With the foam of the berry-red wine I will bathe and brighten my laughter. The badge of the cavil and staid I will tear into shreds for the nonce. I will take the holy vow to be worthless, to be drunken and go to the dogs.”

AN APPEAL TO THE BETTER KNOWLEDGE OF DR. W. B. SMITH.

BY A. KAMPMEIER.

Dr. Smith appeals (Open Court, 1913, p. 699) to “the open-minded reader to consider carefully” the accounts from Hegesippus and Clemens Alexandrinus in Eusebius on James the Just. All “open-minded” readers, on the contrary, will appeal to the better knowledge of Dr. Smith, that the churchfathers in the interest of the perpetual virginity of Mary, and to do away with the hard facts of the Synoptics, that she had other children besides Jesus, quite early declared the brothers of Jesus to be either sons of Joseph by a former marriage or cousins of Jesus, sons of Alphaeus and a sister of Mary, the latter on the basis of a very equivocal passage (xix. 25) of the Fourth Gospel. For while Matthew and Mark represent the three women, Mary the Magdalene, Mary the mother of James the Less, and Salome, as viewing the crucified Jesus from afar, the unhistorical speculative Fourth Gospel in flat contradiction says: “There stood beside the cross Mary the mother of Jesus and her sister, Mary the wife of Clopas (i. e., Alphaeus) and Mary the Magdalene.” This passage has been understood in two ways, the one assuming that four women are meant, the other that “Mary wife of Clopas” stands in apposition to “her sister.” The early Syrian translation of the New Testament already understood it in the first way.

Even if the churchfathers with their dogmatical and otherwise very doubtful basis were right in their assumptions, they would not help Dr. Smith a whit unless he insists that the assumed half-brothers and cousins of Jesus must be taken symbolically also in this case, spiritual half-brothers, what that may mean, and spiritual cousins. If Dr. Smith is right here also, let us be thankful that after an ignorance lasting from the composition of the New Testament in regard to the brothers, whether half-brothers or cousins of Jesus, till up to our times, we have finally come to the right insight through the labors of Dr. Smith.

LAOTOPATI’S SACRIFICE.

[Note.—The following version of a legend from the “Classic of the Thousand Buddhas” is offered as a slight but interesting contribution to the story of Chinese Buddhism. The thousand kings, profiting by the lesson of Laotopati, repented of their want of faith, and after due penance performed for a kalpa or two were promised Buddhahood in their turn. The account is of course legendary, and in view of the modern rehabilitation of Buddhism, involving the recognition therein of much that is fine, much that is wholesome and logical and truly spiritual, it may as well be recorded that the story is not accepted as other than imaginative either by The Open Court or by the translator. The latter must however confess to a good deal of appreciation for the wonderful idea of self-sacrifice that runs through the poem, finding expression in a great act, which, if it arouses horror in many, will not fail to awaken in some minds a measure of admiration. The concept in itself