

guage that developed from the Saxon. Saxon schools and education in general were neglected in Britain under the influence of the Norman-French army of William the Conqueror, while in Germany the old Low German language, spoken all over northern Germany, yielded at the time of the Reformation to High German, the language of Luther's Bible translation, which thus became the language spoken all over Germany.

Thus two changes, one in England and one in Germany, gave a different appearance to a language which prior to 1066 was still practically the same in Britain and on the continent, being a Low German dialect akin to the Dutch language of the Netherlands. There are no other two nations in the world which are so closely kin to each other as the North Germans and the English, and it is really because they are so similar that they are at present at war. They are both natural leaders and have come into conflict because two cannot be leader at the same time. Whether Mr. Shaw is right in prognosticating a combination is another question, and we quote him here because his remarks are worthy of note.

The question, as he also says, has a religious background, for England and northern Germany are typically Protestant, while the nations whom they have subjected (I refer here mainly to the Irish and Poles) are predominantly Catholic, and it would be easy to find parallels between Bismarck's Polish policy and the English policy toward Ireland. Though the former is not as severe as the latter they show points of contact, and we will say that while England has absolutely exterminated and replaced the Irish language the Germans have not succeeded in extinguishing Polish, which is still a great power and seems to look forward at present to a revival under a German protectorate.

MISCELLANEOUS.

WERE THE EARLY CHRISTIANS PACIFISTS?

BY A. KAMPMEIER.

During the present European war Christianity has often been spoken of as having broken down, or as not having been lived up to, else the war would have been prevented. This view, as it seems to me, is based upon an ignorance of the political beliefs, for there were such, of early Christianity. It is true that Christianity entered the world with very lofty moral teachings, the highest, we might say. It taught the purest morality, summed up in the words, Love thy neighbor as thyself; it taught non-resistance, non-revenge, even the love of one's enemies; it made no distinction of race or social position: "There is

neither Jew nor Greek," Gal. iii. 28; to which Col. iii. 11, adds, "neither barbarian nor Scythian," "neither bond nor free." But in spite of all this, Christianity did not believe that a perfect state of mankind, termed the "kingdom of God," would come about without force and power. Even in its own narrow circle of a religious brotherhood it could not do without force, without a rigid discipline, this discipline in the first stages of Christianity consisting perhaps less in the exclusion of members for dogmatic reasons than on moral grounds, for in the matter of dogma there were many divergent opinions till a hard and fast dogma had developed. But in regard to a perfect state of mankind, "the kingdom of God," they were firmly convinced that it would not come about without a forceful overthrowing of all evil, injustice and unrighteousness, and the perpetrators thereof. They were so firmly convinced of an all pervading wickedness, and an influence of spiritual powers of evil, and the subjection of mankind to them, that the complete destruction of all this they believed could only come about by the overwhelming power of God. Only the few would be saved who submitted voluntarily to God's call to penitence and offer of salvation; the majority would be destroyed by the power of God because of not submitting to him. The coming of the kingdom of God with power to destroy the wicked, the destruction of the empires of this world under the influence of the Evil Spirit, the day of judgment, and the supersession of a new and perfect world-order, these things were to the first Christians nothing shadowy, but a vivid reality handed over to them by the Jews,—the Persian doctrine of the final victory of the Spirit of light and goodness over that of darkness and evil, the Stoic doctrine of a final world conflagration. The views of the early Christians concerning these things may have been crude and not in accord with modern knowledge, but they expressed this truth, that a more perfect state of mankind cannot be brought about except by a forceful struggle in which a higher, mightier principle is victorious over a weaker opposing one, that the two are mutually incompatible and that there is no compromise between them.

Early Christianity cannot in the least be absolved from the belief in force and might overthrowing its adversary. It did not claim to meddle in the political questions of the day; it was not politically revolutionary; it accepted slavery and all social inequalities; it taught obedience to the authorities of the state; but we must not think that it was entirely indifferent to world politics. From the Jews Christianity took over the view that the Roman Empire, like all preceding empires, was under the influence of the Evil Spirit and not based on the spirit of God, and therefore doomed to destruction as the last empire. Of course God's governing hand over world empires was not denied entirely, else Paul could not have said: "There is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordained of God"; but in the main the empires of the world were considered as being under the influence of the Evil Spirit and based on injustice and wrong. The view that the Roman Empire was doomed to destruction in the near future stands out clearly in the New Testament in spite of all veiled language, as plainer language would have stamped the early Christians as political revolutionaries and a dangerous element in the Roman state. The idea seems to have been held by the early Christians that the Roman empire was to become weakened by internal dissensions and revolutions, and that out of this anarchy the consummation of evil, the Antichrist, was to come, who in turn would be utterly destroyed by

God (compare such passages as Luke xxi. 9-10, and Revelation xvii. 16, and the phrase "that which restraineth," i. e., the Antichrist, 2 Thess. ii. 6, explained by commentators most reasonably as referring to the yet intact state of the Roman government).

The early Christians in fact were more absorbed in world politics than is generally assumed. But, feeling their inability to bring about a change in the unjust and evil conditions themselves, they fell back on the belief in a change brought about by God. They preached non-resistance and non-revenge, as they saw very clearly that if everybody would right himself this would mean every one turning against every one else; still they held to the firm belief that every wrong would find its retribution, that individuals, whole peoples, states and empires would have their day of judgment.

There is no doubt about it, the earliest Christians believed that a perfect state of mankind could not be brought about but by a principle, a principle possessed of the necessary might to bring it about. Thus they were no pacifists. Modern man of course does not believe such a change will come about through a miraculous supernatural force, as the early Christians believed. Nevertheless there was a truth underlying these early views. Steps toward a more perfect state of mankind have always been brought about by a will that had the necessary force behind it to bring them about. History is a continued series of struggles in which the forces opposing a more perfect state are overthrown by a higher will backed by the necessary power to execute it. It is a series of judgment days and catastrophes dealing out retribution, in which everything seems to go to ruin, but only to awaken new life and progress out of the chaos. The only difference between the ancient Christian view and the modern regarding the attainment of a more perfect state in mankind is this, that the former looked upon this process as coming about from without this world by a higher force and power in a supernatural way, while the latter conceives this process as coming about within the world through the victory of a higher force proceeding in a historical way through the instrumentality of man himself and by gradual steps.

Applied to the present world conflagration, the future will show which of the contending forces is the higher and stronger, and what new life and progress will arise from the general ruin.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTES.

HOLLAND'S INFLUENCE ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. By *T. de Vries, J. D.* Chicago: C. Grentzbech, 1916. Pages, 398.

Given two countries, both famous in history, and place them side by side or at least easily accessible one to the other for a thousand years of time, and the result is sure to be interesting and fascinating. The mutual reaction and various intercourse between such countries prove the essential unity of the human race, for they show that all history is connected, that all language is a development, and that all literature is a growth from previous conditions. Especially is this true of such related countries as England and Holland, both of Teutonic stock and both having a civilization much alike, the one country however in its general development antedating the other by several centuries and so having a decided influence on its successor's language and literature. It has been the province of Dr. T. de Vries, a graduate from the Free Uni-