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

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

effective carrying out of such modifications as I have suggested, the assistance of the two great societies, the Colonial and Continental Church Society, and the S.P.G., would be necessary, as they own many of the Churches, and have the right to appoint most of the Chaplains. I cannot but think, however, that both these Societies would most readily acquiesce in any well-matured scheme that might be proposed to them for the more effective organization of their work on the Continent.

The mass of interesting facts which the Bishop Suffragan has collected in his recent Pastoral, the grasp which he has obtained of the wants and the difficulties and the duties of the Church, and of those who represent her on the Continent; the sagacious counsels which he gives to the clergy, not only as to their dealings with their flocks, but as to their more difficult and delicate relations with the strangers among whom they live, and with the authorities of the countries in which their duties are discharged—these are among the first-fruits of this new departure, and they are fruits full of promise of an increasingly abundant result in the future.

T. Teignmouth Shore.

Art. IV.—MORALITY AND RELIGION.

Whatever theories may be now advanced as to the origin and development of Morality in the prehistoric ages of the human race, it must be admitted that, in so far as historical record throws light upon the question, what we may describe as Morality appears almost invariably associated with Religion, which has accordingly been called "the Siamese twin of Morality." The principles which are regarded as moral principles, the conduct which displays the rule of such principles, and which is designated as Morality, are almost universally connected with a belief in a Supreme Being, a sense of responsibility to such a higher Power, and an anticipation of a future state of existence for man, in which a regard shall be had to his present life, in the sense of a correction of its anomalies, and an apportionment of individual rewards and punishments, so to speak. As far as man has shown himself in the matter, he appears as feeling that he should be moral because he is religious; and the moral code is high and pure in proportion to the sublimity and sanctity of the religious system accepted and acknowledged.

It is no contradiction to this thesis that there is at this

time a new departure on the part of modern philosophy in Christendom, in connection with which the inculcation of a high Morality is insisted on, while the assertion is advanced that such Morality has no essential connection with Religion, that its origin was not from any idea of Religion, but that Religion was an after-graft upon it. Those who so proclaim form an exception to the general rule which I have laid down; but the circumstances which led them into such a position can be easily discerned. Having been first brought to limit their belief by the positive lines of scientific discovery, the faith in a personal God and in a future state for man became extinct; but, as the Morality which they had learned through Christian teaching could not but approve itself to them as somehow intrinsically true and right, and as, besides, it is unquestionably contributive to the peace and prosperity of mankind individually, socially, nationally, and universally, they did not discard the Morality with the Religion; but, having discarded Religion as a reality, they felt bound to account for the manifestation of Morality as an outcome from a different source. I pass by the theory of extreme Materialism that man is a mere machine, in which all mental as well as bodily actions and states, all volitions, emotions, thoughts, as well as bodily movements and functions, are really determined by mechanical forces, as that theory has not received the general sanction even of scientific philosophers. But I would summarize and, as far as may be, combine the other philosophical accounts of the uprise and growth of Morality which are principally put forward.

The theorists on the subject go back in conjecture behind the time in the existence of the human race on which history sheds its light, and grope speculatively in the previous darkness for the little seed out of which this great and fruitful tree grew up. It is assumed that man was from the first a gregarious animal, that even our nondescript ancestors, who dwelt in the "misty mid region," the land of "the missing links," had social tendencies, and that in their crude minds experience gradually established the perception that the safety and happiness of the individual depended on the general good condition of the tribe, and that thus what Clifford calls "tribal piety" was originated, in accordance with which individual members of the community were led to act, even at times with a small degree of present self-sacrifice, for the social good; that out of such beginnings the ideal of Morality developed to the advanced definitions of duty which philosophical moralists unfold for us to-day, and that so, without any overshadowing of the power of the Highest, without the introduction of Religion, Conscience was born. Morality, as accounted for in this way, has been described as "an invention to which men were driven

by the necessity for it, and encouraged to improve by the utility of it. The story of her heaven-descended origin was a pleasant poetic fiction of later ages, invented by self-deluded but well-intentioned enthusiasts, the founders of religions." But the invention brought forth by necessity, the embryonic "tribal piety," has developed into "the love of humanity, and has been dignified with the appellation of Religion"—a religion which, though it gives no promise for the future of a fruition in which its individual votaries can have part, yet prescribes it to be a duty to labour, even with self-sacrifice, for the improvement by degrees of the condition of the human race. The present object of Morality is defined as the effort to secure "the greatest good of the greatest number;" and its ultimate goal the transformation of the world after countless generations into a blessed Utopia—in which state of blessedness, however, the present labourers, being dead, can have no dwelling-place. And the sustaining element in devotion to such an object is grandiloquently described by George Eliot as "an effective and awe-inspiring vision of the human lot."

In a recent book, "Progressive Morality," Professor Fowler gives a somewhat similar account of the origin of Morality, separating the moral sanction from the religious, without confessing any compulsion to do so by a casting away of religious belief. According to his ethics, the moral sanction "is derived from our own reflection on our own actions and the approbation or disapprobation which after such reflection we bestow upon them; the guiding principle is the adaptation of conduct to surrounding circumstances, physical and social, with a view to promote to the utmost extent possible the well-being of the individual and of the society of which he is a member." So, as Professor Fowler puts it, "Morality had its small beginnings in the primeval household, and has only attained its present grand proportions by gradual increments, derived partly from the semi-conscious operations of the human intelligence adapting itself to the circumstances in which it is placed, partly from the conscious meditations of reflective men." But the same writer seems inclined to attach to it a Divine authority, and to claim a Divinely laid foundation for its permanence, since he adds: "If Morality has its foundations in this constitution of human nature, which itself proceeds from the Divine source of all things, its credentials are sufficiently assured."

Very much the same account of the origin of Morality is, as I have shown, given in philosophical theories entirely apart from any association at all with Divine revelation and religious faith; and in these theories the stability and the growth of moral feeling and action are propounded simply on the ground

of the continuance of the environment which led to the earliest notions of Morality, and the development of the psychical forces which were from the first associated in its exercise. It is even asserted that "Morality is safe in its essence because its essence resides in the inmost structure and essence of the developed brain of the species—that it can only be deteriorated by a change for the worse in the composition of the cells and fibres of the brain, and these cannot be suddenly or easily changed in the race, whatever accidents they may be subject to in the individual." But yet another idea is advanced as to the development of the human species in morals as in civilization, which accords with Carlyle's doctrine that "The history of what man has accomplished in the world is at the bottom the history of the great men who have worked here—who were in a wide sense the creators of whatsoever the general mass of mankind contrived to do or to attain." The development of the human spirit, it is said, "has come from an inner revelation to certain privileged individuals—coming none can say whence, further than that it is from the Unknown, from the Purpose of the universe that thus means and wishes to declare and develop itself."—("Creed of Science.")

Now in accordance with this suggestion we may contemplate that "privileged individual," Moses, a marvellous man who effected wondrous and permanent reforms in the human race, and whom we believe to have been the channel of Divine revelation. "The law was given by Moses," as "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Not to speak of the moral law as delivered by Moses with a claim for Divine authority, it is interesting to notice the ceremonial law for the Jewish people, in regard to which a like claim for Divine authorship is made. It seems to consist almost entirely of what are called "positive precepts;" but when we look at these precepts in the light of one of the philosophical definitions of Morality, we may discern in them a large moral infusion, so that obedience to them would be a part of Morality, regarding morality to be a means for "the greatest good of the greatest number." The apparently mere positive precepts with which the ceremonial law abounds, in reference to purifications, contractions of defilements, regulations as to food, and more delicate matters connected even with sexual relations, when considered in this light assume a moral character, since all such ritual contributed remarkably to the health and general well-being of the nation. A striking article in a recent *Fortnightly*, written by a Jew, claimed intellectual, moral, and physical superiority for the Jews above other people, and attributed the distinctiveness to their obedience in considerable part to the injunctions of the ceremonial law. Now if we are not obliged to believe that

Moses derived the ritual to any great extent from the wisdom of the Egyptians, it is not probable that he—one man of that generation—could have evolved of himself a system so full and so particular in detail, and of such far-reaching importance for the welfare of a nation. The inference then would follow that the system was, as he asserted, a Divine revelation, in which, even leaving out of notice its further significance, the philosophical ideal of Morality was marvellously provided for.

Again, in reference to Christianity, it is superfluous to speak of the immense reform in the rules of human life, of the purifying and ennobling of the tone of human sentiment and feeling, which Christ effected. It is in a high degree improbable that such doctrine and influence should so amazingly distinguish a single individual in that age; and so, the inference is reasonable that His claim to be "the Word of God" was truth. But though an effort may be made to search out moral and social reformers besides, and bring them to the front with a display of something in their teaching kindred to the Morality inculcated by Christ, there is still this to be advanced in regard to the Divine origin of Christianity, that in its further doctrines, its "mystery"—to use St. Paul's term—there lies a power for the growth and sustainment of Morality; nay, more, for the development of a higher life above the mere moral plain, a spiritual life which is life eternal, that could come down to this poor world of ours by no other means than that which has been revealed in the Gospel, wherein Christ is shown as "the power of God and the wisdom of God."

The theory which would ascribe to Morality a mere human origin and growth, which would define it as an invention to which men were driven of necessity, and as the further adaptation of conduct to surrounding circumstances, physical and social, would necessarily require its progress to be characterized by very slow development, and not marked by such sudden impetus as were supplied by Moses and far more forcibly by Christ, both of whom claimed to be the instruments of a Divine revelation. And the distinctiveness of the effect which followed their instrumentality is in itself an evidence towards the truth of their claim for Divine inspiration and authority.

I have already said that, in so far as man shows himself in history, he appears as feeling obliged to be moral, in some sense, because he is religious. It does not really contradict this statement, to point to some modern moralists, who, though they have discarded religious belief, are yet warm advocates of moral principles and conduct, and themselves conspicuously consistent with their doctrine in the matter. They were imbued with the teaching of Religion; they derived their impression of Morality from that source; and the old

influence remains though the faith is lost, so that they are not proper instances of Morality as able to continue in existence without Religion. As Miss Cobbe put it in a recent *Contemporary*, they "are no more fair samples of the outcome of Atheism" (in which term she includes Positivism and Agnosticism) "than a little party of English youths who had lived for a few years in Central Africa would be samples of negroes; it would take several thousand years to make a full-blooded Atheist out of forty generations of Christians." The author of that article ("A Faithless World")—which has since been published, I believe, in pamphlet form—writes from the standpoint of simple Theism. She has faith in a living and righteous God, and in the survival of the human soul after death; and she registers the disastrous changes which, according to her opinion, would follow from the downfall even of that much of Religion.

In the "triangular duel" (so to call it) between Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Frederic Harrison, and Mr. Justice Stephen, some months ago, the two former flutter before us Will-o'-the-wisp phantoms of a delightful future for humanity on earth, with which, however, we personally can have no association; and the last propounds an equivalent to the Epicurean doctrine, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." According to Mr. Justice Stephen, this "is a very good world if it would only last." It is easy for a prosperous man to write in that way, but his words can find no response or acknowledgment from the suffering mass of mankind, whose life is made up of toil and pain, or from those either who cannot and who would not force themselves out of sympathy with the multitudes that dwell in darkness and in the shadow of death; but this same philosopher confesses that "If Christian theology were exploded, Christian charity would not survive it."

A similar confession of the inutility of science and philosophy to supply sustaining promise and power for moral life, breaks forth from the writer of "Natural Religion." That writer's Trinity of Religion—the Religion of Nature, of Humanity, and of Beauty—is an unpractical fancy, and in the close of his book he seems to sink down suddenly to the conviction that his system is vain and worthless, that the supernaturalism which he had striven to eliminate from Religion may "be precious, nay perhaps indispensable as a supplement to his naturalism." "No sooner," he says, "do we try to think that the known and the natural can suffice for human life, than Pessimism raises its head. The more our thoughts widen and deepen as the universe grows upon us, the more petrifying is the contrast of our own insignificance. A moral paralysis creeps upon us. Good and evil, right and wrong, become infinitesimal

ephemeral matters, whilst eternity and infinity remain attributes of that only which is outside morality." He appears like the designer and maker of the imitation living man in Mrs. Shelley's weird fancy of Frankenstein, as ready and anxious to destroy the hideous mockery which he had called into being.

But, finally, to put the question to the test of our practical opportunities of observation and judgment: if we bring ourselves into continuous and close contact with the sins and the sorrows of humanity, in the actual effort to sanctify and to soothe, the conviction will press in more and more upon us, that if we should go forth as mere moral philosophers we should make no headway against the army of vice and degration in front of us, and bring no blessed light into the abyss of grief and suffering, out of which human agony instinctively cries for some message of comfort and relief. We should feel weaponless in the face of wickedness, and dumb in the dreadful presence of crushed and broken hearts. We see but scanty evidence of a developed formation of cells and fibres of the brain in the direction of Morality, and very little fitness for contentment or incentive to self-sacrifice, as arising from "an effective and awe-inspiring vision of the human lot," without Religion. If we let drop from our hands "the sword of the Spirit," the Word of God, which is "quick and powerful, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart;" if our tongues no more may echo the voice from heaven, "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life," then may we abandon the conflict, and in the awful darkness of men without God and without hope, go on day by day in despair and misery, with the "Dead March" of Pessimism pouring its mournful minor tones upon our ears, to the goal of Nothingness; to the corruption which is our father, and the worm which is our mother; to the grave which is to engulph and hide away for ever our objectless and meaningless and incomprehensible existence.

A. D. MACNAMARA.

ART. V.—BREMEN TO NEW YORK.

NOTES ON THE VOYAGE.

WE left Bremerhaven on Wednesday, October 22nd, at 1 p.m., in the *Fulda*, and my first impressions of the steamer and those connected with it may be gained from some words addressed to my wife on the following day, on a postal