luther, Jonas and Melanchthon left Weimar for Eisenach, where they arrived, as Jonas mentions in a letter, on Wednesday, the 7th.

(3) Dr. Preserved Smith says on p. 379: "After the conference at Schmalkalden Melanchthon fell ill of a disease something like malaria, then called 'tertian fever.'" His authority is Dr. Rockwell,³ and Rockwell's opinion is accepted in the latest Enders-Kawerau volume,⁴ but in our view all three writers are mistaken. Melanchthon's illness at Weimar was not a "tertian fever."

Two reasons only can be suggested in favour of Dr. Smith's theory. The first is the remark of Luther in the conversation dated by Dr. Kroker June 18: "Philippus moerore paene contabescit et incidit in febrim tertianam."⁵

The sentence begins, "Cum redderentur Doctori literae a Pontano, lectis iis dixit, etc." The letter of Chancellor Brück (Pontanus) is lost, so that we cannot verify the reference, but it was written from Weimar at latest on June 16, and was delivered to Luther either before or along

¹ C. R. iii. 1051.

² Sillem's *Briefsammlung des Hamburgischen Superintendenten Joachim Westphal*, vol. i. p. 56.

³ *Die Doppelreihe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*, p. 191.

⁴ *Luther's Briefwechsel*, vol. xiii. pp. 153, 154.

⁵ *Op. cit.* p. 156.

with the Elector's letter of the same date, which summoned the Reformer to Weimar.

On June 16, the true nature of the illness was not known at Weimar. The Elector, in his letter of that day, writes vaguely of "Schwachheit" (weakness) and in his letter of June 19 to his representatives at Hagenau, he says he would have sent Melanchthon and Myconius from Weimar, "if Master Philip had not been overcome with such great exhaustion and weakness."¹

Luther's conclusion from the missing letter of the Chancellor is worthless unless confirmed from other sources, and such confirmation is entirely lacking. Dr. Rockwell has no authority whatever for his suggestion that the fever from which Justus Jonas suffered at Eisenach in the last week of July had any connection with Melanchthon's illness. Is it not a significant fact that although Melanchthon wrote to various friends about his miraculous restoration during the months following his return to Wittenberg, he never once suggested that he had been suffering from a fever? On the contrary, he wrote as late as November 27, 1540, to the Abbot Frederick Pistorius of the Egidian monastery at Nürnberg, that his sufferings had not been caused by any bodily disease.² His physician, the illustrious Dr. George Sturtz of Erfurt, was perfectly well acquainted with the symptoms of the intermittent malady known as tertian fever, and Melanchthon himself was an eager student of medicine, who could write a prescription as well as any doctor in Wittenberg. Is it likely that after five months he should have

¹ "Wo Magister Philippus nicht so mit grosser Mattigkeit und Schwachheit befallen gewest." C. R., iii. 1050.

² The passage is as follows: "Ex D. Osiandro intellexi te non solum gravi morbo conflictari, sed etiam accedere inusitatos pavores, et animi certamen et luctum. Coepi igitur eo magis vicem tuam dolere, quia similitudo tui periculi me de meo morbo admonuit qui me proxima aestate subito oppresserat, cum nulla corporis aegritudine laborantem soli dolores animi horribiliter prostratum paene extinxissent." C. R., iii. 1174.

been unaware that he had suffered from one of the most commonly recognised sicknesses of the age ?

His fatal illness in April 1560, was a "tertian fever," and his son-in-law, Dr. Caspar Peucer, with another expert, Dr. Veit Winsheim, has left us an account of the varying symptoms almost from hour to hour. They naturally refer to the Weimar illness of twenty years earlier, but instead of calling it a tertian fever, they mention that the cause was "heart-weakness." A modern physician would have diagnosed it as a severe case of neurasthenia, with a tendency to heart failure. Dr. Sturtz tried to strengthen the heart's action by applying crushed coral.¹

LUTHER'S CHARACTER AND WORK.

The American biographers do not emphasise, like Grisar, every unpleasing detail in Luther's writings and conversation, yet with them also, and especially in Dr. Smith's chapter entitled "Character and Habits"—we observe "a manner somewhat fallen from reverence." They are too ready to adopt an apologetic tone, forgetting the words of Principal Lindsay, "To his contemporaries Luther was the embodiment of personal piety." Dr. Harnack, in a recent article,² has expressed surprise that the learned Innsbrück Jesuit should drag to light every coarse and careless passage from the *Table-Talk* and other sources, while he ignores the incomparable greatness of Luther's character and service.

It was perhaps inevitable, that with the lapse of centuries, keen criticism of the heroic man should take the place of unquestioning love. Vinet's words are true of Luther: "In spirits thus gifted—its burning and shining lights—the Church must be willing to rejoice 'for a season,' for much that they bring with them will depart when they

¹ Loesche, *Analecta Lutherana et Melanthoniana*, Nos. 182 and 186. N. Müller, *Philipp Melancthon's letzte Lebensstage*, etc., pp. 19, 20.

² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, November 25, 1911.

go ; the foreign elements will break up and scatter when the cord which binds them together is slackened by absence or unloosed by death. . . . Much of their work seems to vanish with them, reappearing after a time in humbler forms."

Dr. Preserved Smith would have been well advised to cut out more than one sentence on the objectionable passages in Luther's conversation. Has he forgotten the lines which Melancthon wrote in the diary of Conrad Cordatus :

"Omnia non prodest Cordate inscribere chartis,
Sed quaedam tacitum dissimulare decet" ?

How can we tell whether the scribes who ate at Luther's table, and copied down his chance sayings amidst the noise of a crowded dining-room, may not themselves have been responsible for some of the expressions which are displeasing to modern taste ? Dr. Kroker may perhaps say something on this point when he arranges the *Table-Talk* for the Weimar edition. We prefer to dwell on the countless passages of fresh and wholesome humour, the many happy illustrations of Scripture, which enriched Luther's daily conversation. Here is one example from a recently edited report by George Rörer :

Speaking on the childhood of our Lord, Luther said : " At Nazareth He must have helped his father Joseph to build houses, for Joseph was a carpenter, as the Gospel says. What will the people of Nazareth think at the last day, when they see Christ sitting in His majesty ? They will say to Him, ' Lord, didst not Thou help to build my house ? How art Thou come to these honours ? ' " ¹

For our final estimate of Luther, we must turn, after all, to the letters and speeches of his most intimate friends. Take this passage from a letter of Veit Dietrich, who was Luther's companion at Coburg in 1530 : " I cannot sufficiently admire the remarkable firmness, cheerfulness,

¹ *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, 1908, p. 356.

faith and hope of the man in these most bitter times. These he nourishes steadily by more diligent meditation on God's Word. Not a day passes on which he does not devote at least three hours to prayer, and those the hours most suitable for study. Once I happened to hear him praying. Good God, what spirit, what faith there was in his words! He pleaded with such reverence as if he felt himself to be talking with God, with such hope and faith as if he were speaking with a father and a friend. 'I know,' he said, 'that Thou art our God and Father. I am sure, therefore, that Thou wilt defeat the persecutors of Thy children. If not, the danger is Thine as well as ours. The whole of this business is Thine; we have been compelled to meet it; defend us therefore.' I, standing apart, heard him praying with a clear voice in almost these very words. My soul also burned with a strange ardour as he spoke so familiarly, so solemnly, so reverently with God, and as he prayed he pleaded promises from the Psalms like one who was sure that all the things for which he asked would come to pass."¹

For passages like this we look in vain in the American biographies. From Dr. McGiffert's Index, we are led to suppose that the Veit Dietrich of 1530 is the same as the "D. Vitum" of 1518, whom he calls "Dr. Veit."²

Each of these large volumes is wound up so hurriedly that no space is left for even a mention of the memorial tribute paid to Luther by Melanchthon in the Castle Church of Wittenberg. The oration, as Ellinger says, ranks with the best examples of mournful eloquence in the world's literature. Melanchthon had known Luther intimately for nearly a generation. He had experienced from him never-failing generosity and the tenderest indulgence. Knowing that he spoke to Europe and that jealous eyes would scru-

¹ C. R., vol. ii. col. 159.

² See note in Enders, i. pp. 302, 303, on Veit Warbeck.

tinise his every sentence, he ventured to place his friend beside Isaiah, John the Baptist, St. Paul and St. Augustine. The note of personal sorrow was hushed as he dwelt with awe and gratitude on the work divinely accomplished in these latter days through Luther. "And there came a fear on all; and they glorified God, saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us, and, that God hath visited His people."

JANE T. STODDART.

THE TEACHING OF PAUL IN TERMS OF THE PRESENT DAY.

VIII. THE BASIS OF PAUL'S THOUGHT—(2) GOD IS GOOD.

THE religion of Paul was definitely and absolutely inconsistent with the characteristic Oriental doctrine of a pantheistic type. Yet all such forms of thought start, as Paul did, from the perception that man is by the very fact of his existence separated from God and ought to aim at reunion with Him.

Why then did not Paul take the step which so many Asiatic forms of religious thought have taken? How did he avoid the pantheistic view and the inference from it, which was so tempting to an intensely emotional and devotional nature like his, that man should seek re-absorption in the Divine through liberation from the human nature, that man should strive to lose his individuality and to be merged in the one God?

Paul was saved from this step by the whole force of Hebrew tradition and the promise given to his fathers. The Promise had been made and must be fulfilled; and fulfilment of the Promise led in the diametrically opposite direction from that dream of absorption in the Divine nature, which was the goal of the highest Asiatic religious thought outside of the Hebrew people. The fulfilment of the