dential series, but occur in such critical and important points in the series as to prevent the connection of the knowledge we possess into a systematic whole. Mr. Simcox is not discouraged by this unpromising condition of the evidence from making the attempt to advance as far as he can. He believes that the crumbs of knowledge we now possess are worth much, perhaps more than has been generally supposed, and that it is clearly worth while for a scholar to give them such interpretation as they will bear. He opens with a general discussion of what progress has been made toward a solution of the problem of a common origin of the civilization of the race. The critical point he finds to be the connection of the Babylonian and Egyptian civilization with the Turanian Chinese, and advances reasons for believing that this result tho still conjectural, has been made to appear possible in some common, older, proto-original of both races, yet to be identified in the undeciphered or undiscovered remains of antiquity. We quote his summary statement of his point (p. 33, Vol. I):

"Leaving all open questions of affinity to be decided by the learning of the future, we are certainly in a position to affirm that before the so-called Aryans and Semites of history took the foremost place in the Old World, probably before they were clearly differentiated, the first civilized States in the world were *founded by men of some other race—humane, industrious, non-political, but with a moral philosophy for the use of princes*; liberal in the treatment of women, with the most unchanging customs of any people that ever lived, and with the most enduring records of their life. By analogy we should expect all these States to belong to the same ethnological family; but if the identification cannot be maintained, the similarity of temperament and institutions which suggested it only becomes the more noteworthy; as if the social order formulated by Chinese and Egyptian rulers were not merely one natural view, but in fact the first or only one that presents itself to a primitive community as either natural or possible."

The body of the work in the two volumes falls into four distinct Books, in which the author, taking his suggestion from Aristotle, or at least falling back for support on the Aristotelian definition of possession or property as an instrument for maintaining life, proposes to trace ownership as far as possible through the primitive civilizations on the general assumption that this is the key to the history, and that the "character of religious beliefs, the state of art or science, and the course of political and social development, are all reflected in proprietary institutions." Acting on this view of the subject, we have in the first of the two volumes before us a discussion of "Ownership in Egypt," "Ancient Babylonia," "From Massalia to Malabar," and a second volume entirely (apart from the Appendices) occupied with the discussion of "Ownership in China." The author has an aim in all this review, which is not wholly antiquarian but very largely sociological, as we find in the closing chapter of "Conclusions" in the second volume, where the methods adopted in China, for example, to meet some of the most serious difficulties of modern social life are brought forward for study if not for imitation, as, for example, the Chinese method of preventing the development of excessive inequalities of ownership and the concentration of property into the power and possession of a small number of great agglomerators. He brings forward the history of China on this point as a reply to the doctrines which are taught in Europe and in this country, and as showing that "the tendency of the natural inequality of men to reflect and exaggerate itself in the inequality of their possessions can be controlled by legislation." So, too, as to the formation of a criminal class, Mr. Simcox believes that the Chinese have something to teach us in the way of modifying the circumstances which tempt men into crime. He succeeds in drawing from the history of China some wisdom on this subject which tends strongly to re-enforce the best opinion of our own writers on the same subject. He shows, for example, that the whole aim and interest of the Chinese system is directed to prevent the formation of a criminal class, while in our system we permit our social failures to sink into a social residuum where they propagate. Whatever may be true of the Chinese system the statement is undoubtedly true as to the effect of the methods commonly practiced in this country. It is not so clear, however, that Chinese methods have been more successful, and it is very certain that they would do no good here. Methods for reaching the evil, which lie wholly within our reach, have been suggested, and have already been set in operation, with far more promising results than could be expected from any of the methods drawn by Mr. Simcox from his study of Chinese examples.

Primitive Civilizations; or, Outlines of the History of Ownership in Archaic Communities. By E. J. Simcox, Author of "Natural Law," etc. (Macmillan & Co., New York. Two vols., crown 8vo, $10.00.) The author of these ingenious and scholarly volumes frankly admits that he has a task before him whose results, in the present condition of knowledge, can be only provisional. Recent progress in the accumulation of prehistoric material and the extension of our knowledge of prehistoric times has been enormous; but gaps still lie open in it which not only break the continuity of the evidence and interrupt the evi-

The Fleming H. Revell Company (New York, Chicago, Toronto, 50 cents) publish *The Church and the Kingdom*, by Washington Gladden, a handy little volume of two very readable and useful addresses, one delivered before the Congregational Association of Ohio, and the other before the graduating class of Oberlin Theological Seminary. In the Preface he disclaims any controversial purpose in the addresses, but admits that they are issued as "an effort . . . to supplement and complete statements made by men with whose purposes" he is in deep sympathy. We understand this remark to refer to certain extravagances, as we should describe them, in the utterances of Lyman Abbott and Professor Herron, who, among other things, have committed themselves to the proposition in the words of the former, that "*to love one's neighbor as one's self is not the Christian law of love; it is the Jewish law of justice*," the Christian law being "that ye love one another as I have loved you," which is interpreted as meaning, more than one loves himself. Against this proposition, as put forth by Professor Herron, we have already published our protest. Dr. Gladden, in the second of these discourses, comments from his own point of view on this propoition with sense and ability, showing for the first point that the example of Christ in the humiliation (the *kenosis*) cannot be interpreted in this way. He says:

"He loved them—their manhood, their spiritual integrity—so much that he was willing to deny himself the blessedness of the Father's house, to suffer many things, even to give his life, that they might enter into the rights of the sons of God; but he did not love their spiritual integrity more than he loved his own; if he had he would have had nothing to give them."

He shows next, in many examples, the essentially unethical character of this sentimental modern altruism which he calls a "species of moral insanity." He points to the undeniable fact that parental discipline and influence is suffering from an excessive parental altruism which humiliates, degrades the parent, and weakens his authority. Parents have no right to love their children more than they love themselves, and whenever they dispossess themselves in this way they lower their ability to discharge the parental office. Turning to the social and industrial sphere, he shows how this new modification of the law of Christ works out there into immorality. The passage is so strong and pertinent that we quote it in full (p. 71):

"The fact is that we have now on our hands a very large number of people—a class which is constantly increasing—who consider themselves entitled to receive charity, and who assume that it is the Christian duty of the rest of the community to bestow charity upon them. They are perfectly willing to sit in idleness while others work and save to supply them with the necessaries of life. They have an idea that this is what Christianity means—that other people should keep them from suffering, no matter how lazy or how wasteful they may be. There are people with whom I come in contact, who evidently propose to eat their bread in the sweat of my brow; who expect me to work that they may rest and to save that they may spend. If I hesitate, they are ready to cry out, 'Where is your Christianity?' Now it is evident that if this kind of sentiment has gained currency among the receivers of charity, it must be largely the fault of the bestowers of charity If the giving had not been done in wrong ways, such degradation would not have been suffered in the receiving."

We wholly agree with Dr. Gladden in his conclusion that the one remedy for all these evils is the rigid adherence to the law of Christ which bids us love our neighbors as ourselves. The perfect law of social morality is given here in terms which cannot be changed without dropping into social injustice and social confusion the moment its terms are changed by lowering them on the one hand or attempting to raise them on the other. We do not understand Dr. Gladden as saying that this law as it stands is in any just sense an appeal to self-interest, tho he does say that "as it has been popularly represented," it does recognize self interest as the ruling motive. This is a very different proposition, as to which we say nothing here, except that it requires many exceptions. Dr. Gladden has probably exposed himself to some misapprehension in his remark (p. 51):

"One of the ten commandments was . . . distinctly repealed by our Lord; and others were so modified by his interpretation that they cannot, as they stand, be considered as binding upon us."

Granting that Christ did *repeal* the fourth commandment, tho we should prefer, on all accounts, Dr. Gladden's alternate phrase and use the word *modify*, we are unable to make out what he means when he adds: "others were so modified by his interpretation that they cannot, as they stand, be considered as binding upon us." Professor Herron's rhetorical extravagance on *property might seem* to call for some modification of the commandment: Thou shalt not steal; but Dr. Gladden is strong on the doctrine of property and individual rights. The position so fully and admirably defined above is carried out in the equally important and interesting address which opens the book, on "The Church and the Kingdom." Dr. Gladden again declares that the law of the kingdom as defined above

"reverses the current maxims and practices of exchange, and expects us, in all our bargains and dealings, instead of getting as much as we can, to give as much as we can. *As much as we can*, I say, in justice to ourselves and to those who are dependent on us. *As much as we can* without weakening or pauperizing those with whom we deal. A proper self-regard is not abolished; but the whole attitude of the mind is changed; and life, instead of being a discipline of greed, becomes an opportunity of ministry."

This doctrine can hardly be preached too much or too earnestly as the true and final principle which is to be applied to the prudence, the economics and the stern realities of trade to transform them into beneficent social agencies.