

Many waters cannot quench love,
Neither can the floods drown it;
If a man would give all the substance of his house
for love,
He would utterly be contemned.

This is the author's theme. He sets it forth with wonderful skill. He depicts the faithfulness of a pledged love amid all the blandishments of Solomon's harem. With a boldness unexampled he imagines a village maiden of marvellous beauty who dares to repulse the king."

He thinks that neither the allegorical nor the typical theory was in the mind of the author. While recognizing the analogy between the love of husband and wife and the love of the soul to Christ, he thinks that this was not in the thought of the author, and that in general we shall "do better to win from its words only the natural, simple, and healthful lesson of the beauty, the rightfulness of a pure human affection, a love that was as truly instituted by God as any law of our being, and that it is as sacred as any religious emotion."

President Merrill identifies the daughters of Jerusalem with the members of Solomon's harem. He gives a new arrangement of the poem, which will perhaps satisfy in all its details nobody except its author. In saying this we do not mean to reflect upon the literary skill of our author, for the same statement could be made concerning every other arrangement of the poem by previous critics and commentators. Truly the Song of Songs is "the enigma of the Old Testament."

III. CHURCH HISTORY.

What is History? Five Lectures on the Modern Science of History.

By Karl Lamprecht, Ph. D., L.L.D., Professor of History in the University of Leipzig. Translated from the German by E. A. Andrews. Pp. 3-227. The Macmillan Co. 1905.

As is well known, Professor Lamprecht is the founder

and head of a new and peculiar school of historical science which seeks to study and present historical facts and development from the standpoint of psychological causes found in the individual and in society. History is applied, or practical psychology, a study of the human spirit rather than human actions, "primarily a socio-psychological science." Actions must be studied of course but only as illustrative and confirmatory material. According to Prof. Lamprecht, this is modern historical science, the only modern historical science. His theories and work have been strongly opposed by what he calls the "political historians," led by the historians of the University of Berlin. The controversy has been sharp, not to say bitter.

An invitation to speak before the Congress of Arts and Sciences in St. Louis last fall afforded the distinguished professor an excellent opportunity to explain and defend his views. This he did in an address on "Historical Development and Present Character of the Science of History." This was followed by other addresses intended to illustrate his theories from German history and delivered on the occasion of the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of Columbia University of New York. It is explained in the preface that "the author felt that in his work on the 'History of Germany' he had carried his investigations far enough into the different culture-epochs to justify him in formulating and presenting to the public his ideas as to the content of history and the true method of writing it." "Another incentive was given in the literature of recent psychological science, particularly in Von Lipp's 'Outlines of Psychology,' a book which seemed to invite a further application of the laws of psychology to the science of history."

The author has been working at German history for twenty years along these lines, and thoroughly believes that his method is the only one that is likely to survive in the future. All former historical writing has been largely

surface work; he penetrates to the heart of things. These lectures are interesting and important as an attempt on the part of the author to set forth and illustrate his views of history. But in my opinion they will not recommend his method. It is too subjective and arbitrary, too abstruse and complex. Psychological phenomena are too elusive and uncertain to form the basis of historical science. We shall be compelled to content ourselves largely with the account of accomplished facts. At the same time every historian knows that accomplished facts are a very small part of real life, and Lamprecht is doing a great work in seeking to lead historians away from politics as the only human activity worth consideration and back to the life of the people in its entirety, its reality. It should be the historian's aim as far as possible to reproduce the inner and outer life of the people as it actually was. This is a most difficult task and Lamprecht's subjective method is likely to err as far on one side as the older historians erred on the other.

These lectures are most difficult reading. It is a good example of a very bad tendency to transfer German compounds into English. Such compounds, while perfectly intelligible in German, are repugnant to the genius of the English language and ought not to be tolerated. If a man can not translate a German book into intelligible English he ought not to undertake it; if he can translate it, he ought to be ashamed to present such work to the English reading public. It reminds me of Prof. Harnack's remark concerning a German translation of the fragments of Celsus found in Origen. "Gentlemen," he said, "if you will compare the original Greek you can probably get a little sense out of the translation." Such a remark would doubtless be somewhat too severe on this translation, but it is a fair specimen of some very loose work that is being inflicted on a long suffering public.

W. J. MCGLOTHLIN.