

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

open to the criticism of artists who have acquired a profounder knowledge than was attainable at that time. The lofty corridor, 130 feet long, is part of his work. He also made considerable improvements in the chapel, though its present beautiful condition belongs to a later date. He half rebuilt the episcopal residence at Addington, and restored the parish church there, which is described in an old guide-book shortly before his time as "extremely dirty and indecent." He also provided a water-supply for the village of Addington, and built the commodious schools. He lies buried under the chancel arch of the village church, his wife beside him. She was very rich, Mary Frances, daughter of John Belli, E.I.C.S. To her great fortune was owing the fact that, notwithstanding his munificence, he left £180,000. His wife was evidently anxious that his name should not be forgotten. She placed three different memorials to him in the church. It excites a smile to note that she placed a recumbent figure of him by Westmacott on an altar-tomb on the north side of the chancel, but then coming to the conclusion that it was lost in the little village, she had it transferred to Canterbury Cathedral, where it may now be seen on the north side of the sacarium. Howley bequeathed his library to his former chaplain, Benjamin Harrison, whom he had made Archdeacon of Canterbury. The Archdeacon, on his death, left it to the Cathedral library there, stipulating that a separate apartment should be provided for it under the designation of *Bibliotheca Howleiana*.

W. BENHAM.

ART. V.—JOHN HUSS.

MOST English men and women know little more of Huss than his name, as that of a reformer, and his tragic fate. No brilliant novelist has placed us among his audience or introduced us to his cell; no classic volumes issued from his pen to find their place on every shelf; no powerful nations waited for his word or followed him to victory. He was, indeed, far from being one of those who are described as born to greatness; but his lot was cast in days when Western Europe was waking to new ideas, of which he was among the first to catch a glimpse. The man himself stands forth worthy of all honour for his loyalty to the light he saw, and the pathos of his story has touched the hearts of men in later days when they have learnt how he died for believing in the light by which they lived.

His faithfulness to what he believed to be true has made

him prominent in Christian history, for faithfulness to truth was the new principle for which Christendom in his time was painfully, if unconsciously, longing. He was burnt because Christendom was reluctant to adopt the principle for which it yearned. As a herald of the new birth of religion in Europe he is, from our point of view, the foremost figure of his day.

John Huss comes before us first as a student at the University of Prague. Like so many of the clergy who have played famous parts before the world, he was a child of the people, sprung, as we are told, from poor but pious parents of the Bohemian village of Hussinec, from which he derived his name. He brought with him to the University a simplicity of character and a modesty of demeanour which he never lost. As we should expect from what we know of his features in later life, his mind was acute rather than comprehensive, reflective rather than passionate, and his speech clear and direct, and free from the elaborate elegance which found favour among speakers in his time. He has not the "orator's lips" of Savonarola, nor the rough forcefulness of Luther. His point of view, his way of looking at things, was that of the people—that of one of the country-folk rather than of the cultured, many-sided son of the populous city. He sought, that is to say, the broad truths which underlie the movements of life, and cared little for complex problems and fine distinctions. He was himself intensely in earnest, and, as is so often the case with such men, found it hard to believe that others were not as earnest as himself. To him the God of Truth and the living Christ were intensely real, and the life of man little or nothing worth apart from the knowledge of God and the power of the life of the Saviour. Endowed with such a mind and character, or perhaps we should rather say, with the elements of such a mind and character, he came to Prague to study for the Christian ministry.

Our interest in Huss reaches much further than to what he was. We want to know what he did.

Now, a man's work in the world may be described as the product of his character into his circumstances. What, then, let us ask, were the circumstances of the religious life of his time amid which Huss found himself in his student years at Prague? There was, on the one hand, a vast, all-pervading ecclesiastical organization, with a fully-developed, highly-complex theory concerning itself, which claimed to embrace the religious relations of God and man. On the other hand, there were three witnesses claiming to be heard against this organization and its theory.

The ecclesiastical organization was that of the Church of Western Christendom, owing obedience to the Bishop of

Rome. The plan of its system was modelled on that of the ancient Roman Empire. Its strength had been gained in the days when hordes of heathen invaders threatened the existence of every institution in Western Europe, and when a consolidated hierarchy moulded on monarchical lines seemed necessary to maintain the existence of the Church. The rulers of the Church had not scrupled to make use of the prestige thus gained to further the fulfilment of ambitious aims, which included in their range all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them. According to the Papal theory, the Pope was to be the supreme monarch of the world. Its authority was primarily the Bible, but only as interpreted by the Pope, from whose rendering of its sacred meaning there was no appeal. For the decisions of the Pope were the decisions of the Church, and the decisions of the Church were the decisions of God. Its theory of the salvation of the soul of man, on the acceptance of which the power of the Pope largely depended, was simple—that the Church of Christ is identical with the ecclesiastical organization of which the Pope is the head, and that only the soul that is in communion with the Church can reach heaven when it passes from the world.

On the other hand, there were three opposing forces which weakened the power of the claims of Rome over the heart and mind of Huss. The first was the growth of national self-consciousness in Bohemia. The Bohemian people came of a different stock from that of the surrounding German peoples. They had learnt their Christian faith, not from the West, but from the East, and even when they had been cut off from the Eastern communion and were compelled to join the Western they were allowed to maintain important peculiarities in their modes of worship. Throughout the fourteenth century the consciousness of difference between themselves and their neighbours had been fostered by circumstances, and they resented more and more a subordinate part in the organization of the German peoples, which nominally included them all, Germans and Bohemians alike, as members of one Holy Roman Empire. The political ideas of the people, centred for so long upon Rome, were being transferred to Prague and to Bohemia. Huss was not slow to catch the popular feeling, and it weakened in his mind, perhaps more than he was himself aware, the authority of Rome.

Secondly, there was the schism in the Papacy. When Huss was a child of eleven the headship of the Roman organization had been divided between two rivals, each of whom exercised to the utmost all the powers he claimed, against his rival Pope. All the political influence he could call to his aid, all the

awful spiritual authority he claimed for this world and the next, were directed by Urban at Rome against Clement at Avignon, and by Clement at Avignon against Urban at Rome. Christendom was divided. This holy Church, which was said to be God's temple on earth, and through which alone men's souls could be saved, was split into two hostile camps, each assailing the other with every weapon, whether carnal or spiritual, on which it could lay its hand, each concerned about little else than destroying the other by force or by fraud.

Small wonder that so earnest and so shrewd a mind as that of Huss should ask itself whether, after all, either head of the Roman Church was all he claimed to be.

The third disturbing factor was the corruption of the Roman clergy. Simony was widely prevalent; the clergy neglected their duties, extorted vast sums of money, and were to a horrible extent flagrantly immoral. The facts Huss could see with his own eyes among the local clergy of Bohemia were themselves indictments of the Roman claims, and the more he came to know, as he grew older, of the lives and actions of the heads of the Church at Rome and at Avignon, the more revolting to his moral sense did he find the practice of the leading professors of Christianity. The vicegerents of the God of Righteousness themselves were vile. By minds that could juggle with facts these things might be slurred over, explained away, forced to the front or ordered to the rear, according to the demands of expediency or convenience, but not by the mind of Huss. Those earnest eyes of his were given him in order that he might see, not that he might profess to see as other men told him that he ought. There is one word we find again and again on Huss's lips. It is the key to his mind and his idea of human life. "Pontiffs and priests," he writes, "the Scribes and Pharisees, Herod and Pilate, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem formerly condemned the truth; they crucified it and buried it, but it rose from the tomb and conquered them all, sending forth in its stead twelve preachers of the Word." And again: "I do not hesitate to expose this miserable body to the peril of death for God's truth" — "that truth," he wrote in later days, "which I have ever kept in view."

However ancient the history, however great the authority of Rome, he could not in loyalty to truth refuse to listen to the three great witnesses against her claims.

When the mind of a man in his younger years is struggling with such thoughts as these, and he comes in contact with another and a stronger mind that has faced and forcibly dealt with the same problems, it is safe to say that the younger student will bear the marks of the contact for life. So it was

with Huss. At the time when Huss was a boy of thirteen Richard II. of England had married Anne, daughter of Charles of Bohemia. Channels of thought were opened between Bohemia and England, and three years later Jerome brought from Oxford to Prague the writings of the English Wycliffe. Huss read them, and, as so often happens, at first shrunk horror-stricken from the teaching which actually formulated his own thoughts and afterwards moulded his life.

He read in Wycliffe's pages that the spiritual office of the clergy must be regarded, not as a *dominium*, but as a *ministerium*; as a service, not a lordship. He learnt to "place above everything else the moral personality of every individual man." He was led to think of the Church as "nothing else than the whole number of the elect," and to look upon it as "a right to apply the moral standard in testing the actual life of the Church." He was taught to see the failure of that preaching which "preaches not the Word of God, but other things." He read such passages as that in which Wycliffe spoke with a stern emphasis of the greatness of the Pope, consisting in his humility, poverty, and readiness to serve; and "when the Pope becomes degenerate, secularized, and an obstinate defender of his worldly greatness, then he becomes an arch-heretic, and must be deprived of his spiritual dignity and his earthly dominion." Writing on the truth of Scripture, Wycliffe said: "It is impossible that any word or any deed of the Christian should be of equal authority with Holy Scripture."¹

By the time that Huss was thirty years of age his mind was clear. The Church must be reformed. Her teaching, her organization, her practice, her life, must be made true to the New Testament and to Jesus Christ. To say that they were so now was false, from what lips soever the declaration came. Wycliffe showed the way to bring about the change. Refer to Scripture, study, and follow the teaching of Jesus Christ, serve faithfully the God of Truth—this must be the method of the Christian Church as of the individual human soul. Huss has learnt at this time the main principle of the work he is called to do in the world.

The following fifteen years were spent in making this issue clear to the Bohemian people and to the rulers of the Church at Rome. In lecture-room and pulpit, at the court and in the city, by book and pamphlet, as foremost figure at Prague and in exile at Hussinec, Huss pursued his purpose. He had attained to a position of great influence in the University; he was confessor to the Queen, which gave him the ear of the Court.

¹ Lechler's "Wycliffe," translated by Lorimer.

In 1402 he became priest of the Chapel of Bethlehem, and so a preacher to the people, and after the disruption in the University he was appointed or reappointed Rector. He was not the man to fall short of his opportunities. In religious ideas Huss and the Bohemian people were at one.

By 1409 Rome itself had taken the alarm. The Archbishop ordered Wycliffe's books to be burned, denounced his opinions, and prohibited all preaching in private places and chapels. Huss defied the Archbishop's ruling, asserting that we must obey God rather than men in things which are necessary to salvation. He asserted the freedom of the conscience against the authority of the Church. Huss had stepped, as Bishop Creighton puts it, from the position of a reformer to that of a revolutionist. He was excommunicated, and driven further still into antagonism to Rome. When the time came for the Council of the Church at Constance, the condition of Bohemia was bound to take a front place upon its programme. Huss and Bohemia demanded reformation, and demanded it on the broad but definite lines of an appeal to Scripture and a fearless regard for truth.

Let us turn now from Bohemia to Western Europe as a whole. We find that the mind of Huss, as we have traced its working, was in some respects no isolated phenomenon in Christendom. The facts which moved him to thought were agitating all the countries owing obedience to the Pope. Everywhere the same vast claims of the Roman Church were being vigorously pushed by the Papal ecclesiastics. In all parts except in Italy a national consciousness was being born. The splendid idea of one universal Holy Roman Empire had lost its hold on the imaginations of the peoples. England had always been independent of the empire. The first and third Edwards, supported heartily by Parliament and people, had entered on the policy which ultimately led to separation from the Pope. A few years earlier Philippe le Bel had withstood the demands of Pope Boniface VIII., confirming the action of St. Louis, who in his pragmatic sanction had laid the foundation of the Gallican liberties. The Germans were not long after in adopting a national course of action. The schism in the Papacy scandalized and shocked men's minds, the more in proportion to their reverence for the majesty of the Roman See. No less widely spread was the dissatisfaction with the corruptions of the clergy. The luxury and avarice and the laxity of the morals of the clergy, the tyrannous exactions of the Pope and his officials, angered the minds of the serious and pointed the wit of the lively all through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Western Christendom was stirring restlessly under the Papal yoke, was growing rapidly in the con-

sciousness of national strength and national aspirations as opposed to the aims of the Papacy, was finding the Papal outrage to its moral sense more and more intolerable.

The University of Paris stood forward to give expression to the desires of Europe.

Here we may draw a fair comparison, and say that as Huss and Bohemia caught at and followed the method of reform suggested by Wycliffe's work, so Europe followed the lead of the University of Paris. But the two methods of procedure were entirely different, and were in the hands of advocates of very different strength. How the advocates of the two great alternative methods met face to face and with what results we read in the tragic story of the life we are studying to-day.

The remedy proposed by the University of Paris for the ills which were distracting the mind of Christendom was to be found in the assemblage of a General Council of the Church. The chief exponents of this means of securing the reform so eagerly longed for on all sides were Gerson and D'Ailly. Gerson was Chancellor of the Church and University of Paris, a man of European renown for scholarship and intellectual power, of noble ideals and unimpeachable private life. D'Ailly was Cardinal of Cambrai and Gerson's able fellow-labourer in the conciliar movement for reform.

"The Catholic Universal Church," wrote Gerson, "is composed of, and receives its name from, various members constituting one body, Greeks, Latins and barbarians, believing in Christ, men and women, peasants and nobles, poor and rich. Of which body of the Universal Church Christ alone is Head. . . . This Church could never err concerning the current law, could never fail, has never suffered from schism, has never been defiled by heresy, never could be deceived or deceive, has never sinned. . . . But there is another, called the Apostolic Church, partial and private (*particularis et privata*), included in the Catholic Church, made up of Pope, Cardinals, Bishops, prelates and ecclesiastics. And it is commonly called the Roman Church. . . . And this can err, and has proved itself capable of being deceived and of deceiving, of being guilty of schism and heresy; also it can fail. And this is found to be of far less authority than the Universal Church. And it is, as it were, the organ or instrument (*instrumentalis et operativa*), making use of the keys of the Universal Church, and wielding the power of binding and loosing possessed by the same. . . . These two Churches differ as genus and species."¹

The General Council, Gerson held, represents the Church.²

¹ Gerson, "Tract. de Mod. Un. ac. Ref. Eccles.," edit. Dupin, ii., 163, 164.

² *Ibid.*, ii., 174.

It therefore is above the Pope, and can depose the occupant of the Papal See ; it can legislate without question on matters of reform, and decide on questions of heresy and the punishment of heretics. Order and authority were for Gerson the first matters for consideration, and to these the conviction of the individual man must be kept entirely subordinate. He never seems to have doubted that the thoughts of the Universal Church were the thoughts of God, or that the voice of the General Council was the voice which expressed those Divine and therefore infallible thoughts. To Gerson's mind the relationship between God and the Christian was determined only by the Church, and that by the Church as he himself conceived it.

With such ideas and aspirations Gerson came to the Council. I have dwelt upon the attitude of his mind for the simple reason that he represents in the clearest form all that was really great and noble in the best of the leaders in the Roman Church who met at Constance. There were some there who were personal enemies of Huss. There were many whose minds were narrow, and some whose motives were base. Gerson was none of these. He was no doubt in a mood to be severe. He must not discredit his reputation for hostility against the disturbers of the order of Christendom by any merciful leanings towards those who disputed its authority. Against Papal schismatic and Bohemian heretic his face was set with equal sternness.

On November 16, 1414, the first public sitting of the Council was held. The great council hall, built by the city for the convenience of its guests, still stands on the shores of the Boden See, and frowns heavily down on the joyous freedom of the sunlit waters of the lake. John XXIII., the Roman Pope, opened the first sitting. Huss was already in the city. Before the year was out the Emperor had come. Roman Christendom was represented by members of almost all the peoples of Western Europe. Thirty cardinals, twenty archbishops, bishops, abbots and doctors in hundreds, nearly 2,000 priests, came to the great Council. Before the end of May the Roman Pope was deposed, Wycliffe's writings had been condemned, and a feeble vengeance ordered on his ashes ; but these things are not now our immediate concern.

Within a month of his arrival Huss was arrested and conducted before the Pope and Cardinals at the Papal residence. He was told he had been arrested on account of his teaching error. His answer was that he had come of his own free will to Constance to be corrected if he could be proved to be wrong. His interrogators allowed that his answer was fair, but there was a fundamental difference which had not as yet appeared.

To the mind of the Cardinals that was error, which they or the Council should decide to be such ; to the mind of Huss error was what he could see to be false, or which to his eyes was not in accordance with the teaching of Scripture.

Here his examination rested for awhile, but three times they changed his prison. The first week he spent in the house of one of the cathedral Canons ; then for four months he lay in that dark and narrow tower of the island monastery into the depths of which the visitor peeps curiously through the ivy to-day ; three months more he was in closer durance still at Gottlieben ; and from June 6 till the end he lay in chains in the Franciscan monastery by the river. In misery from sickness and fever, in loneliness, and cramped with fetters, the heroic spirit bore bravely through. But we must not stay with him in prison. We have yet to see him face to face with the Council.

Three times he was had in audience—on the 5th, on the 7th and on the 8th of June. At the first audience, the works of Huss being in the hands of the Council, he was asked whether he acknowledged them as his. He admitted the authorship, and added that if these works could be shown to contain error he would willingly amend them. The first article of accusation was read. Huss attempted to justify the statement for which he was indicted in the article. From all parts of the Council the cry was raised, "That is not the question." Huss was dumfounded for the moment. He was being shouted down on what seemed to him precisely the point at issue. He was there to prove the truth of what he had said, or to be confuted by the fathers of Christendom, instead of which he faces an assembly lashed to fury at the suggestion of proof, and shouting that proof is not the point they are met to discuss.

At the second audience there was much discussion with little definite result. One of the questions under debate was concerned with the nature of the evidence by which Huss's doctrine might be proved. The Council appealed to the statements of its twenty witnesses, Huss appealed to God and his own conscience. The President advised him to submit to the monition of the Council. The Emperor supported the President. Huss repeated his readiness to retract if anything better or holier than what he had taught were shown him. The Council and he were at cross-purposes ; neither could take the other's point of view, neither, therefore, could believe in the other's sincerity of purpose.

The third audience was held on the following day. The reading of the indictment was ended and the last witnesses examined. D'Ailly, as president, warned Huss that the choice lay before him of submission or further attempt at defence,

which latter would be perilous. His answer was that he came to the Council, not to defend his opinions with obstinacy, but to obtain information if he was wrong. His judges told him a written form of abjuration would be submitted to him, which he could consider and sign at his leisure. Many endeavours were made to persuade him to retract. Some of the errors with which he was charged he declared he had neither held nor taught, but though the nominal issue had by this time become somewhat confused between false accusation and false doctrine, the actual issue was clear. One last effort was made to induce him to follow the line of safety. "Are you wiser than the whole Council?" asked one of the questioning Bishops. "Show me," said Huss, "the least member of the Council who will inform me better out of the Scriptures, and I will forthwith retract." "He is obstinate in his heresy," they said, and left him to his fate.

It cannot be said that the Council willingly pursued its course in respect to Huss. The conduct of his trial, his repeated examinations, the frequent presentment of the issue, the constant urging of the ease with which he could retract and submit, all show that the Council's mood was the opposite of that of eagerly seeking his death. The best, at least, if not the greater number of the members, would have spared him if they could; but they saw, or thought they saw, a horizon lowering with forms of danger if a man might be allowed to appeal before the face of Europe to a higher Judge than the Christian Church. Therefore Huss must die.

They did not see that disorder and anarchy spring, not from the man who asks for information and seeks to learn what is true, but from the man or the men who think that final and absolute truth is with them and them alone. It is an easy thing for us, moved by the sufferings of a saintly character, to pass an impulsive verdict of condemnation on the Council; but if we are wise, if we try to understand the Council's outlook, we shall pause before we condemn. And yet I think that even when we turn from the eager verdict of feeling and listen to the colder dictates of thought we must still condemn the Council, for while it sought to promote the peace of Christendom, and desired to fulfil the will of Him whose eternal mind it believed itself to express, it strove to accomplish this by what was, after all, however nobly meant, the method of expediency, and not the method of truth regardless of cost.

And thus it was that when the Council met in session in Constance Cathedral on July 6, 1415, there was there, too, at the west end of the nave the thin, worn figure of the man who dared to die for the truth. For expediency's sake the Emperor

had forsworn himself, and abandoned to his judges the man he had promised to protect, and now imperial power blushes at the reproach of defenceless Truth. The Bishops degrade him from the priesthood, and withdraw the protection of the Church; the civil power takes charge, and leads him forth from the cathedral doors across the fields to die. "I am prepared," he said, "to die in that truth of the Gospel which I taught and wrote." As he sings a verse from the Liturgy the flames sweep up into his face. For a few minutes his lips are seen to move in prayer, and then—only the leaping flames.

And to-day, to him who stands with reverence at the spot marked by the great stone where John Huss died, the hills near by that looked down upon him in his last agony seem to bear their message. They tell us that that scene was not the end. They speak of the eternal God of truth, who is able to deliver them that serve Him from the burning fiery furnace; and even if it were not so, if we mistake the message of the everlasting hills, if the green waters of the Rhine swept away that day six centuries ago all that was left of Huss, yet even so it was better far for him to suffer and to die for Truth's sake than to fall down and worship the image of divine authority which Pope or Council had set up.

We can do no more than give the briefest glance at the after-effects of Huss's life and death. Indeed, it cannot be said that the direct results were widespread or important. The fierce Hussite wars, kindled by the anger of the Bohemians at the betrayal and death of the teacher they loved and honoured, raged for many years, but there seems to be no reason to suppose they roused much interest in other parts of Europe.¹ The Moravian Church, formed in the first instance of those Bohemians who adhered to the doctrines of Huss, has lasted in singular purity and beauty to our own time. It bears to this day, in the simplicity of its faith and its freedom from all pretentiousness, the impress of the character of him from whose teaching it took its rise. The roll of membership includes rather less than 134,000 souls, but of these 96,000 are connected with its 138 mission-stations in all parts of the world. Its home may be said to be in English and German speaking countries.² John Wesley, as we learn from his biographers, was profoundly influenced by what he heard and saw of the Moravians. He came in contact with them at a critical period in his life, and they, he says, "thoroughly convinced" him by what they told him.³ In the Wesleyanism of to-day Huss's influence still lives.

¹ Beard's Hibbert Lectures, p. 29.

² Moravian Almanac and Year-Book for 1900.

³ Coke and Moore, "Life of Wesley," p. 157.

But the mind of Christendom was not ready for his message. There was many a sad lesson to be learnt before Western Europe could reconcile itself to the failure of the conciliar method of reform. And when a hundred years later another and a more powerful leader came, he learnt his methods for himself and not from Huss's work. Yet Luther recognised the power and purity of the treatment of Scripture by the earlier reformer, and wrote to Spalatin: "We are all unconscious Hussites."

Huss had not the power which was in Luther, and came too soon to use it to such purpose as Luther did, even if he had possessed it. He was a herald and a forerunner of the Reformation. It is never easy, it is seldom possible, to gauge with accuracy the effect of the herald's advent. He does his work and passes on his way, well-nigh forgotten in the greater glory of those whose coming it is his duty to announce. But he prepares the minds of men, and leaves behind him as he goes a keenly-expectant multitude. So it was with Huss. That man in any case has done a noble life's work, and left a noble heritage behind him, of whom, as of Huss, it may be said that with an unflinching trust in the God of righteousness and in the Jesus of the Gospels he sought to know the truth.

H. B. COLCHESTER.

ART. VI.—WAR-HYMNS, OLD AND NEW.

IN a passage much quoted of late as a salve to uneasy consciences, Mr. Ruskin has declared that, according to his study of history, "All great nations learned their truth of word and strength of thought in war," and that "War is the foundation of all the arts," as it is also "the foundation of all the high virtues and faculties of men."¹

Probably we shall be unwilling, without considerable qualification, to endorse such an assertion as this. War must always be terrible. We cannot lightly become its apologists. But it is some alleviation to think that from what is undoubtedly an evil, good may yet spring forth, and it can scarcely be denied that a time of war calls forth in a marvellous degree some of the higher virtues, such as heroism, patriotism, and self-sacrifice. Nor can it be denied that some of the greatest creations of the human brain have had their birth in stirring times, when the mind was set on fire by contemporary events. From Homer downwards, many of our great poems have been inspired by warfare. The age of

¹ "Crown of Wild Olive," vol. iii., pp. 87-95.