

Arnold Toynbee.

It is in connection with the movement for the formation of University Settlements in East London that Arnold Toynbee's name has become familiar to those who have not come into direct personal contact with him. Toynbee Hall, the first of these Settlements, bears his name; and we have a living witness of the strength of his position as a social idealist in the fact that a project for bringing university culture into touch with East London life seemed to others most suitably to express his aims, and thus to be the most fitting memorial of his life and work.

Of his short life (he died at the age of thirty-one), there remains to all who knew him a warm and living memory. Few could fail to be impressed by the transparent sincerity of his character, and by the moral earnestness with which he brought all his rare intellectual powers to bear upon subjects which with too many of us are questions of simple feeling, often unconsciously ill-directed or misled. Few could fail, at least in part, to realise his great disinterestedness, and the high aims which he set before himself. He was gifted with an imaginative power which enabled him to realise the needs of men, and at the same time he was able to discover and work out for himself practical means for their improvement, and thus for opening the way to a more ideal condition of society.

We are beginning to recognise now that the duties which he tried to perform are attached to our rights as citizens; we hope that succeeding generations will grow up with even a stronger sense of the responsibility attached not only to position and wealth, but also to intellectual power and culture; and certainly, in this respect, we owe a great deal to the life and example of Arnold Toynbee. He was free from the fault of the mere theorist; he did not confine himself to inventing new sets of duties for others to perform; on the other hand, he did not wish, like some social reformers, to destroy existing rights, in order to equalise rights and duties in the world. But he was a student of the causes which have brought about, and the laws which regulate, the present conditions of life (especially for those classes whose existence and prosperity are a matter for hard struggle), and at the same time he looked

forward to a new state of society in which these conditions would be modified and these laws influenced by a wider ideal of citizenship. Thus he was at the same time historian, economist, and idealist.

As a boy he had been interested in the study of history; principally, however, for the sake of the light which it throws on the facts of present social life. He entered later upon historical investigations with the "sole, and in so far as it can be so, unalloyed motive . . . the pursuit of truth." He studied economics by the historical method; interested, not in its abstractions so much as in its bearing on social questions, on the actual life of to-day. Unlike many social reformers, he did not even wish for the upheaval of the present artificial conditions of life by means of a social revolution; unlike men who, unconscious of any ideal aim, accept facts not only as present evils, but as necessary ones, and as incapable of remedy, he considered that from the material at hand the social reformer should strive to form the structure of his ideal state. He considered that those chasms between class and class, the artificial divisions brought about in part by the irregular distribution of wealth, should be bridged over by a far-reaching human sympathy, capable of uniting as citizens in an effort to serve for the common good, both men of culture and the men who have "to work with one hand, and fight for their own improvement with the other." He did not base his ideal state on the conclusions of the older political economists, because he felt that these conclusions, in so far as they were limited, were untrue to life. A nation, in the old Political Economy, was regarded merely as a great wealth-getting community, and all human beings as actuated by motives of interest for themselves or their families; an imaginary condition of things that reminds us of Carlyle's "vipers in a jar, each trying to get its head above the other." Free and untrammelled competition, such as they assumed, exists only as a postulate of abstract economics. Competition, as one of the forces that underlie a common life, does indeed exist, but is modified by other forces, and can hardly be said to be ever free. And indeed the assumption of the older economists does not pretend to be a picture of actual

life. But it was perhaps because the theories which rested upon the assumption have been worked out in such detail that men in general had come to imagine that the facts they saw around them were also capable of being explained by the theories which worked so beautifully and so indisputably in the false world of the economists. This false world was, as Arnold Toynbee says, "laid like a mask over the face of the living world;" and men became more and more blind to the growing tendencies of actual facts. When the reaction came, the earlier economists were blamed, wrongly, it is true, for having wished to bring about a state of things which they merely assumed as a hypothesis; while, on the other hand, it is a matter of history that great harm has been done by well-meaning people, who sought to fashion their conduct in accordance with economic theories. How much ignorant opposition to the Factory Acts can be traced to a widespread idea that it was not within the province of the State to interfere in questions concerning labour, but that they ought to be worked out by giving competition free play? The newer school of economists, with whom Arnold Toynbee was in sympathy, tested continually the results of their speculations by comparing them with facts, and thus kept their work in touch with the realities of social life. It was the feeling that too little use of history had been made by the advocates of pure economics that induced Arnold Toynbee, when he had finally settled in Oxford as a tutor, to make his first important contribution to the science of economics on its historical side. He wished to investigate that period of history which alone can offer any explanation of the difficulties connected with the position of the labouring classes in England—the Industrial Revolution.

The great changes in the methods of industry, forming together what is known as the Industrial Revolution, began about the year 1760, and included the invention of machinery, and the application to these machines of steam power. They resulted in the shifting of the great centres of population and industry to the North; in the ruin of the small employers of labour, in the introduction into home manufactures of capital originally gained by merchants in foreign trade, in the foundation of an aristocracy of wealth, and later, in a great struggle between the capitalist and the labourer. A passage in Defoe's *Tour through*

Great Britain, in the year 1724, before these changes began, gives a vivid impression of the England of that day, and enables us to contrast it with the England of to-day. "The land" (near Halifax), he says, "was divided into small enclosures, from two acres to six or seven each, seldom more; every three or four pieces of land having a house belonging to them, hardly a house standing out of speaking distance from another. . . . At every considerable house there was a manufactory. Every clothier keeps one horse at least to carry his manufactures to the market, and every one generally keeps a cow or two or more for his family. By this means the small pieces of enclosed land about each house are occupied, for they scarce sow corn enough to feed their poultry." "The houses," Defoe goes on to say, "are full of lusty fellows, some at the dye-vats, some at the looms, others dressing the cloths, the women carding or spinning, being all employed, from the youngest to the oldest . . . not a beggar to be seen nor an idle person."

The changes caused by the introduction of machinery were sudden and violent in their effects, and the old state of things, as above described, was destroyed. Home industries were replaced by the factory system; the old social and neighbourly bonds were broken, and the bare forces of competition could now be seen at work, far less restrained than before by the kindly feelings of individuals one to another. Before the Industrial Revolution the people were not crowded together in over-populated towns, their life was healthy and easy, and living was cheap; for, if wages only averaged 9s. 6d. per week, living could not be called expensive when you could rent a cottage at 6½d. per week, when meat was from 2d. to 3d. per lb., and bread 1½d. More than this, the relations between employer and employed had been close; after the Industrial Revolution they were broken.

But as far as outward prosperity went, England still seemed to flourish, and passed through her continental wars with very little injury to her trade. But 1815 came, the year of the Great Peace; and the heavy taxes which were then laid on to pay the expenses of the war pressed lightly indeed on the enriched capitalists, but heavily on the workmen, whose wages had not risen in proportion as the profits of their employers had increased. In the time of misery that

trace the beginning of a gigantic conflict between employer and employed, between capital and labour. Many plans were set on foot to remedy the evil; none with any large measure of success. For a time the workmen clamoured for political representation, hoping that through their acquisition of political power the economic difficulty might be solved. Philanthropists tried to do away with the evils of the factory system, especially in regard to its harmful effects on the women and children; others, not so far-sighted, tried to reduce the amount of the misery they saw around them by out-door relief, too often indiscriminately given. Later, the workmen, led by Joseph Arch, found that they held in their own hands a weapon, the power of combination. They formed Trades Unions with the object of raising wages and improving the condition of the labourer. Here the principle of competition between groups of employers and employed was substituted for the old system of competition between individuals, and a machinery was furnished by which it is to be hoped that in the future the demands of groups of labourers can be sifted, and difficulties adjusted by means of arbitration, and the injurious warfare of the strike become unknown. The road will then lie open towards industrial peace.

Arnold Toynbee was able to seize the ideal principle in such schemes for reform, and also, in some degree, to point out practical ways by which the relations between capital and labour could be improved. For, in the light of the progress which he hoped we were making towards the better settlement of social questions, he understood that though at times the interest of master and work-people clash, yet their *permanent* interests are the same. To give a very simple example. A workman's wages, we will suppose, are too low for him to subsist upon, and at the same time to do efficient work. So long as his employer can raise the man's wages, and yet make adequate profits; so long as a rise in wages means increased power to work on the part of the man; so long as the temporary loss involved in the payment of a larger sum in wages does not prevent the employer from undertaking new contracts, it will pay him to raise wages rather than close his works. If, however, the workman demands wages which more than cover his expense of living, it will pay him to lower his demands rather than be thrown out of work. In either case, that work should go on is to the interest of both parties.

But in order that master and workman should each be ready to help towards this desirable end, it is necessary that the feeling of responsibility one towards the other should be more highly developed. Arnold Toynbee hoped much from this. Believing, like Mazzini, that people would in time come to understand that every right brings its corresponding duty with it, he saw that the immense power which employer and employed possess for injuring each other is in fact a perversion of the immense power they have for mutual help. He believed that the bitterness of conflicting interests increased by a difference in social position might be softened by more sympathetic intercourse; that, in fact, men of culture and refinement could meet on a friendly footing those whose advantages had been fewer, and could in some degree help to break down artificial barriers. In a word, he looked upon competition as a mighty force which must be controlled by morals, and rightly so, since competition only dominates temporary interests.

To translate these ideals into words and actions, to make them intelligible and helpful to others, was by no means easy; especially as Arnold Toynbee recognised more clearly than many more experienced men have done, in what different aspects the truth appears to different minds. Speaking of some words he had used in writing to a friend, he says: "I think they are the truth, but truth comes to every mind so differently that few can find the longed-for unity except in love." It was this longing for the truth to be clear and evident that made the limitations of human knowledge hard for him to bear. "Man knows he is limited," he wrote, "why he is limited he knows not. Only by some image does he strive to approach the mystery. The sea, he may say, had no voice until it ceased to be supreme on the globe. There, where its dominion ended and its limits began, on the edge of the land it broke silence. Where man feels his limits, where the infinite spirit within him touches the shore of his finite life, there he, too, breaks silence."

The working of such an intense inner life, and the width of his human and intellectual sympathies, had already led Arnold Toynbee to spend part of the vacation of 1875 in Whitechapel. He took rooms in a common lodging-house in Commercial Road, and tried to help forward any efforts that were being made to do good. Ill-health prevented

him from working out his experiment, but his short stay had convinced him that the philanthropic work of the future must owe its strength to knowledge and not to mere feeling. His life, from this time onwards, till his death was remarkable for the conscious many-sided development of an effort to reach the most noble ideal of citizenship. By joining workmen's clubs, he, and others who were like-minded with him, helped to diffuse political knowledge; in his Bradford lectures he discussed social and economic questions with masters and workmen alike.

We realise in reading these lectures his sympathy with all that was best, his clear-cut rebuke of all that was unworthy in the demands and aims of the work-people. He reminded them, for instance, that a rise in wages was only good so far as it led to a rise in the civilisation of the wage-earners. "You know only too well," he said, "that too many working men do not know how to use the wages which they have at the present time. You know, too, that an increase in wages often means an increase in crime. If working men are to expect their employers to act with larger notions of equity in their dealings in the labour market, it is at least rational that employers should expect that working men should set about reforming their own domestic life."

His sympathy with the cause of co-operation; the growth of his theory of an ideal Church commensurate with the ideal State; his last exhausted effort to refute what he considered to be misleading principles put before the public in Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, all testify to the wonderful versatility with which he approached all sides of the great social question. As regarded the progress of humanity, he considered that the apathy, too often the result of hard physical work, was the principal obstacle which had to be overcome in raising the masses. "Languor," he said, "can only be conquered by enthusiasm, and enthusiasm can only be kindled by two things: an ideal which takes the imagination by storm, and a definite, intelligible plan for carrying out that ideal into practice." These words unconsciously sum up the effect of his own life. His enthusiasm had definite aims and means, and so did not pass away.

The sense of a work to be done in the world and a misery that called for remedy never left him. In his last illness the latter thought was continually with him, and he could not forget it.

He asked that sunlight should be let into the room where he was lying. "Light purifies," he said, "the sun burns up evil; let in the light."

This "contrast of the Divine fate of the world pacing on resistless and merciless, and our passionate individuality with its hopes and loves and fears," which in some minds went near to quench the hope of immortality, was with him but a "passing picture of the mind," that had not obscured his hope. "Soon," he had once said, "the great thought dawns upon the soul: 'It is I, this living, feeling man, that thinks of fate and oblivion; I cannot reach the stars with my hands, but I pierce beyond them with my thoughts, and if things go on in the illimitable depths of the skies which would shrivel up the imagination like a dead leaf, I am greater than they, for I ask "why," and look before and after, and draw all things into the tumult of my personal life—the stars in their courses, and the whole past and future of the Universe, all things as they move in their eternal paths, even as the tiniest pool reflects the sun and the everlasting hills.'"

The establishment of Toynbee Hall as an East End University is the best comment upon such a life—with its high aims, its practical power, its wide sympathies. To the passer-by the mere sight of the place is suggestive. It leads out of Commercial Road, Whitechapel, a wide, filthy street, noisy with continual traffic. As you come near to Toynbee Hall, the wall that rises on one side of the street is the wall of a church, and bedded in dimly-coloured outlines in this wall is a large mosaic. It is an allegorical representation of Time, Death, and Judgment, in which the figures are of more than human size, and in more than human repose. Beyond this wall of St. Jude's Church, which closes in one side of the Toynbee Hall buildings, is a low archway, and within can be seen a quiet quadrangle with college buildings round it. There are sounds of work going on, men moving from one lecture to another, coming in or going out at intervals; but these are pleasant sounds that contrast with the noises of the street outside. The very existence of such a place must do good; and the extent of the work reaches far beyond the accommodation here. Opportunities are given to the students not only to read and to discuss subjects of interest, but also to travel, and to see for themselves the great historic cities and scenes with which they have become familiar

in the course of their reading. In their political and social life the men have been interested, guided, helped. The effects on the residents, too, in the wise direction and strengthening of effort have been no less marked; and the influence of such an institution on a part of London at once

one of the most crowded and most desolate is most wide and beneficial. It is, in fact, in itself an assertion of the principles which Arnold Toynbee loved to teach; the dignity of individual man, and the doctrine of social responsibility.

ELEANOR F. JOURDAIN.

The Epistle to the Hebrews in the Syrian Church.

BY THE REV. G. H. GWILLIAM, B.D., FELLOW OF HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

It is a commonplace of New Testament criticism to note the difference of the reception which has been accorded to the *Apocalypse* and to the *Epistle to the Hebrews* in the different parts of the Church.¹ The presence or absence of one or other of these books may even be a sign of the origin and locality of a particular list of canonical writings.² While the exclusion of the Hebrews would suggest that the list was western, that epistle would certainly be found in any genuine Syrian list. The Church of Edessa appears to have received all the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, at least from the first days when a formal list of his writings was first compiled by the Syriac doctors. The object of this paper will be to state the grounds on which such an assertion is confidently made.

It is interesting, and useful for the present purpose, to compare the contents of a Greek and of a Syriac New Testament as they were published in the fourth and fifth centuries. We have the unimpeachable evidence of the MSS. themselves, which we inherit from the copyists of those days. Of the fourth century, we possess the *Sinaitic* and the *Vatican* Greek New Testaments; the former contains all which is included in the English New Testament; the latter originally, no doubt, contained as much, but in its present state it is without the last part of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (ix. 15 f.) and the *Revelation*. Of the fifth century, the *Alexandrian MS.* contains the whole New Testament, a few leaves being lost; the *Parisian* fragments (*Cod. C.*) represent the same Canon.³

¹ See, e.g. *History of the New Testament Canon* (Westcott), p. 245. The acceptance of these books is well shown in a Table in *Studia Biblica*, iii. (Oxford, 1891), pp. 254-257.

² Professor Sanday in *Studia Biblica*, p. 244.

³ See the convenient Table, pp. 107, 108, of that useful manual. *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, E. Miller, 1886.

The contents of these ancient documents are evidence that whatever doubts might have been entertained by individual writers, whatever hesitation might have been felt at an earlier period, the Canon of the Greeks of the fourth and fifth centuries was the same as that of our New Testament. In like manner, the opinion of the Church of Edessa may be inferred from an examination of a complete Syriac New Testament, which is preserved in the British Museum.⁴ Like the above-named Greek MSS. it is undated; but with at least as much confidence as they are assigned to particular periods, this Peshitto codex may be assigned to the century A.D. 450-550. There is no presumption against its having been written in the middle of the fifth century; it is almost certain that it is older than the Cambridge MS. (D), and than most of the fragments which form the group of sixth century New Testament uncials. Its contents and arrangement are as follows:—(1) *SS. Matthew, Mark, Luke, John*; (2) the Epistles of St. Paul, in the familiar order, concluding with *Hebrews*; (3) the *Acts*; (4) *James, 1 Peter, 1 John*. Colophon: "Here endeth the writing of the Holy Gospel and of the Apostle, and of the Praxis and of the Three Catholic Epistles, of Jakob one, and of Petros one, and of Juchanan one." So much, and no more, seems always to have been included in a Peshitto New Testament. The order, too, was seldom varied; and if, as in the case of Add. 14,448,⁵ the *Apostolus* came last, or, as in the Jacobite Massorah,⁶ the Holy Gospels, yet the Three Epistles were always attached to the Acts, and the Epistles of St. Paul were arranged as in the English Bible.

⁴ Add. 14,470. See *Catalogue of Syriac B. M. MSS.*, part i. p. 40.

⁵ Dated apparently A.D. 699-700, *B. M. Cat.* p. 41.

⁶ *B. M. Cat.* p. 108, *Horæ Syriacæ* (Wiseman), p. 217.