

THE Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. XL

OCTOBER—NOVEMBER, 1899.

No. 1.

I. Literary.

ICONOCLASTS.

BY J. W. LAPSLEY.

“YE shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down their groves.” This was the divine command to Israel as they invaded Canaan. Policy as well as reverence for the divine authority demanded strict obedience to the command. But it was not so obeyed as to put out of sight the temptations to idolatry; and again and again Israel sinned after the example of the heathen they had supplanted, became image worshippers, and suffered grievously for their apostasy. Hence image breaking was accounted a sign of devotion to Jehovah. Jehu said, “Come with me and see my zeal for the Lord,” and he went and broke down the image of Baal, and the house of Baal, burnt his images with fire, and slew his priests and votaries with the sword. But this was as far as Jehu’s zeal for the Lord carried him. While he had no real devotion to God, and, in fact, renewed the idol worship at Dan and Bethel, he made the divine commission an excuse for pursuing with lavish bloodshed his own schemes of worldly ambition. And there have been others besides Jehu in other ages who have trod in his steps. “Mohammed,” says Dr. Schaff, “started as a religious reformer fired by the great idea of the unity of the Godhead, and filled with horror of idolatry.” And he and his Caliphs, long after they became world-wide conquerors, full of ambition and given up to every cruel and sensual passion, continued to proclaim, “There is but one God,” and continued to the last their warfare on image and image worship. They made their professed zeal for the one God a cover and ex-

bed, but, happily for the reader, no trace of his suffering appears here."

We cannot repress our sorrow that a man so gifted in characterization should have passed away leaving only one book. David Harum is one of the most original, freshest and breeziest characters we have ever met with in literature. He has feeling and romance in his heart, too. The other personages who appear on these pages have each his distinctive merit; but they are relatively common-place. We tolerate them, are pleased with, or despise them moderately. With David it is quite otherwise.

However, David is totally unchristian. He is a heathen—the finest type of a heathen—who loves his friends with undying affection and hates his enemies remorselessly. He had made his way from a canal boy through various businesses, particularly the buying and selling of horses, to being a banker. He still loved to trade horses and to get the better of his neighbor in the bargain. He was readier to trade horses on Sunday than to go church. He was rough, superstitious, shrewd, suspicious of all strangers; but kind at heart, trusting his friends thoroughly, once his confidence was won, and ready to go all lengths for them. He was no Christian, no philanthropist of broad mind; but a stalwart heathen of the best type, ready to avenge himself at all costs, or to sacrifice himself utterly for his friends.

Seeing so much in him to admire, we are sorry that he was not made to love even his enemies.

The hero is spoiled in our eyes by his making love to one whom he thought was married. He had loved her when she was free; might have spoken, but did not speak. Later, he meets her when he understands that she is married, and tells her of how he *had felt and continued to feel toward her*. The girl was still unmarried; but she ought to have kicked him for daring to dishonor her by telling her of his love, as long as he thought she had no right to listen to such declarations.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

HUMAN IMMORTALITY—TWO SUPPOSED OBJECTIONS TO THE DOCTRINE.

By William James, Professor of Philosophy at Harvard University and Ingersoll Lecturer for 1898. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1898.

A few years ago Miss Caroline Haskell Ingersoll founded in Harvard University a lectureship on a plan somewhat similar to the Dudleian—one lecture to be delivered a year on the subject of "The Immortality of Man."

The first lecturer to be chosen on this foundation was Professor James; and the little book before us contains his lecture, together with some supplementary notes.

After taking, at least tentatively, as a postulate, the formula, "*Thought is a function of the brain*," he attempts to show, first, that it does not follow that "even though our soul's life may be, in literal strictness, the function of a brain that perishes, it is impossible that

the life may still continue when the brain is dead." He also attempts to show that the vast number of things that must be admitted to be immortal, if we ourselves be held to be immortal, is really no reason for denying our own immortality.

This book may be of some use about Harvard, as well among idealistic pantheists, materialists, agnostics, and those insane philosophers generally who trample under feet our primary cognitions. Nor is it without interest and a degree of instructiveness to men of common sense. Such men can take Professor James' materials for use in meeting these objections in their own way.

Professor James meets the first of these inferences by teaching that there are several sorts of functions, viz., functions of "transmission" as well as functions of "production." He admits that if brain produces thought, then thought ceases when brain dies. He asserts correctly that a fallacy of the materialist is in making all function that of production. In answer to the second objection, he illustrates nobly the fact that because we do not see why so many things should be immortal, if we are, is no reason for our denying that they and we are immortal. He shows that after all there may be fully as much justification for their immortality as for our own.

The greatest objection we have to the book is that the whole line of argumentation suits an idealistic pantheist better than any theist with whom we have acquaintance; that the writer appears to be too much under the control, nevertheless, of physiological psychology; that there is here a sort of undigested syncretism.

A robust theist may take the facts of the physiologist, the primary intuitions given by the mind on occasion of sensation, but not through sensation, the immanence of God in his created works, and knock these objections into pi more successfully, we think, than has been done in the work before us.

THOMAS C. JOHNSON.

Richmond, Va., September 26, 1899.

HUGH WYNNE. Free-Quaker, Sometimes Lieutenant-Colonel on the Staff of His Excellency, General Washington. *By S. Weir Mitchell, M. D., LL. D., Harvard and Edinburgh.* New York: The Century Co. 2 vols., 12mo. 1897.

This is admitted to be one of the greatest novels issued from the press during the year 1897. By some it has been declared "the greatest."

A very pleasing love story runs through the books from start to finish. The stalwart young Quaker, Hugh Wynne, loves Dorothea Peniston as another stalwart hero loved Lorna Doone. The men are not alike. There is no suggestion of imitation of Blackmore's character; but they have the same large primordial mass of manhood. They are men of the same inexhaustible resources. They, alike, love very attractive women, too; albeit for ourselves, we did not fall quite so deep in love with Dorothea as with Lorna Doone.

The picture given of the manners and character of the times gives