

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

the enjoyment of his inheritance. The Apostle draws the parallelism, "Even so we, when we were children, were in bondage under the elements of the world"—that is, under the Law. But the Church came of age at the advent of God's Son; hence, "Thou art no more a bondsman, but a son." There is much that is remarkable in this. St. Paul identifies himself and all Jewish believers with the Gentile Christians as one Church, one from the beginning: "We," the Church, were under the bondage of the Law; "Thou," the Gentile believers (the Galatians as a portion of them) art no longer in bondage. How could such language be addressed to Gentile believers, save on the great fact that there is, and has always been, only one Church, one and the same in the days of Abraham, when under the Law, and in the present dispensation?

The Church is thus presented in different circumstances; similarly as the heir is first a slave, then a free man; not two men, but one in different states—the one Church, however different at times its conditions, however changed its constituents. The Church of all ages, "the Holy Church throughout all the world," was, and is, the Church of Abraham. Hence "we" were under the Law; "thou" art no longer under it; "we" (the Church) were bond-slaves; "thou" (the Church) art now free. It matters not that the constituents of the Church were at one time all Israelites, and that now they include both Jews and Gentiles.

The conclusion to which all my reasoning leads is, in the words of St. Paul to Timothy, quoted in a previous part of this paper, εἰς Θεός, εἰς καὶ μεσίτης Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος, χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς; one God, one Mediator also between God and men—men of every age and every nationality—that Mediator a man; that man Christ Jesus.

THEOPHILUS CAMPBELL, D.D.

---

#### ART. V.—SOCIALISM.

IN the last number of THE CHURCHMAN an endeavour was made to establish the position that the discontent out of which the demands of Socialism spring is not only natural, but reasonable, and that no one ought to be satisfied, or can be satisfied, whilst the condition of the poorest classes is such as to be both a peril and a disgrace to our civilization.

In order still further to illustrate and emphasize this position, we propose to quote some extracts from a series of articles on "Tempted London," which appeared in a Nonconformist paper, the *British Weekly*, during the months of May and June

in this year. These articles set forth the results of an inquiry into the condition of those women who have to gain their own livelihood in this great London labour market.

It may be natural, perhaps, to expect that women's work should be not so well paid as men's; but the competition amongst women themselves is rendered the more fierce and eager, and as the result their wages are brought down to a lower and lower level, because those who are entirely dependent upon their own labour, and perhaps have others dependent upon them for a livelihood, are compelled to compete with others who can afford to work at a lower rate of wages because they are, in part at least, supported by husbands or parents, and have not to provide for themselves the necessaries of existence.

We proceed, without further comment, to make a few extracts:

A poor woman was visited near Shoreditch, whose husband is out of work, and who has not had work herself lately. She weaves fringes for toilet-covers, and is paid 2s. for a piece thirty-six yards in length. Her husband puts the cotton in the loom for her over-night, and if she gets up at 4 a.m. and works till 11 p.m. she can make a piece in one day. *But lately she has not had any work.* When our Commissioner went into her room it presented a strange picture of cleanliness. The floor was white, and the furniture had not a speck of dust upon it. A clean patchwork quilt covered the bed, and the empty grate was as spotless. By the table stood two little children, without shoes or stockings, but as clean as the furniture; and the mother was clean herself, although her apron consisted of an old sack, and she wore a piece of sacking over her shoulders. The poor thing burst out crying when our Commissioner spoke about the fringe for toilet-covers, and said she had had no work lately. No food had touched her lips that day, and the children had been to school without any breakfast.

Umbrellas are now made by machinery, but the elastic bands for them are done by women at home. These consist of button, ring, and flap. They are paid at 4d. per gross. The tops of tassels are worked by women, and are paid at 4s. 6d. per gross. One gross takes a week to make, for the work is fine and troublesome.

One old lady near Drury Lane made binding for the Queen's carriages at the Jubilee. The poor woman received 2½d. per yard for it. She produced about six yards a day by working from dawn till dark.

A poor woman in Southwark was visited who supports herself and five children by making button-holes at 2½d. per gross. A woman in the same house makes bows for boys at 10d. per gross. Neckties are not paid much better.

The next extract is very striking when we remember that a Royal Commission has been appointed by Government to inquire into the "Sweating System":

A Commissioner reports a palm-worker<sup>1</sup> visited in Aldgate, a widow with two children. The eldest girl helps the mother; and some of the

<sup>1</sup> A palm-worker is one who uses a thimble in the palm of the hand, instead of on the finger.

work is done by the grandmother. The three work in the same small room—one stands by the bed, the second stands by the table, the third stands by the fireplace. Palm-workers do all their work standing up: sitting down they would not have enough force to pass the long needles through the stiff canvas. These three women do "Government work." They think that the Government is responsible for their hardships.

"I suffers murder from pins and needles in my hands at night, all along of the Government," says the mother.

"The work tears my clothes to bits: I wish Government had to pay for them," says the daughter.

"Men used to get 7s. for ten sacks, and Government only gives 4s. for ten to us poor women," says the grandmother.

At the present time they are making coal-sacks for ships. Each sack has four splices, eight holes, two patches. Each sack is sewn and roped. Each sack has a broad "R" worked on it for Government.

By working hard the mother can make such a sack in two hours, and she gets 4½d. for it. How hard the work is our readers can guess when they hear that she has sprained both her wrists over Government work. Yet her only complaint is, "I can't get enough of it." She says, "Such a lot flies to the work that it's eaten up quite; and if Government liked it could get the work done for next to nothing. I work from five in the morning till late at night, and I'd work all night long if I could get more to do. I want to bring my girl up to something better than Government work." "They do say about here as the men will have to stay at home and mind the babies, because the women are getting the work," said the grandmother. "She was a wicked woman who made the first sack for Government. Government was obliged to pay the men, but it can get women for next to nothing."

These extracts are sufficient for our purpose. The pictures are very terrible and very real. Who can wonder if discontent grows up into irritation, anger, and resentment, or if the wildest dreams and the most extravagant demands of Socialists find very ready listeners?

If any apology is needed for pressing this point, let it be found in the apparent difficulty which people find in understanding the reality of the pressure which is wearing out the hearts and lives of our fellow-countrymen.

In considering the subject of Socialism, it must always be remembered that the ultimate object which the Socialist has in view is to redress the wrongs which we have endeavoured to describe, to ameliorate the condition of the poorest classes, and if not to make wretchedness and misery impossible, at least to remove those obstacles which the selfishness of the individual may interpose so as to prevent men rising out of a state of poverty and misery.

Now, when the case is stated in this way, it is perfectly obvious, not only that this is an object which commands the respect and sympathy of every thinking man, but also that all the combined forces of Christianity, of philanthropy, of legislation, of political economy, as well as the individual energies of men and women of all kinds of opinions, are being exerted in

order to achieve it. Socialism does not hold the field entirely to itself.

Again, it is equally clear that we may have every sympathy with the suffering patient, and may have every desire to relieve his malady, and yet not be altogether willing to entrust his safety to the doctor who claims to be able to effect a cure. And on the other hand it is quite possible to conceive that a valuable remedy may be rejected simply because we have acquired some prejudice against the doctor who proposes it. We cannot help thinking that there are many persons who are frightened at the very name of Socialism, who have never taken much pains to examine into its aims, its motives, or its methods.

What, then, is Socialism? What are its proposals and its plans?

Cardinal Manning, in a letter to the *Times*, writes thus:

What is Socialism? It is the vision of society governed by the law of nature only, under which the State is the supreme, and therefore really the only landlord, and the supreme and therefore really the only employer of labour. It is, therefore, the negation of all progress, and of all the social laws which wisdom, justice and experience have sanctioned and matured. It is also an attempt to arrest or to reverse the natural inequalities resulting from the intrinsic inequalities, intellectual and moral, of man; an impossible task, and a theory replete with every kind of injustice to men and to society.

The Report of the Committee of Bishops, on Socialism, at the Lambeth Conference, says:

Speaking broadly, then, and with reference to such definitions as the preceding, any scheme of social reconstruction may be called Socialism, which aims at uniting labour and the instruments of labour (land and capital), whether by means of the State, or the help of the rich, or the voluntary co-operation of the poor.

To which description is added the following very important comment:

Between Socialism, as thus defined, and Christianity, there is, obviously, no necessary contradiction. Christianity sets forth no theory of the distribution of the instruments or products of labour; and if, therefore, some Socialists are found to be in opposition to the Christian religion, this must be due to the accidents, and not to the essence, of their social creed. . . . With what Socialists profess to be their central aim, the improvement of the material and moral condition of the poor, she must have the deepest sympathy.

Let us quote one witness more:

Mr. H. H. Champion is regarded as by no means the most extreme or extravagant amongst Socialists. Indeed, we believe that he is to a certain extent separated from the rest, because he deprecates the employment of force or revolution or anarchy, to accomplish the Socialistic plans. Now, Mr. Champion in a publication called "Common Sense," of which he would appear

to be the editor, puts forth a programme of the course which he thinks Socialists should take, and in this he incidentally remarks that the "ultimate goal is the collective control of the means of production."

It cannot be said that there is very much difference between these definitions of Socialism, and we may take it on the unimpeachable testimony of these three witnesses, (1) that the aim of Socialism is to improve the material and moral condition of the poorest classes; and (2) that the plan by which it is proposed to accomplish this result is by acquiring collective control of land and capital to be used for the advantage, not of the individual, but of the society or State.

But, supposing that this plan be generally accepted as desirable to be pursued—and on this point the eminent authorities above quoted do not appear to be altogether in accord—the question remains to be considered, By what means is it proposed to secure this end? Granted that State control of the means of production might tend to the amelioration of the conditions under which the poor have to live, what are the steps to be taken in order to produce this result? Now, here there is the widest variety of opinion and of schemes. There are some who would tear down the Throne, disestablish the Church, abolish the House of Lords, confiscate property, denounce the rich, turn out the landlords, set at defiance law and order and good government. The demonstrations in Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square, about which such an absurd fuss was made, at least had this advantage, that they were the means of drawing out a good deal of this wild and extravagant talk from the would-be leaders of a new social revolution.

But it must not be supposed that the charms of anarchy and spoliation and confusion are as keenly appreciated by all Socialists. Indeed, Mr. Champion in the paper to which reference has been made, strongly deprecates this course of action, not perhaps so much on the ground of its injustice, as because it does not seem to have much chance of success. He would attain the object by more constitutional means, and would "organize the political power of the proletariat" to the accomplishment of his ends.

It may be interesting to set forth what he calls "a practical political programme," and of which he says it "neither includes any reactionary measure nor any demand which is impracticable or trivial":

Adult suffrage (one man or woman, one vote).

Annual Parliaments.

Payment of members.

Payment of returning officers' expenses at elections.

Second ballot.

Abolition of all hereditary authority.

Free, secular, and industrial education.

Provision of a free meal a day in Board schools.

Limitation of labour day to eight hours.

Reform of the prison system.

Reform of the workhouse system.

Granting of Government contracts to trades union firms.

Extension of the Factory Acts, Mines Regulation Acts, and Employers' Liability Acts.

Extension of the principle of graduated income-tax.

Reduction of period during which debts are legally recoverable.

Protection of property to the extent of £30 from debt.

Nationalization of railway system, of royalties on minerals, and of national property now devoted to the Established Church.

Municipalization and nationalization of land.

Erection by local authorities of workmen's dwellings.

Vesting control of liquor traffic in the hands of the community.

Of course we have not the space, nor indeed have we the inclination, to discuss a political programme of this far-reaching character in the pages of *THE CHURCHMAN*; but it is referred to here in order to show that whilst many of the proposals are revolutionary in the extreme, there are others which are only the expansion and extension of laws already standing upon the statute-book, and which many persons who are by no means inclined to revolutionary measures would find no great difficulty in accepting. And it is important to notice this fact, because it reminds us that there is some common ground upon which we can all act in concert with those who call themselves Socialists. The truth is that Socialism cannot claim any monopoly of good intentions or of active service in the improvement of the condition of the poor.

Indeed, in a very real sense, all government is Socialistic. For it is the recognised function of the State to interfere with the operation of what may be regarded as natural laws, in order to protect the weak and defend them from the oppression of the strong; to redress the results of the natural inequalities between man and man for the benefit of the whole community. Take the Poor Law as an illustration. In it is recognised and asserted the duty of the community to provide for the helpless, and the fundamental duty of the Guardians and their officers is to see that no one is allowed to starve. The asylums for the sick and the insane, the district schools for the children, the casual wards for the homeless wanderers, are all comparatively modern outgrowths from the same principle—that the strength and power of the whole community must be put forth in order to relieve the wants of the weak and the helpless.

Look again at the Education Acts. For a long time it was

thought to be preposterous for the State to undertake any part of the duty which belongs to the individual parent, and so weaken the sense of parental responsibility; but there are few persons now who would venture to express any doubt as to the wisdom and prudence of the provision which the State has made in this behalf; and there are many who would regard with the utmost complacency any further advances in the same direction.

The tendency of all modern legislation testifies to the general recognition of this same principle. It may be true, indeed, that the progress of legislation in these days has become painfully slow, and many who do not call themselves Socialists would hail with extreme satisfaction a more rapid advance. But the Factory Acts, and the Truck Act, and the Employers' Liability Act, and the Mines Regulation Act, and the Irish Land Acts, and the Sanitary Acts, and a hundred others, are witness to the desire of the community to put forth its powers to protect those who are unable by their own individual efforts to defend themselves from oppression and wrong.

Then, again, we may fairly claim that philanthropy is Socialistic, or, at any rate, has a Socialistic aim. For no one would dispute that the one aim of the philanthropist is to seek out and relieve the necessities of the poor. And these are days in which we pride ourselves upon the extent and the completeness of our philanthropic efforts. Charity has become a profession; it is organized and directed by trained experts; it has its laws and its literature; while there is scarcely any form of evil, physical or social, which has not a society appointed in order to meet it. Look at our orphanages and our schools, our asylums and our hospitals, our benevolent societies, our public gardens, our People's Palace, and a multitude of similar efforts. Are they not all evidences of a desire on the part of the rich and the strong to make the burdens of the poor more tolerable, and the conditions of their life more easy? And is not this the very same end which the Socialist has in view?

But surely we may go even further than this, and assert the claim of Christianity to be the highest and noblest source from which the efforts of the statesman, and the philanthropist, and the Christian, naturally and necessarily spring. The spirit of self-denial for the sake of others is the very spirit of Christianity and of Christ. To quote once more the Report of the Lambeth Conference Committee:

The Church is bound, following the teaching of her Master, to aid every wise endeavour which has for its object the material and moral welfare of the poor. Her Master taught her that all men are brethren, not because they share the same blood, but because they have a common



heavenly Father. He further taught her, that if any members of this spiritual family were greater, richer, or better than the rest, they were bound to use their special means or ability in the service of the whole. "He that is greatest among you," He said, "shall be your servant," and that for a special reason, because each disciple was bound to imitate his Divine Master, "Who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."

It can hardly be disputed that the New Testament contains the most earnest and forcible appeals to unselfishness and self-sacrifice for the good of others, and that these appeals gain their motives and their strength from the blessed example of the Redeemer's life on earth: "He pleased not Himself." "He went about doing good." "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me." "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ." "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." But it is needless to quote further. The very text and structure of the New Testament must be altered before there could be taken out of it the pervading spirit of unselfish love and sacrifice.

And to turn to the other side, where will there be found denunciations of selfishness, and avarice, and extortion, and oppression, so stern, so emphatic, so vigorous, and so severe, as those which are contained within the pages of the Word of God?—"The spoil of the poor is in your houses. What mean ye that ye beat My people to pieces to grind the faces of the poor?" Again. It is of deeds of mercy and charity done to the brethren for the Master's sake that He says: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these My brethren, ye have done it unto *Me*." And we may certainly claim that Christianity—*i.e.*, the love of Christ and the recognition of our brotherhood in Him—has ever been the strongest motive to urge men to deeds of heroic self-sacrifice for the sake of their fellow-men. Upon the glorious muster-roll of those whose names are held in highest honour by their fellow-men for noble deeds of devotion, of philanthropy, of heroism, will be found inscribed those who would have pointed to Jesus of Nazareth as their example, their motive, and their strength, who would say with St. Peter, "Why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our own power and holiness we had done this work?" and who would attribute, as the Apostle did, to the name and power of Jesus the results of all their efforts.

From these considerations it appears that the work to be done in redressing the evils of society, and relieving the burdens of the poor, is a work which belongs to the statesman, the philanthropist, the Christian, as well as Socialist. All may not work according to the same plans, but all are

pursuing the same ends, and this fact would lead us to hope and to expect that there would be mutual harmony and confidence. But instead, as the Lambeth Conference says, "mutual suspicion and the imputation of selfish and unworthy motives, keep apart those who have, in fact, a common aim." The Christian is inclined to regard the Socialist as if he were of necessity the teacher of anarchy and revolution, whilst the Socialist is too apt to toss aside with contemptuous scorn and pity the efforts of all who cannot work in precisely the same groove with himself.

The charity of the rich is regarded as if it were a salve to their conscience, or a concession extorted by their fears, and "we don't want charity" is the ready cry of men who would find it difficult in time of trouble to get on without it. Philanthropy, they say, does not meet the case; it has been tried for centuries, and it has failed. Let it stand aside while we pursue our ends by other means.

And religion is spoken of in very much the same strain. Christianity has been for eighteen centuries doing its utmost in these directions. It has preached the gospel of unselfishness, and of consideration for the poor; but what is the result to-day—here, in a Christian country, in which, if anywhere, it might be expected that the principles and sentiments of Christianity would abound? What do we see around us? Is oppression and robbery and wrong banished from amongst us? Language even stronger than this, indeed, is not seldom heard, and virulent attacks are made upon religion on the ground that it has so greatly neglected its duty in this direction. "It is of no use to go on in the same old way; we must get help from other sources, and put forth our political strength, in order to force attention to our demands."

It would be well worth some pains and trouble to collect from the Bible the teaching of religion upon the subject of our duty to the poor. It would be a good thing to show the Socialists that religion has no sympathy with, no encouragement nor excuses for, oppression or robbery or wrong.

It is true, of course, that the teaching of Christianity does not exercise so wide or so large an influence as we could desire. Even in this Christian country there are many persons who exclude themselves altogether from its control, and it can hardly be expected that such persons will in any way recognise the authority of a system which they repudiate. And the Socialist is quite right in seeking to accomplish by means of legislation those objects for which Christianity has not succeeded in securing general acceptance and recognition.

Take as an illustration the question of almsgiving. It is a recognised Christian duty; but anyone who has tried to raise

a sum of money, even in a wealthy parish, knows how many there are who evade or boldly repudiate the obligation. Suppose that, instead of relying upon a rate for the relief of the poor, we were to try to raise the same amount by voluntary contributions under the influence of Christianity; and what would be the result?

But not only does Christianity fail to influence those who separate themselves from its teaching. We are bound to acknowledge that the life and conduct of those who profess and call themselves Christians is not always such as to afford the best illustration of the power of the Gospel in the heart.

It is very sad to have to confess it, but it is the meanness and the self-indulgence and the cold inconsideration of many amongst the rich and the comfortable and the well-to-do Christians which bring religion into discredit amongst the poor, and lend emphasis and force to the most extravagant demands of extreme Socialists.

It would be out of place in these pages to point to individual instances, but no one can move in the world and be ignorant of them; and it is these instances which call forth irritation and anger and bitterness. The wealthy landlord, deriving a large income from his property, from which he is careful to exact the uttermost farthing, and who cannot afford to spare anything from his self-indulgence in order to meet the claims of benevolence and philanthropy, but consistently ignores or refuses every appeal for help; "Dives, indifferent though Lazarus is laid at his gate full of sores;" the manufacturer who, in eager haste to be rich and to distance all his competitors in the race for custom, cuts down the wages of his workmen to the very lowest point; the rich lady who orders out her carriage with coachman and footman, and drives half across the town that she may purchase some needed article at the cheapest shop, and who never gives a thought to consider whether the few shillings which she takes such pains to save are wrung out of the misery and torture of some miserable workwoman in an obscure and remote court; the customer—whether an individual or a Government department, or even a religious or charitable society—which puts work out to tender, and invariably accepts the lowest, without considering at all whether at such rates the workpeople can be properly paid,—all these are instances of the way in which a thoughtless want of consideration may sow the seed of incalculable wrong, and become the best ally of Socialism or Communism or Anarchy.

We want to recognise more clearly, and set forth more fully, in our conduct as well as in our teaching, the self-denying principles of Christianity; we want a truer conception

of the duties of stewardship ; we want a spirit which does not satisfy itself with mere empty words and phrases, but which is willing to give personal service to meet the ever present claims of this great brotherhood of our humanity: the exhibition of a practical Christianity which acts as well as talks, would go far to repair the mischief already done, and to remove some of the causes of a growing discontent.

Can nothing be done? Are we for ever to sit still with folded hands, uttering dreary and empty platitudes about "buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest market," or about the "sin of charity," or about the "inexorable laws of supply and demand?"

Take the question of the competition, so fierce, so eager, and so cruel. Is it honest to compel a worker, because he is poor and his lot is in our hands, to produce his work at a rate so low that he cannot possibly procure the means of living? Is it right to buy always in the cheapest market, which means, in other words, to compel employers to produce at the lowest possible rate? The report of the Lambeth Conference touches on this question, and says: "Competition is not injurious in itself; it only becomes so when unrestricted, when it takes no counsel of the dictates of brotherly love. The committee do not doubt that Government can do much to protect the class known as proletarians from the evil effects of unchecked competition." Of course it can, and this is what the Socialists are striving for; but Christianity and humanity may do something, too. We cannot afford to wait for the slow action of the legislature.

If we want workers to be well paid, we must be willing to deal only with those employers who are known to pay their workmen well, even if we seem to get a little less for our money. There are many persons, no doubt, who would gladly make this arrangement, if by this means their consciences could be satisfied, and if they could be assured that they were doing good to the working classes. How is this fact to be ascertained? The forming of a Consumers' League has been suggested, the object of which league would be, first, to ascertain the names of those employers who were generally recognised in their own trade circles as good pay-masters, and to put their names upon an approved list. There might be difficulties in this, probably there would be, but none that could not be surmounted. Then the league would have to procure a sufficient number of persons who would undertake to consult this list before making a purchase, and who would, if possible, deal only with persons whose names were contained in it. If this matter could be generally taken up, a great encouragement would be given to those employers who are

dealing fairly by their workpeople, and trading firms would find it to be to their advantage to have their names entered upon the list. Something ought to be done to root out the old superstition that it is absolutely necessary to buy where things are cheapest. Why should the Government say by one of its officers "that it was bound to accept the lowest tender which it thought was offered by a solvent and responsible contractor"? Was there not an obligation preceding this, and more important still—to see that the contractors to whom the tenders were sent were such as did not cheapen their productions out of people's lives?

To let things alone, and rely upon the inevitable working of inexorable laws, is easy, no doubt; but it is not right or wise, and in these days it is not safe. Population is increasing, trade shows hardly any signs of recovery, agriculture seems almost to be given up as past revival, the strain increases on every side, discontent is growing, and if no kind of remedy is forthcoming the prospect is by no means cheerful.

It is no time to sit down in hopelessness and despair; it is no time to congratulate ourselves that the trouble does not touch ourselves; but surely the time is come when every man, and certainly every Christian man, ought seriously to consider what effort he himself can make, and how far he may be able, by personal service and self-denying energy, to assist others, by whatever name they may be called, who are doing their utmost to lessen the inequalities of society and to bear the burdens of the poor.

JOHN F. KITTO.

---

## Reviews.

---

*George Maxwell Gordon: the Pilgrim Missionary of the Punjab.* A History of his Life and Work, 1839-1880. By the Rev. A. LEWIS, C.M.S. Missionary in the Punjab. Seeley.

THIS is a book without much literary pretension. It might, one would think, have been possible for one with the local and personal knowledge of the author, to have enabled the general reader to have more vividly conceived the life of the "Christian fakir," who refused a bishopric that he might tramp through the tribes of Northern India. As it is, the author has done little more than edit the journals and descriptive letters of Gordon. He leaves much for us to read between the lines. Notwithstanding, the book is one of unusual interest. It should be in the hands of every intending missionary. The reading of it cannot fail to raise every worker's conception of his duty. Through every line of the simple and modestly written journal breathes the influence of the life of a truly great, because a truly good man. His