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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is characteristic, both of Dr. C. J. Cadoux and of the age in which we live, that for each of the six periods which he distinguishes in *The Early Church and the World* (T. & T. Clark; 21s.), there is a special section on the attitude of the Church to war. It is safe to say that no subject studied in this most interesting volume will receive more attention. In 'The Early Christian Attitude to War' (1919), Dr. Cadoux had already dealt with the subject; but in the new volume he treats it on broader and fuller lines.

In discussing the non-resistance passages of Jesus' teaching, he rejects all interpretations which emasculate these epoch-making pronouncements. To say that we are to regard not the letter but the spirit of the words, usually means, according to Dr. Cadoux, simply that we refuse to accept the teaching. No more helpful is the suggestion that the dicta of Jesus would apply only in a perfect society; for in a perfect society, whence would come the wrongs that have to be 'non-resisted'?

Nor is it the case that Jesus was thinking only of our attitude as individuals, not of our duty as citizens, with the citizen's responsibility for the punishment of wrong-doing. In point of fact, it was the State or its representatives that imposed the forced labour, which was one of the cases of injury Jesus warned His hearers not to resist. 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth' was no mere legalizing of private revenge; it was a regularizing of public justice. Yet Jesus mentions it only to forbid its application.

Further, there is no need to be content with negatives in describing Jesus' conception of the Godlike attitude to those who wrong us. In the Temptation He definitely rejected the method of advancing His plans by political means; not that the result would not have been altogether for the good of mankind, but that Jesus had a horror of compulsion and bloodshed. Dr. Cadoux mentions with respect the Rev. S. Liberty's interpretation of the three Temptations as 'symbolical experiences in which Jesus, as representative of Israel, successively rejects the three Jewish attitudes to Rome, the Sadducaic (material security), the Pharisaic (narrow Messianism), and the Herodian (unprincipled compromise).'

In the very early history of the Church, the question of Christian service for soldiers can hardly have arisen in any practical way. Jews were by law disqualified from service in the imperial armies. Gentile freemen and freedmen, who became Christians, would hardly ever be called on to serve. Throughout the New Testament, soldiers play varied rôles, as reverently appreciative of the Master and His followers, as friendly or unfriendly

agents of the enemies of the Christ and the Christians; but when a Cornelius or a Philippian gaoler becomes a Christian, it does not seem to occur to any one that he should abandon his profession.

When the question did arise as a problem in Christian casuistry, there were several factors at work to prevent the influence of Jesus having its full fruition. One of these was the Old Testament conception of Jehovah as a God of war, and the orders He was believed to have given for the bloody expulsion of the Canaanites. The theory of evolution has come to the relief of the modern Christian conscience, with its suggestion that such conceptions of God were a necessary stage in the spiritual education of Israel. The first Christians apparently saw no problem here; both Stephen (Ac 7^{45}) and Paul (Ac 13^{19}) referred with pride to the conquest of Canaan, and soldiers have an honourable place in the roll of heroes of Heb 11. When the element of blood in the Old Testament began to offend the conscience of the Christians, they had not at their disposal the category of evolution, and found a way out by spiritualizing unwelcome passages.

Again, the Messianic wars played a large part in the apocalypses, even of the Christian Church. Paul, too (apparently), introduced the habit, differing in this from Jesus, of drawing his metaphors largely from warfare. Eph $6^{12\text{-}18}$ is the best known example, but they occur again and again. It is easy to say that these are only metaphors; but Harnack has warned us of the power that warlike metaphors have to produce a bellicose frame of mind. Are we quite certain that it is only spiritual warfare that is encouraged by the singing of such hymns as 'Onward, Christian Soldiers'? It is significant that 'pagan' (a civilian as opposed to a soldier) came to be the technical Christian term for a non-Christian.

There can be no question that the increasing antipathy of Christians to military service was due to their growing horror of violence and bloodshed. Yet, as Harnack has shown, the ethics of a military career for a Christian was in the early days a far more complicated question than might at first sight appear; the pacifist problem for the Christians of the early centuries is not quite the same as ours.

To begin with, emperor worship, which so early became a test question for Christians, would naturally come to a head in the army. A soldier, also, had to take the oath of allegiance. Even if Jesus had not forbidden the use of oaths, the Christians had 'another king, one Jesus,' loyalty to whom might be incompatible with loyalty to Cæsar. In peace time, then as now, the soldier was not regarded as a model of all the virtues, and it was doubtless harder then than now for a Christian soldier to 'keep straight.'

The position of the Christian officer was peculiarly difficult: he had to take a leading part in the heathen sacrifices, and had to administer discipline, it might be torture or even crucifixion, to delinquent comrades. We must not, of course, imagine that the Christians saw from the first all that was involved. Simple, unreflecting men doubtless in many cases saw no harm in continuing in their profession, especially as they could quote in their favour Paul's advice to the Christians of Corinth, that each man should remain in the station in which he was called. It would often be difficult or dangerous for a soldier to quit the army for religious reasons, and in any case there was a subtle and not unspiritual pleasure in seeing the banner of Christ flying in the camp of Belial.

Certain steps in the changing story of the early Christian attitude to war can be more or less definitely dated. At least till the year 110, no extant Christian writing definitely takes up the position that the military calling is incompatible with the profession of Christianity. On the other hand, there is no undoubted reference to any Christian soldier for one hundred and twenty years after the conversion of Cornelius.

In the Christian writers of the second century,

there is a manifest glorying in the peace of Christ, a definite repulsion to bloodshed in whatever cause. That, long before the end of the century, Christian soldiers had begun to be converted, seems to be clearly shown by the story of the rain miracle wrought by the Christian soldiers of the Legio Fulminata about 173. Whatever we may think of the miracle, the existence of the Christian soldiers seems to be proved.

Even down to the middle of the third century, Christian writers give a tacit approval to war, though not necessarily to the participation of Christians in war. Tertullian, pacifist as he was, was specially partial to military metaphors; and Dr. CADOUX thinks that the use of the Latin word (*sacramentum*) for the soldier's oath, to indicate the sacred ceremonies of the Church, facilitated the development of the military conception of Christianity.

Evidence is presented to show that in the period 180–250 there were considerable numbers of Christian soldiers in the imperial armies. But the question of the Christian attitude to war was now seriously and formally discussed; and Tertullian was clear that 'the very act of transferring one's name from the camp of light to the camp of darkness is a transgression.' The Lord 'in disarming Peter ungirded every soldier.' Nor could a pagan soldier who turned Christian remain in the army without unworthy compromise with his conscience.

By the beginning of the third century there were Christian soldiers in the army who had joined it after conversion. In the latter part of this century Christian writers speak of the military profession with sympathy and respect, and when Christians prayed for the emperor they had an eye to his civil security and military efficiency as well as to his soul's salvation. By the time of Constantine, the Christian pacifist trumpet gave forth a very uncertain sound. The Synod of Arelate in 314 definitely sanctioned, if it did not actually encourage, the choice of the military profession for Christians. The Church was now well on the way to the bloody evangelism of Charlemagne, and the holocausts of Christians and Mussulmans that were offered in the name of Jesus during the Crusades.

All students of the Gospels have long ago become accustomed to the idea that the First and Third Gospels are based on earlier documents, of which the Gospel according to Mark is one. The opinion seems to be gaining ground that in the Fourth Gospel also different strata can be recognized, whether or no these strata represent written documents. The conception of the Second Gospel as a composite is less familiar.

Professor BACON of Yale, who has made the Second Gospel peculiarly his own, tells us in *The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date* (reviewed under 'Literature'), he is convinced that the author or editor of this Gospel used in its composition earlier Greek documents. Moreover, that author or editor was not the John Mark we know, and the Gospel according to Mark does not mean the Gospel written by Mark, but the Gospel as it used to be preached by Mark.

Why does Professor BACON think so? According to Col 4^{10}, Mark was the cousin of Barnabas. Assuming that this was the John Mark who was the son of Mary of Jerusalem and the companion in travel of Paul and Barnabas, he may reasonably be supposed to have had a wide and intimate knowledge of the persons and places mentioned in the Gospel story.

Yet, according to Professor BACON, the author of the Second Gospel is very hazy about the geography of Palestine, though he acknowledges that the data on which this conclusion is based are somewhat uncertain. The author, again, is quite at sea about Antipas, and his relations with Herodias, Salome her daughter, and John the Baptist. But the most striking feature of all is his apparent

ignorance of persons, about whom the merest crumbs of knowledge would have been treasured by the Church.

Surely John Mark would have told us more of Peter and Andrew, of James and John, to say nothing of the rest of the Twelve. Surely he would have had something more to say of the family circle of Jesus than that they called Jesus mad, and tried to divert Him from His work, and that Jesus found no honour among them.

It is not only ignorance of, or indifference to, the personages of the sacred story, that is so striking in the Second Gospel. Professor BACON finds, in the references to the first followers of Jesus, a tone almost of hostility. Right down to the denial by Peter, the Twelve cherish selfish and unworthy ambitions, and remain callous and obdurate to Jesus' exposition of His mission. 'If there were a single incident recorded, whether of Peter or of any other of the Apostles, or a single word were said of Jesus' mother and brethren, to relieve the evangelist's portraiture of its most sinister features, or to place the characters in a more favourable light, we should receive a different impression of his attitude. But there is none' (p. 305).

Different people will interpret the data differently. To some, the obtuseness attributed to Peter and the other Apostles in Mark will appear as the remorse of loving disciples, looking back on the story from a later day and wondering at their blindness. For many, the comparative indifference shown with reference to the story of Mary the mother of Jesus and James His brother, of the Twelve and others of whom we should gladly have known more, will find its adequate explanation in the conviction of the early Church that a 'gospel' is the story of Jesus and of Jesus only, that the life-history of all others, however dear and revered, is only incidental to the story of the Master.

However that may be, the conclusion drawn by Professor BACON is that the Second Gospel was the product of a Church (Rome) which was far removed both in time and space from all possibility of first-hand information as to the facts, and which had developed a certain hostility to the Jerusalem leaders. Genuine reminiscences of Peter, as often repeated by Mark, underlie the narrative; but the book as we have it is based on earlier documents, which were written in Greek, though at some stage in their history they may have been translated from Aramaic.

The author of Mark used the special source of Luke, at least in one of its forms. He was acquainted also with Q, the double tradition material found both in the First and Third Gospels. If Mark did not make great use of this 'teaching' material the reason was not that he was ignorant of it; but he was more interested in what Jesus did and in what happened to Him than in the code of morals that He taught. To Him Christianity was not a Law to be obeyed, but a Way of Eternal Life.

Professor BACON, then, rejects *in toto* the later attempt of Harnack to put Luke-Acts before the death of Paul, and Mark necessarily earlier still. He is confirmed in this conclusion by the consideration that, by the time the Second Gospel reached its present form, practically all trace of the order of events in the ministry of Jesus had been lost. It is true that what little we know of the chronology of Jesus' life we learn from Mark, but that little is very little indeed, far less than it would have been had the author ever had direct contact with Peter.

In asserting for our Second Gospel a date well beyond the Fall of Jerusalem, say 75, Professor BACON, in this agreeing with Wellhausen, relies chiefly on the Doom Chapter (13). It was in this chapter that Canon Streeter, following Gould and others, found evidence that the Gospel was written *before* the Fall of Jerusalem. How does Professor BACON deal with the chapter?

In Mk 13^{14}, Jesus is represented as saying that one day the Abomination (*Shiqqutz*) of Desolation

will stand 'where he ought not.' This is apparently a prophecy of a desecration of the Temple, a desecration which, in fact, never took place. It is open to us, then, to believe that Jesus made a mistaken prophecy; Professor BACON prefers the other alternative: that the prophecy was wrongly ascribed to Him.

In that case we can date exactly the origin of this saying which was afterwards mistakenly attributed to Jesus. The Abomination of Desolation of Dn 9^{27} (in the Hebrew there is a punning reference to the 'heavenly' Zeus whose worship Antiochus was trying to introduce) was the heathen altar with which, in 168 B.C., Antiochus Epiphanes for a time desecrated the temple of Jehovah. We have to look for a period in the early history of the Church when Jew and Christian had grave reason to fear just such another desecration of the Temple.

As it happens, this exactly describes the situation in the year 39–40. At that time, all Judæa lived in horrified expectation of a renewal by the mad emperor Caligula of the sacrilege of Antiochus, over two hundred years earlier. With the assassination of Caligula on January 24, 41, the danger passed away. We can therefore date the prophecy within a few months.

This kind of 'sign and portent' prophecy, which was alien to the spirit of Jesus and, according to Montefiore, even of the Rabbis, exactly suited the temper of the year 39–40; nor does it seem likely that a later generation would originate a prophecy which was already known to have been falsified. It is true that we have been inclined hitherto to associate such prophecies rather with the time preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. But, as Professor BACON points out, we are wrong in assuming, largely under the influence of Josephus, that the Siege and Fall of Jerusalem had the same significance for the Christians of the time that they have for us in retrospect.

For Paul and the Christian judgment of his time, the day of grace was over for the Jews in 42, when they rejoiced at Agrippa's violent attack on the Church leaders. The sudden death of Agrippa in 44, the famine of 45–46, and the complete subjection to Rome that followed the insurrection under Theudas in 44–45 were the answer of God to the treatment of the Christians by the Jews.

Is there any other trace in the New Testament of this prophecy of 39–40? In 1 Th $4^{15\text{-}17}$ there is a Little Apocalypse, not at all like a genuine utterance of Jesus, which is nevertheless styled a 'word of the Lord.' Presumably it was a declaration of a Christian 'prophet' who believed he was inspired by 'the Lord.' In 2 Thessalonians there are other apocalyptic passages which, in their vindictiveness, represent the spirit neither of Jesus nor of Paul, and which are therefore presumably taken from some current apocalypse.

It is very tempting to suppose that this apocalypse, quoted by Paul in the year 50, is the same as Mark had at his disposal. In 2 Th 2^{2}, Paul uses exactly the same expression as Mark uses in 13^{7}: 'Do not be alarmed.' The object in both is to tell their hearers to keep their courage up: the end is not yet.

But in 2 Thessalonians a new feature is introduced into Apocalyptic, the Man of Sin. The Christ is to be faced with a Mock Christ, an Antichrist; the Mystery of Redemption is to be parodied by a Mystery of Anarchy. Moreover, we meet in 2 Th 2^{6} the ever-recurring feature of eschatology; the End is postponed. There is 'something that restrains.'

All this reflects the actual historical situation. The Profanation of the Temple expected under Caligula did not take place. Claudius, who succeeded to the throne so unexpectedly on the assassination of Caligula, by his policy of extraordinary favour to the Jews, acted as a Restrainer. (As Hitzig pointed out, 'that which restrains' in 2 Th 2^{6} may be a punning reference to Claudius, the Restrainer, from *claudere*, 'to restrain.') We know, how-

ever, that Paul did not expect the destruction of the Temple; he even believed that the Lawless one would 'take his seat in the temple of God' (2 Th 2^4).

Mark agrees with Paul in representing the End as postponed. The End will not take place till after the appearance of many false Christs and the proclamation of the gospel to all the nations. He agrees with Paul also that the Abomination of Desolation is to be a person ('standing where *he* ought not'; Matthew silently replaces the masculine by a neuter), not a heathen altar or idol.

But there is this marked difference between Paul and the Second Gospel, and here is the sign of the much later date of the latter. Mark says the Abomination is to stand 'where he ought not.' Why this vague phrase? Because, says Professor BACON, the author, writing after the Fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of its Temple, knows that the defilement prophesied did not take place, and now can never take place. If the prophecy was ever to be fulfilled, some other location had to be found for it.

This conclusion is confirmed by a reference to the treatment of this feature in Mark's apocalypse by the later Synoptists. Matthew also knows that the prophecy of Daniel was not, and now can never be, literally fulfilled; so he introduces a subtle alteration. The defilement will take place, not in *the* holy place, but in *a* holy place (24^{15}); that is to say, Matthew finds the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy in the desecration of a synagogue in Cæsarea, from which Josephus dated the outbreak of the war of 66–70. Luke, with the same problem to face, has another solution, and states it more explicitly. For him the Abomination of Desolation is the sight of Vespasian's armies encompassing the Holy City (21^{20}). In their treatment of the prophecy, all three, Professor BACON believes, were looking back on the event.

Miss Evelyn UNDERHILL stands in the very front rank as an interpreter of mysticism to the English-speaking world. She has all the qualities of head and heart necessary for that somewhat elusive task. She writes from the inside—not as one who has acquired her subject, but as one who has long lived and moved and had her being within it; and her special studies of some of the English, Flemish, and Italian mystics remind us that, in reading her books, we are listening to one who speaks with the authority of first-hand knowledge.

It is therefore with peculiar pleasure that we welcome her new book on *The Mystics of the Church* (James Clarke; 6s. net). The very title is arresting. For to many people mysticism suggests an individualism which cares little for the corporate consciousness, in however noble or vital a form it may happen to be expressed. The mystic is supposed to go his lonely way, enjoying his own solitary experience and reckless of his heavy obligation to society or the Church. Miss UNDERHILL conclusively shows that this description is very far from being applicable to all the mystics. They were neither spiritual freaks nor free-lances. The Friends of God, she reminds us, were and desired to remain faithful members of the Catholic Church; they 'never broke with institutional religion, and seem to have felt peculiar reverence for the sacraments,' while Ruysbroeck, 'the most transcendental of all mystics, highly valued corporate and sacramental religion.'

There are those, of course, to whom the mystic and his ways are hopelessly uncongenial. In a book published two years ago appears the following drastic criticism from the pen of Paul Elmer More: 'As for emotional values, one cannot read the lives of the great and little mystics without being impressed by the constantly recurring association of the ecstatic experience with ill-health, mental derangement, sodden stupidity, morbid excitability, moral degeneracy, downright criminality, erotic mania. . . . The record is too clear and too disastrous; mysticism of the Plotinian type is

almost certain evidence of a physical or mental or moral taint somewhere in the devotee.' Miss UNDERHILL'S winsome presentation of the mystics is an admirable corrective of this unduly fierce and sweeping estimate.

Not that she ignores the facts—she is too conscientious for that. She tells us frankly of the ill-health of Hildegard and Madame Acarie, of Peter of Alcantara's 'ferocious and almost unbelievable asceticism,' of the 'severe and indeed savage asceticism' practised by Suso and his 'starved human affections,' of the naturally good health of Catherine of Siena which had been injured by austerities, of St. John of the Cross 'prizing the hours of aridity and interior darkness more than those of conscious communion, because these bring "diminished satisfaction with self."' She knows better than most the morbid and unbalanced features that have sometimes disfigured the mystical temperament, but she makes us feel, for all that, how human and even how lovable the mystics were.

Here, *e.g.*, is the picture of Angela of Foligno in her unregenerate days, drawn by herself: 'I diligently made an outward show of being poor, but caused many sheets and coverings to be put where I lay down to sleep, and to be taken up in the morning so that none might see them.' And here is part of an amusing criticism of the mannerisms of his fellow-religious by the author of 'The Cloud of Unknowing': 'Some persons are so cumbered in nice curious customs in bodily bearing that when they shall ought to hear, they writhe their heads on one side quaintly, and up with the chin, they gape with their mouths as they should hear with their mouths and not with their ears. Some can neither sit still, stand still, nor lie still, unless they be either wagging with their feet or else somewhat doing with their hands. Some row with their arms in time of their speaking, as them needed for to swim over a great water. Some be ever more smiling and laughing at every other word that they speak, as they were giggling girls and nice japing jugglers lacking behaviour.'

Here, again, is a piece of plain and practical speaking—from words of St. Teresa to her pupils: 'What is the good, my daughters, of being deeply recollected in solitude, and multiplying acts of love, and promising our Lord to do wonders in His service, if, when we come out of our prayer, the least thing makes us do the exact opposite?' If the heads of such mystics were in heaven, their feet were on terra firma. There is repeated reference to their love of children and the interests of children: we see it in Hilton, in Julian of Norwich, in Madame Acarie, who 'would always break off her ecstasies to join in her children's games,' and in Lucie Christine, who 'entered completely into her children's interests and amusements, wrote and staged the plays which they acted, welcomed their friends.'

Nor can the mystics, as a whole, be fairly charged with indifference to, or impotence in, the affairs of practical life; many of them have a record of magnificent achievement as workers or organizers. St. Bernard and St. Catherine of Siena exercised considerable influence on the politics of their time, St. Catherine of Genoa undertook the most repulsive duties among the sick poor, to cure herself of her natural fastidiousness. Classic expression was given to this aspect of mysticism by Eckhart when he said, 'Were one in a rapture like that of St. Paul and a sick man needed help, it were better to come out of the rapture and show love by serving him who had need.' In later days Woolman's crusade against slavery illustrates the same point.

The following eloquent sentence, descriptive of the career of St. Teresa, shows how crowded with affairs the life of a mystic could be: 'To write a series of works which are at once among the glories of Spanish literature, and the best and most exact of guides to the mysteries of the inner life; to practise and describe with an unequalled realism, the highest degrees of prayer and contemplation; to found numerous convents in the face of apparently insuperable difficulties; to reform a great religious Order in spite of the opposition of those

pious conservatives whom she was accustomed to call pussy-cats; to control at once the financial and spiritual situations of her enterprise, and to do all this in spite of persistent ill-health in a spirit of unfailing common-sense, of gaiety, of dedicated love—this, which is far from exhausting the list of St. Teresa's activities, seems a sufficient programme for one soul.'

Again, one is repeatedly struck by the adventurousness and sheer heroism of the mystics, both men and women—*e.g.* of Madame Martin who in the seventeenth century went to Canada as an educational and religious pioneer; of the scholar-mystic Henry Martyn who in his short life left his mark upon the East; and not least, of the intrepid Vicomte Charles de Foucauld, saint of the Sahara, whose career is a romance as thrilling as it is pathetic.

All these heroic and capable spirits drew their strength from a source beyond this world. One of the many services which Miss UNDERHILL renders us is that, besides presenting a fascinating picture of the kind of people the mystics were, and the manner of life they lived and work they did, she defines very clearly and carefully what mysticism, that vaguely understood term, really is. 'It is the direct intuition and experience of God.' And more, she maintains—surely justly—that this is the very soul of religion. What the mystics enjoy in supreme measure, every truly religious person must experience in some measure, and 'every human soul has a certain latent capacity for God.'

It is good to enter through these sympathetic pages into the mind and the experience of the great mystics, like Augustine, Suso, Ruysbroeck, Boehme; but Miss UNDERHILL helps us no less by the glimpses she gives us into the lives of mystics less well known than these mighty ones, and almost more by reminding us that it is to an experience of God analogous to theirs that we are all called, and that our life, like theirs, is strong only as it responds to the great Reality. In a striking phrase she speaks once of *the merely active Christian*: we know the type too well—the busy life whose roots do not go very deep. But by communion with the mystics, whose lives were hidden in God, she encourages us to remember that 'the merely active Christian can realize the actuality of the world of spirit, and even catch something of their fire.'

We have travelled far from the days when well-meaning ladies from the West End went slumming and zealously distributed tracts. We have outgrown the idea that haphazard charity, in the old narrow sense of that much abused word, is an adequate response to social evils. We have reached the position, in theory at least, that social evils must be grappled with in a more radical way, that the economic and moral welfare of the worker must come first, and that the supreme concern is not the amassing of wealth, but the organization and maintenance of an industrious, healthy, and happy people. This ideal is assiduously preached in press and pulpit, and is variously set forth in a never-ending stream of books on sociology. Yet, when all is said, it remains true that very little has been yet done to equip and train systematically an army of social workers, capable of giving practical effect to this ideal in an intelligent and scientific way.

In *The Equipment of the Social Worker*, by Elizabeth MACADAM, M.A. (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), a strong plea is put forward for a more adequate provision of such training. New types of public service have arisen, and a great deal of social work is done, but the delicacy of the operations which involve an interference with the social habits of the people or with industrial conditions is not obvious to the ordinary person, and the need for training makes little appeal to the average member of a governing body. 'Twenty years ago it was argued that a spirit of love and devotion was the best equipment for social services, and in some quarters the notion that scientific training will kill

the missionary spirit still prevails. The application of economic and philosophical theories to practical social organization, from law-making at Westminster down to the handling of individual human lives, is barely even now realized, and economists and philosophers are still too often segregated in their academic fastnesses, while the men of action muddle and tinker in the world outside. Any one who can command sufficient votes may be elected as a "guardian of the poor," with at best only a nodding acquaintance with the immense range of the Poor Laws, or of the effect on human character and happiness of their good or bad administration.'

In these circumstances it was inevitable that social legislation should not be so intelligently conceived nor so efficiently administered as it might have been. Great opportunities have, in consequence, been lost. In the early years of the century constructive ideas with regard to the prevention and cure of poverty began slowly to bear fruit in social legislation. New standards of public health, housing conditions, and security of employment, treatment of the criminal, moral, and social hygiene, led to an unprecedented series of enactments which continued almost until the outbreak of war. But the carrying out of these new schemes was for the most part entrusted to those without special preparation, and it is impossible not to think that with a better trained service the results would have been more commensurate with the vast expenditure.

Still more tragic was the waste of a second even greater opportunity during the years immediately succeeding the War. The talk of 'reconstruction' led to lofty expectations among men and women who had found an outlet for ability and devotion during the War, and who now turned with eagerness to the possibilities of the 'war against poverty.' But, unfortunately, these hopes were frustrated by the dictates of a spurious economy. 'To-day, for the third time, we find ourselves at the cross-roads. Better counsels are beginning to prevail with regard to the real extravagance of nominal economies in administration. Whatever the party colour of the Government in power, a thorough overhauling and extension of our social services in the near future seems inevitable.'

But even if these predicted reforms should fail to materialize, whether we like it or not we are moving swiftly towards far-reaching economic changes. 'If there is cause for disquietude in the extent of the powers affecting human lives already vested in officials, many of whom are but inadequately trained, the almost certain extension of those powers in the not far distant future gives rise to even graver apprehension.' Take the case of housing. Doubtless the officials are chosen with a due regard to their technical qualifications as architects, surveyors, or engineers. 'But is there any reason to suppose that they are necessarily qualified by previous study or experience to realize the vast economic and social implications of the whole policy of State and rate-aided housing, or that they are even acquainted with the history and developments of housing legislation in this and in other countries?'

The remedy can only be found in the extension of systematic study of social and economic problems in a school where theory and practice meet. It is to the Universities we must look to provide such schools, where social workers, from the highly paid official to the rescue worker, the Church sister or Salvation Army lass, may be better equipped for their services to the community. University control would provide a guarantee against the very real danger of political or other forms of propaganda. 'Social politics are tending more and more to become party politics. Research will be increasingly undertaken by political parties; the education of the citizen will be conducted by schools equipped with party funds. Such political research departments are already to be found, and colleges, summer schools, etc., associated with the three parties have been established. We do not quarrel with these tendencies; they are healthy signs of the

times. But it is to the universities we ought to be able to look in these days of economic transition for the scientific and undogmatic inquiry and study which will unite those of widely different religious, social, or political creeds in the common service of the community.'

In all this the Christian Church has a vital interest. Numerous charities are administered by the clergy, while institutional churches are centres of extensive social and educational activities. 'It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that knowledge of social conditions and some grasp of social economics is necessary only for the poor parish. It is required by the preacher to the fashionable West End congregation for his cure of souls as much if not more than by the hard-worked incumbent in the East End. Christian teaching in the pulpit cannot be separated from Christian practice, and the preacher who possesses some grasp of social economics coupled with practical experience will move and convince when the solely sensational appeal will irritate and harden.'

On the other hand, the Church has her own special contribution to make in transfusing social service with the spirit of Christian charity in its original and noblest sense, without which it inevitably becomes hard and mechanical. In American schools of social study 'case work' and 'case analysis' have an ugly prominence. We may not relish the American terminology, but any one familiar with the administration of the Poor Law knows that all too easily the 'case' spirit creeps in and gradually becomes dominant. It is the mission of the Church to combat such a spirit, and to inspire legislators, administrators, and all social workers with that respect for humanity and that spirit of brotherhood without which all hope of a Christian social order is vain.

America is fortunate in the number of its business men who devote a proportion of their fortune to the cause of enlightenment. There is a number of highly endowed lectureships which have attracted men from all parts of the world to give of their best, and the result has often been an increase of knowledge and the enlargement of the kingdom of truth. The latest of these foundations is the Dwight Harrington Terry lectureship at Yale University. The founder was Mr. D. H. Terry of Plymouth, Connecticut, who left $100,000 to endow a course for the purpose of assimilating the truths of science and philosophy with the structure of a broadened and purified religion. No tests are applied to the lecturers, the only condition of their appointment being that they should be eminent in their own department, and the only aim of the appointment being that it should promote a liberalized religion which might minister to the advancement of the race.

The first appointment has been that of Professor J. Arthur THOMSON, M.A., LL.D., of Aberdeen University (a well-deserved compliment), and the first series of lectures is on the relation of evolution to religion. The title is *Concerning Evolution* (Milford; 11s. 6d. net). Professor THOMSON is a peculiarly happy choice, because he is one of the most eminent of living scientists in his own field, and because he is at the same time a religious man. If anything the accent is on the scientific side, and the lecturer is jealous of any invasion that is unwarranted from the religious side of the line. But the attitude of mind throughout the argument is so carefully honest to both sides that the reader cannot but feel complete confidence in his guide.

There are three lectures in the volume, one on the evolution of the worlds, a second on organic evolution (the development of life), and the third on the evolution of man. Taking the argument as a whole we may describe it as a statement of the case for evolution as a mode of development. This Professor THOMSON regards as a fact established beyond dispute. But it is only the fact of evolution as the mode of 'becoming' that is established. This says nothing, of course, of origins, and nothing

of interpretation. The theory of evolution is a descriptive theory of the way things have come to be what they are. And even here much is uncertain. The fact is sure, the *factors* are many of them doubtful.

Perhaps the best way in which we may present Professor THOMSON's contribution to the reconciliation of science and religion will be to state first what, in his view, is the gist of Darwinism, and then to indicate his own hints of religious interpretation. It is interesting to have the main Darwinian theory summarized with the beautiful clearness of these lectures. It consists of four facts. The first is the *Web of Life*, the correlation of organisms, the linkages binding one living creature to another in a vital economy. Nature is a fabric. This is one of the central ideas of Darwinism, and many vivid instances of it are given in the lectures.

The second fundamental idea of Darwinism is that of the *Struggle for Existence*. This does not mean only a jostling and elbowing round the platter of life, like pigs at a trough. It means also the struggle of parents to protect their young. It includes mutual aid like that among ants. Huxley's description of Nature as 'a vast gladiatorial show' is false. The struggle in Nature is for well-being, not only one's own but that of others. As Herbert Spencer put it, 'From the dawn of life altruism has been no less essential than egoism.' Professor THOMSON says that 'self-regarding activities do not cover more than half of animal life.' Hunger and love are equally at work in evolution. And the struggle for existence has been essential both for making and securing progress.

The third great idea in Darwinism is *Variability*, the mysterious welling-up of novelties, so that children may differ from their parents. These variations are the raw material of evolution and present the hardest problem in biology. The fourth idea of Darwinism is *Natural Selection, i.e.* the sifting of these new departures referred to. Nature goes on the principle, 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.' Living creatures answer back to their environment. That is the struggle for existence. But there are endless variations that can be entailed on the off-spring. An advantageous variation means a favourable start. There are qualities with survival value, and Nature sifts these out. The sieves are the quest for food, the physical environment (such as temperature, pressure, habitat, and so on), the existence of competitors, courtship, and other conditions like these. Nature's sifting is complex and thorough.

Such is Darwinism. What about its bearing on religious belief? Well, Professor THOMSON points out many ways in which Nature exhibits the appearance of being 'thought out.' There are, for example, elaborate preparations to make the earth a home for life. Even inorganic Nature looks as if it is what it is 'with a purpose.' Then there is the upward trend. What we have to deal with is a constant ascent. Further, there is the fact that the end is always in the beginning. If mind is the outcome of natural evolution, then 'there is no way, even if we wished, of escaping the conclusion that what we call material is also psychical. . . . Therefore we say, in the beginning was the Logos; in the beginning was Mind.'

Professor THOMSON believes that throughout the inorganic world there is a 'metakinetic' aspect, the analogue of 'mind,' which struggles for expression in plants and in the lower animals, and finds a considerable degree of freedom in the higher reaches of life, notably among birds and mammals. This, it will be remembered, was a prominent idea in his Gifford Lectures on 'The System of Animate Nature,' and it is obviously one of the ways in which he interprets Nature religiously, in which he sees 'the hand of God.'

But in addition to all this there are strong reasons why religious people should welcome evolution as a modal theory. It gives the world a unity when we recognize man as the crown of Nature. It

gives more meaning to the groaning and travailing of Creation when we see that the outcome was man. There is fresh interest in the elaborateness of the intricate economy of Nature when we understand part of it at least as the foundation which has rendered man possible. Moreover, there are discomfiting features in every man which become more intelligible when we recognize them as anachronisms inherited from a *distant* ancestry. The evolutionist interpretation makes both the good and ill in the mingled yarn of life more understandable.

Professor THOMSON is very cautious in his statements on the religious side. We think he might perhaps have gone even further than he has done on his own premises. But the very caution of a scientific man who believes is in the end an asset and will have more influence on those to whom science presents real difficulties in the way of belief.

Some Misunderstood Psalms.

BY PROFESSOR ADAM C. WELCH, D.D., D.TH., NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

I.

PSALM LXXXVIII.

BAETHGEN regards the psalm as a community hymn, in which personified Israel speaks, and he assigns it to the Exile, when the people could regard their life as at an end, and themselves as beyond the reach of Yahweh (v.[6]). The only real support for this view is to be found in v.[5b], where the writer speaks of himself as a man destitute of power. No individual, Baethgen thinks, could describe himself as 'like a man,' though a community could. That would have force, if the speaker said he was like a man. It has none, since what he does say is that he has become like an impotent man and continues with the addition that he is already as good as dead.

Further, to regard this as a community psalm, admitted to the psalter by the priesthood in the period of the Exile, does not agree very well with the conception we are generally asked to form as to the attitude of that time. In the Exile it is as a rule supposed that the priests were diligently preparing the code which was to govern the life of the community, so soon as it had returned to Zion and reconstituted the temple worship. So confident were they of the future. Yet at the same time they adopted into their psalter a hymn which is unique in the national literature in that it is wholly destitute of hope. Did the priests, who were bending all their energies to foster a Zionist movement, damp it down in this fashion?

The hymn can only be construed as the utterance of an individual, who was suffering from severe (v.[8]), dangerous (v.[4]), and long-continued (v.[16]) sickness. He is so reduced that he is impotent and as good as dead (v.[5]), indeed, he can think of himself as already dwelling in Sheol (v.[7]). His sickness is regarded by himself and all his world as the evidence of God's peculiar anger (vv.[8. 17]). As such, it has made him תועבה, an object of horror (v.[9]), and therefore hateful to Yahweh and Israel.[1] He is shunned by all his fellows (v.[9]), even by his dearest friends (v.[19]). He is כלא, isolated (v.[10]); and this, like the similar word עצור in Jer 36[5], probably implies incapacity to take part in public worship. The entire description agrees, as Kittel recognizes, with leprosy, and with nothing else. Leprosy was regarded in old Israel as the proof of the Divine anger, and it brought exclusion from the civil and religious life of the nation.[2]

Further, the psalm is a prayer for delivery from sickness, and, as such, has analogies with several other psalms, notably with Ps 38. What, however, is most significant is, not its likeness to, but its distinction from, these other similar hymns. In the first place, the psalm has nothing to say about sin, either by way of confession or by way of prayer for forgiveness. The speaker believes that his sickness is the proof and the outcome of the Divine

[1] Cf. for the specific sense of the word, Dt *e.g.* 12[31] 14[3].

[2] For the law, cf. Lev 13[46]; for the practice, cf. 2 K 7[3] 15[5].