

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 *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php

Founded 1883
No. 296

OCTOBER, 1917

Fifth Series
No. 28

NOV 7 1917
The
**London Quarterly
Review.**

Contents.

THE MORALIZATION OF RELIGION Principal F. T. Foreyth, M.A., D.D.
A GOSSIP ABOUT CLERICAL BIOGRAPHY George Jackson, B.A.
LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE Emile Boutroux (trans. by Fred Rothwell)
THE FALSE DECRETALS W. Ernest Best, M.A., D.Lit.
WESLEY'S STANDARDS IN THE LIGHT OF TO-DAY

H. Makiwya Hughes, B.A., D.D.

THE WAR IN PARAGUAY

E. E. Kallet, M.A.

THE PROSECUTION OF OUR LORD

H. C. Hawkin.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

W. H. Griffith Thomas, D.D.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS—

A POST-STATESMAN'S MESSAGE FOR TO-DAY

Principal W. T. Davison, M.A., D.D.

THE POET OF THE BATS

Arthur Symonds.

A CRITICISM OF GHOSTIC THEORY Henry Strachan, B.A., B.D.

METHODISM AND THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Samuel E. Keeble.

NEW AND RECENT BOOKS: Theological, Historical, War Books, &c.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE: British, American.

London

CHARLES H. KELLY

25-26 CITY ROAD, and 26 PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C. 1

PRICE HALF A CROWN. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, 8s. POST FREE.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

OCTOBER 1917

THE MORALIZATION OF RELIGION

IF we were to carry our thought back for, say, a century of this country's religious life we might mark a succession of influences issuing in movements which could be classified thus. They all mean, of course, the modification in some way of the traditional Christianity. First, there was the effort to *rationalize* faith, whether in the smaller way of the mere critical understanding, or the larger way of the imaginative reason. This was quite necessary in its place. But it was not all that was needed, nor was it the main thing. Accordingly, to balance matters, we had, in the second place, the effort to *spiritualize* religion. The foremost representatives of this were the evangelical and the sacramentarian movements, with which may be coupled the aesthetic and the intuitive, passing at a later date into the whole mystical tendency that is still so strong, and that degenerates into occultism. Thirdly, we had the effort to *humanize* religion—the humanitarian movement, when literature, and especially poetry and fiction, began to tell strongly on faith, not to say on belief, when people took their theology from Tennyson or Browning, or even MacDonald and Whittier, and positive creed was lightly doomed if it collided with the best instincts of the kind heart. Others, with a more scientific bent in their humanism, are engrossed with our mentality rather

than our poetry, and their great desire is that religion should be brought home by being *psychologized*, as a new style of fiction might do it. Fourthly, there arose the effort to *socialize* religion, with all that rich crop of movements which led some to various schemes of Christian socialism, others to social reform, others to attempts to commit the Church to economic remedies and ideas, others to identify the two great types of Church with one or other of the political parties, others to manifold fraternities and fellowships apart from the Church, others to treat the Churches as no more than religious clubs, or to turn their work from evangelistic to social, as in the striking case of the Salvation Army. All this without a clear and ruling grasp of the social idea dominant for Christ—the Kingdom of God. And, fifthly, we have, working through all these but taking a form of its own, the effort to *moralize* faith and belief, to recognise in Christianity the ‘hegemony of the moral,’ the creative centrality of conscience. It makes the moral experience the ruling feature of Christianity as the religion of moral redemption. It means the tendency to treat the moral and not the rational as the real, to recognize, as the principle of all Christian formations and reformations, that Kingdom of God which dominated Christ in life and especially in death. It seeks to reconstruct all the forms of faith, social or intellectual, by that principle as the authority which is intrinsic to Christianity and is not an imported dynasty. It would open Christianity with its own key. It says that we loose with the power that binds. Freedom rests on control. If we are to speak of the reconstruction of belief the first necessity is a reconstructive authority. Mere liberty can reconstruct nothing; it only gives due play and honour to the reconstructive power. In this country, moreover, the battle of liberty has now been mainly won. And for the sake of liberty itself we are forced to recognize that its very first interest is authority; which must be an authority both moral and re-creative,

one which new-creates the conscience, and, from thence outward, recasts, in so far as may be necessary, the forms of creed and conduct. He that sits on the throne makes all things new. The first charge upon anything that flies the flag of the Kingdom of God is not liberty but righteousness, and the apostles of spiritual righteousness are the aristocracy of faith. All this means at last the primacy of the moral, the finality of the holy, the recognition of Christianity as the religion which answers the revelation of holy love. This is the new Evangelicalism, for which reconstruction means at root *moral* redemption, redemption of the social soul by the last powers of the moral universe. We can moralize Christianity only by evangelizing it, and reviewing its orthodoxy by its own good news and great gift of a Kingdom of God. There is something which must precede the reconstruction by religion ; it is a reconstruction of religion. It is the kind of reconstruction, for instance, which does not leave it possible for a man to be an evangelical pillar and a public profiteer. It is a reform of evangelicalism by the gospel of the kingdom, where salvation means something much else than safety.

I venture to illustrate this by discussing the relation of three ideas in particular—sacrifice, righteousness, and obedience—in the process of this moral revival. The great war has cast them all into the forefront of our moral concern, and it may do much to correct things in the religion it has done so much to shock.

For three years now the air has been full of the spirit of sacrifice. It is a good and a great spirit. It is capable of great and good things—indeed of the best things. But not in itself. In itself it is neither good nor bad. It may be used both ways. It is no monopoly of one side, either. It abounds among our worst enemies. But we believe that in Germany it is the servant of national unrighteousness, and the adjutant of Satan. It is the sacrifice of the citizen to a State which disowns moral obligations, repudiates

for State affairs the moral world and its controls in the passion for national power, abolishes international law, and seeks to live in a region beyond good and bad. Such a Machiavellian State is the trustee of unrighteousness. It is the protagonist of Antichrist for the hour. So also with those who serve it. Their patriotism, however sacrificial, is a world curse.

Sacrifice by itself is morally neuter. Taken alone, it is more useful in poetry than in morals. It is more aesthetic than ethical. Let the war help us to this lesson, which had become so needful when sacrifice was coming to be regarded as religion, when religion was coming to be measured by the sacrifice we make instead of the Sacrifice we trust, when martyrdom was idolized, and was consequently falling into contempt because it was exploited without supreme regard to the moral nature of its aims. We needed to be sharply told that the sacrifice by love as a passion might be sacrifice to demons, that reputation was not well lost for such love, that a mere cause did not keep martyrdom noble, that to lay down life for the love of our country might be offering ourselves to the enemies of the race and of the Kingdom of God. Satan too has his sacrifices. We needed to be called above a religion which is one of sacrifice only or in chief, even of sacrifice for love's sake. It is not easy to be explicit here without seeming to disparage high and gallant things. But indeed, I am concerned with the principle of their permanent increase. Let me press it, then, that a soul may sacrifice everything worthy for a love illicit and ignoble. Or the spirit of sacrifice for comradeship may abound among men who are entirely pagan at heart. Romantic love is a stuff that will not endure. Love is eternal as it is holy. Righteousness is the last solemn music of things, as it is the keynote of the Kingdom of God.

One thing the war has done, especially for youth as it is represented at our Universities. It has turned them

from a life of sport, good form, and general dilettantism to a sense of reality. It has destroyed for the time ethical ritualism. It has, indeed, cast us all on a deeper sense of reality, and the religious especially. It has given a blow to the kind of idealism that retreats from history, dreams in the lily gardens of peace, cultivates a sublimated religion, lives upon the brave, and eats the sacrifices of the dead. It has discredited the type of religion that cultivates a piety more or less aloof for fear lest the soul should be sullied or captured by the world. It has shown moral purism to be something else than moral nobility. It has done something to set the Church on a way of righteousness, leaving to God to keep it pure. Righteousness—that is the most real form of reality. I would put special stress on the enthusiasm for righteousness as a sounder thing than the passion for sacrifice, or even the enthusiasm of humanity.

‘Offer the sacrifices of righteousness.’ The higher we rise in the scale of love the more it becomes a question of what the authority is within it. Love cannot live on mere liberty. In marriage it rises to responsibility. Its sound and permanent liberty flows from its authority, the authority itself obeys. The opposite of the egoism from which the higher love delivers us is not sacrifice but obedience. We have to be saved not from selfishness only—the essence of sin is more than selfishness—but from the self-will which so often goes with even self-sacrifice. People may sacrifice themselves in a way so self-willed that they can work with nobody, and they do much to set other workers by the ears. Patriotism, for instance, can become faction. The divine thing in love is not the operative intensity of it, but its moral quality, including its power to convert even unselfishness from selfwill. Christ did not die for love alone but for *holy* love, for love whose prime passion and power was righteousness eternal, for love of the Kingdom of God and its righteousness. He died for that Kingship which

dominated His whole life of love. It would alter considerably some of our time-honoured theories of His death to construe it by His own ruling principle of the Kingdom of God. That, in some form, is what makes all sacrifice divine. For self-sacrifice, I have said, may be practised for ignoble, and even nefarious, means—as in the case of avarice. We have to ask what sacrifice serves. What is its loyalty? What righteousness does it own? To what do you sacrifice yourself? To die for country is not necessarily to serve the Kingdom of God which was Christ's end and is Christ's realm. So to die is not serving God's Kingdom unless your country is serving God's Kingdom in Humanity.

There is, therefore, a greater thing than self-sacrifice. It is obedience. That sounds less romantic; but it is really much harder. It may be less heroic, but it is more holy. We all know that sometimes the hardest form of self-control is to obey duty and abstain from self-sacrifice. But obedience does not always appeal to the romantic age, or the romantic half, of mankind. There are more people eager to sacrifice themselves, or to lyricize sacrifice, than there are who have the spirit of obedience. Real humility is less easy than martyrdom. Yet true obedience to the righteous or holy is what makes sacrifice fruitful, saves it from being thrown away, saves it from being ridiculous. Sound sacrifice is sacrifice in obedience to a righteousness we have taken due pains to understand, and which we have come to an age to gauge. One tires of being asked to respect a belief for which many have suffered; that witnesses less to the belief than to the believer, and not necessarily to his credit. The gospel no apostle need be ashamed of is that which primarily reveals the *righteousness* of the God of holy love (Rom. i. 17). Here again notice that it is not a case of obeying conscience only. Nobody ever obeyed his conscience more faithfully than Torquemada. All the cranks obey what they are pleased to call their conscience—many being more preoccupied with their con-

science than with their duty, as people have been more occupied with religion than with God, with their faith than with the grace of God which it lays hold of. To treat faith as merit is quite parallel to that idolatry of conscience which replaces the worship of the duty that conscience should grasp. The divine sacrifices are the sacrifices of righteousness and not of conscience merely. Which means that often the form of sacrifice that conscience needs most is a long course of discipline instead of a public martyrdom. The real destruction of egoism is obedience to the righteousness of God's Kingdom. And this is the spirit of the true International.

Since spirituality can destroy faith, the practical reform which religion needs is less its spiritualizing than its moralizing. And, within that, it is the change from the supremacy of self-sacrifice to the supremacy of obedience in the sacrifice, from the worship of love alone to that of the righteousness in love, to the worship of holy love. So we rise in three stages — *sacrifice, obedience, righteousness* — righteousness, obedience to it always, sacrifice for it at need. If the world needs to be converted from egoism to love, the Church needs conversion to *holy* love—from love sacrificial to love holy, from sacrifice for its own sake to sacrifice 'for My sake and the gospel's,' to sacrifice for the Kingdom of God, and not simply for any cause that happens to kindle us—and that may blind us with the smoke. There can be self-willed sacrifice, but not self-willed obedience. The cross of Christ was the greatest sacrifice in the world because it was the greatest and deepest obedience. We have dwelt much on that Cross as love's sacrifice for man; we must go on to prize it most as love's obedience to God and His righteousness. We must return to think of the Cross not only as the sacrifice of love for man, and not as the supreme case of the sacrifice that adorns human nature; for the sake of that very love we must grasp the Cross anew as the sacrifice of love for God and His kingdom. When Christ died, was He

thinking more of God or of man—of God and what He required or of man and what he needed, of His gift to God or His gift to man? It was Christ's perfect and obedient sacrifice to a God of holy love that saved man. So we are not saved by the sacrifice we make, but by the sacrifice we trust. That is religion, that is faith. Self-sacrifice is not religion. Salvation by self-sacrifice is but ethic; and it may be poor ethic till we know its inspiration, its principle, and its object.

Now is it not true to say that at the present moment there is more of the spirit of sacrifice than of the spirit of obedience in this country? Perhaps we have exported too much of our sacrifice. The more of the spirit of sacrifice we have in connexion with the army, the more egoism and insubordination we may seem to find in other connexions at home. Soldiers may be dying while commands are quarrelling. We have the spirit of faction in public affairs, the spirit of profiteering in business, and the spirit of uncontrol and 'don't-care' in the youth of both sexes.

Hence when the war is over and the enthusiasm of sacrifice has died down, when we are in the trough of its wave, we may have to face something little short of civil war. People mutter about revolution. And all for lack of the spirit of obedience (by which of course I do not mean mere submission). The war called out the latent sacrifice in the country; will peace call out a spirit of latent loyalty and obedience? Is it latent? Is it there? Of course, remembering how we were surprised by the revelation of the spirit of sacrifice, especially in the youth, we must take care not to dogmatize hastily in our answer to these questions. But is that spirit of obedience to righteousness the solemn temper in which classes promise to face the dangers internal to this country, and peculiar to its love of liberty? That love is constantly trembling on the verge of licence. Righteousness tends to degenerate into mere recalcitrance, and independence to mere self-will.

And all for the lack of an authority which has the right to rule freedom because it creates it.

Take three of the chief discoveries of last century. They were the woman, the workman, and the child. But recall the years just preceding the war. Recall the attitude of these sections of the community. There was a degenerate tendency to believe in lawless force as the engine of a cause. The women were leaders in defiance and destruction. They hoped, in a Teutonic way, to gain by terrorism what better women have really gained by service. The workmen, copying perhaps the egoism of capital, broke loose from loyalty or obedience to their own organization and representatives; and they seemed to entertain the idea of war on society by a general strike. The young grew more and more insubordinate to parental and other control, especially where they became premature wage-earners or premature prophets. And this last feature has been strongly aggravated by the war.

At present we are united in a loyalty to country. But when that has done its work, and we are exhausted morally, physically, and economically, when the country is divided against itself as capital and labour will sharply be, where are we to find the object of loyalty and the source of obedience? Our wise and prudent men are, for the inevitable reconstruction, devising the machinery of a joint board to adjust the two interests, and to enable them to work in fairness and reason. But what will any such machinery be worth if it have not behind it that love of righteousness in the community which is the true citizenship, and which is something greater than fair play or loyalty to sect or party. In a Christian land that passion should be the enthusiasm of God's righteousness. It should be the Kingdom of God. I do wish some phrase about the enthusiasm of the Kingdom might catch on as the enthusiasm of humanity did in the seventies. That international of the Kingdom which we long to see ruling between the

peoples should also take the lead within them. But is it an idea which has much power with us? It is a pulpit theme; is it a public power? Of course if it is a mere dream, another Utopia, a mere obsolete Christianity, one could not expect it to rule. It would be an æsthetic ideal without ethical control. But then if it is a mere dream, how was it the staple of the most potent, the most public, and the most inexhaustible figure in history? How could a visionary found what is, after all, the greatest institution of history—the Christian Church? The idea ruled Christ absolutely; does it rule Christendom? Does it rule the political and social relations of a nation of Christians? Is it ever alluded to by our very able publicists? Is it a motive which our political and social leaders can use on a platform with any expectation of response, or in Parliament without impairing their effect? Yet would a population of God-fearing people, true citizens of God's Kingdom, not solve the social problem? The Church does of course speak of the Kingdom of God; but a chief source of her need to be moralized is that her egoism does not seem to grasp it. How could an egoist sect preach the Kingdom of God? It means, for High Church, the Church itself as a polity; for Low Church it means missionary enterprise, or benevolence more or less sectional to history. But the Kingdom of God is greater than any Church or mission represents. The Kingdom of God is the supreme power deep and driving in the whole moral order of history and society. It is the destiny written in the very nature of the moral universe, mounting to the image of God. It means God's eternal and re-creative act for the humane conscience of all history and society which set up His Kingdom in the Cross. And, with all the great things the Church has done, it has not grasped that, nor taught that, as the public crisis requires it. Which means that the chief part of the reconstruction of religion, theology, and the Church is the moralizing of them by their own

central power duly understood—by the gospel of that Kingdom of God. Let that be grasped as the moral intent of the world of history, as it was the dominant power working in the world's Saviour, and flowing from Him. It is not a matter of conversion alone, as the pietists thought. It is not a flight into a better world, but a step forward into it. It is a matter of righteousness and its policy as well as of piety and its philanthropy. It is more than the machinery of beneficent love. It concerns society and not only the soul. It is the whole realm of moral and social ends, not just developing to the ideal but converted from progress to worship. It is a work and gift of God deeply, mystically, practically realized by those who worship in love the public kingship for ever of a holy God in Christ. It is the doom of the exploiter and the sectary, of the honest old Pharisee with his moral dullness, and the devotee with his spiritual egoism. It is the glorification of God's holy and sovereign love by man's personal dignity, social righteousness, and brotherly sympathy. It is not a morality but a religion. It is not sectary; it is the last catholicity. It comes not as a moral demand but as a moral gift, a gospel, a good news. Above all else the doctrine means that the best things are not ideals of ours but powers of God. Life's dominant is not an attractive ideal on the horizon of history, but God's achievement working as the expansive power within it. It means that all the best things ideal to the soul are by the Christian gospel already guaranteed and real. Christ's redemption never can or need be redeemed. Seek first the holy and the catholic will be added.

That may be called theology, but would it not be the greatest reinforcement to public ethic were it active in every conscience? Communion with God, the divine value of the soul, the development of all its powers, the fellowship of love, the joyful exchange of spiritual wealth, grateful delight in nature's good, the passion for righteousness in the power of the holy, the sacred family of nations,

the common conquest of earthly sorrow and social anomaly—such things are not heavenly *ideals* of ours but *powers* of God, already *given* freely, fully, and finally, always at work, as already victors in historic things, whose consummation spreads into the world unseen. It is an unspeakable moral asset when supreme ideals of ours are converted into final achievements of God and dominants of the moral universe. On this rests the gospel, and this way lies its public path. The root of public ethic is the rule of the King of the Kingdom of God.

What are we to do for an obedience, I have been asking, when sacrifice has done its work? And the question, I have said, is the great question that returns, and returns again, to our door, and to our scanty welcome. It is the question of authority. We have been the devotees of liberty so long that we resent the idea of authority; we certainly resent the notion of devoting to such a quest or interest the enthusiasm and sacrifice we have spent on freedom. Yet freedom itself demands that we should attend to it, and attend supremely, freedom which begins to feel serious tremors in the ground she has secured. It is no question of an authority which requires our submission *sans phrase*, but of an authority which is identified with the last righteousness, the last stay, and the last liberty. It is an authority which means the expansion of life much more than the security of a tradition. It is that will of holy love worshipped in the life of the single soul, embalmed in our growing Society, and honoured in our public life—till the instinct of it grow into the insight of it by the civic conscience, speaking in our most gifted men. It is an authority whose answer from us is the grand quest for the public and historic will of God, and the living out of it *con amore*.

I could not go farther on this line without passing into the theological region and speaking more deeply of the divine emancipation which underlies all the moral freedom of

society, and is called redemption. We can really moralize only as we truly evangelize. We must ask ourselves, with new knowledge, courage, and conscience, what evangelical really means, what it has to do with a double ethic, what ails its moral note. The religion of the future must be more and more the religion of the moral soul and its reconstruction; the religion, for the soul, of a *holy* Father's grace, and, for society, of the kingship of the righteous King. The royal law of such liberty much orthodoxy has travestied. But the reconstruction of our spiritual world—of religion, theology, and the Church, is not the rationalizing of it but the moralizing of it. It is the social moralizing of it—as when we insist that the worker's due wage is the first charge upon industry.¹ And it is its moralizing by the central principle of religion, of Christianity itself—the Kingdom of God. It is moralized by that gospel, and the supreme moral act of the Cross at its heart.

The object is not to make religion more plausible. It is first to make it more sympathetically righteous by carrying it deeper than rational systems go. And beyond that it is to make it more imperative; for we need a command as much as a sympathy. But it is also to unite the elements of command and sympathy in a realm of holy love, redemptive and creative for the moral soul and the righteous society. Righteousness as a creative power—we are not grasping that, because it is not at the heart of what makes Christianity Christian for us. All this of course means more than that, by the aid of our scholars, we should realize Christ as a historic person more freshly and vividly than the Church has mostly done. That is a welcome thing. But it would

¹ It was with horror and fear, and not simply with astonishment, that I read recently in the column of wills one item. The head of one of the largest industries of its kind left about a quarter of a million, and of that he bequeathed £1,500 for distribution among certain of his employees. No other public legacy was named. It was time we had war. No hell could be worse than the unavailing passion of such a soul to return and give it freely away.

be still more precious, if it made us that we could read for our mere delight no more; if it made us, with these fresh and living results, to pass to His moral depths; to ask what a personality so quick and powerful came to do and make us do; to pierce to the centre of His one moral purpose and work; to realize, in the new perspective of the Kingdom of God, His function no less than His person, His office, as above all His character; and to lay hold of Him as the Messiah and King of the moral universe in its crisis, and of all society at its moral spring. 'Add to your faith moral proficiency' (2 Pet. i. 5).

The passion for the world righteousness of God's historic Kingdom is the best antidote for the war-weariness which now so easily besets us. We have gone too far and too deep now to turn back, without walking into a calamity worse than the war, and a moral infidelity like the German. God has taken a hand in the game, and we are not free to refuse to be His partners. The issues have become widened and exalted since the war began. The war itself has undergone a certain conversion. It has risen morally in its course to be a crisis in the world righteousness which is bound up with the Kingdom of God. It is no more only a clash of patriotisms. It is a judgement of the Kingdom.

If there are good reasons why the Church should not control the State, yet the same social power in Christianity which makes the Church in its conditions—namely, the Kingdom of God—must also make society in *its* conditions. The moral power of society cannot be different at last from the moral power in the Church. We have but one conscience. There is really but one ethic; the supremacy of the Kingdom of God means that; and it is gathered up in the cross of Christ and its righteousness of holy love as the crisis of the whole moral and historic world. The moral centre of our civilization and affairs must become identical with the moral centre of our religion. There will be recurrent war till this come about.

P. T. FORSYTH.

A GOSSIP ABOUT CLERICAL BIOGRAPHY

HAVE you seen *Darwin's Life* ? ' William Allingham once asked his friend Tennyson. ' No,' said Tennyson, ' I hate biographies.' ¹ I am thankful to say I do not ; I delight in them, and not least in clerical biographies, and I make the confession without any sort of shamefacedness. Some twenty-five years ago I remember a well-known man of letters, who is also a minister, asking me what books I was reading. One of the books I named was the *Life of Archbishop Tait*. I shall not quote his reply, but it was of the kind that meant you should go and stand in a corner and think over your sins. Nevertheless, I am still impenitent, and I still find delight in the lives of archbishops and of their humbler kith and kin. Nor, if I must continue in the apologetic vein, do I defend the practice simply on account of the pleasure it gives. From what may be called the schoolmaster's point of view, from the point of view of those who think that all reading is a grievous waste of time that does not in some way make for edification, or at least store the mind with useful facts, the study of biography, and of clerical biography, can readily justify itself. Whatever we may think about Carlyle's famous theory of history, it is certainly true that one way of understanding history is by the study of the lives of individual men who have lived and worked here. Handbooks of Church history are very well in their way, but, as Robert Louis Stevenson would say, they are mighty bloodless substitutes for the lives of the men who made the history. If, to take but one example, any one desires to know what was happening in Scotland during the

¹ See *William Allingham, a Diary*, p. 368.

century or century and a half before the famous Disruption of 1843, what books will open up to him so surely and swiftly the inner meaning of that period as, say, the *Memoirs of Thomas Boston*, the *Autobiography of Carlyle of Inveresk*, and Hanna's *Life of Dr. Chalmers*?

In what follows no attempt is made at nicely balanced judgements of individual biographies, and still less at a general survey of this section of the wide biographical field. I am only making notes on a few of the clerical biographies that have come my way and have interested me. If the reader sometimes wonders why this is taken and that is left, he has the explanation in advance.

I

I begin with one or two comments of a general character. Like most readers of biography, I am ready to cry aloud and shout against the strange lust of length to which so many of our modern biographers have fallen victims. Have they never heard of the *Lives* of Plutarch, or of our own Izaak Walton? I do not for a moment suggest that modern biography should be modelled on these brief masterpieces of the past; like every other living art the biographical must take on new forms; but Plutarch and Walton may at least remind our craftsmen of to-day that a good man's memorial may be built, and built to last, out of something less than two stout octavo volumes. This inordinate length is due sometimes to the notion that in order to tell the story of a man's life it is necessary to write about a segment of the universe—the classic example of this kind of biography is, I suppose, Masson's truly mammoth *Life of Milton*—but more often simply to the inability to omit. Biographers above all men should keep in mind the truth of the old Greek saying, Μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν—a great book is a great evil—and should weed their pages ruthlessly of elaborate genealogies, letters of travel, and, as a rule, the reminiscences of friends.

By way of illustration I may name four conspicuous offenders among modern clerical biographies: Wilfrid Ward's *Life of Cardinal Newman*, A. C. Benson's *Life of his father*, A. G. V. Allen's *Life of Phillips Brooks*, and Liddon's *Life of Pusey*. They run respectively to about thirteen hundred, fifteen hundred, sixteen hundred, and two thousand pages. The two last named are almost, if not quite, equal in bulk to Morley's *Life of Gladstone*. Some readers possibly think Morley's book needlessly long. I do not share their opinion; large as it is I do not think it can be fairly called disproportionate. But what has become of an author's sense of perspective when he allows himself to plan the life of a man like Phillips Brooks or Pusey on the same vast scale? Mr. Ward is in a way the worst offender of the four. Recognizing very properly that Newman's story as an Anglican had been told once for all by himself in his *Apologia*, he passes that over in about a hundred pages, only to weary the reader with interminable detail concerning the second, and with one great exception comparatively featureless, half of the Cardinal's life.¹ Let me hasten to say, however, that clerical biographers are not all sinners after this fashion. Four of Izaak Walton's exquisite *Lives* have clergymen as their subjects. Carlyle's *John Sterling* is perhaps the best short biography in the language; but its author would probably refuse to allow it to be classed as a "clerical" biography, though Sterling was for a few months an Anglican curate. Liddon himself, for all his prolixity over Pusey, could be terse and compact when he wished, as his admirable sketch of Bishop Hamilton shows. Nor must I forget Dora Greenwell's *Lacordaire*, one or two volumes by Charles Stanford, and Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*.

¹ In Mr. R. H. Hutton's interesting study of Newman ('Leaders of Religion' series) exactly the opposite method is pursued. The main part of the book is devoted to the study of Newman's life before leaving the Anglican Church, and the later part of his career is compressed into a single long chapter.

Of their kind I know nothing quite so good as the Dean's lively sketches. To a rather boisterous self-confidence and an obvious delight in his own good stories which readily communicates itself to his readers, there is added a touch of that rare gift which makes Boswell supreme among biographers. And, to name but one other, there is that 'gem of purest ray serene,' Dr. John Brown's sketch of his father, hidden away from many eyes in the second volume of *Horae Subsecivae*, under the odd and unpromising title of 'A Letter to John Cairns, D.D.' The reader of these hundred pages has within his reach the secret of all that is deepest and best in the life of Scotland.¹

Something might be said concerning clerical biographies that should have been and are not, and now it is to be feared will never be. One of the giants of English Nonconformity in the nineteenth century was Thomas Binney. Dale's admiration for him was unbounded, and echoes of his wonderful preaching can be heard in the sermons of 'Thomas Bradshaw' in Mark Rutherford's *Revolution in Tanner's Lane*. But what is there to keep alive his memory to-day? Nor have we as yet any adequate account of Spurgeon or Parker or Maclaren, nor of the amazing apostolate of Dwight L. Moody, ordained of God if not of men.² Is

¹ Let me also acknowledge, if only in a footnote, my debt to Mr. George W. E. Russell for several volumes of biography—Sydney Smith, Pusey, Liddon, King and others—whose brevity is but one element in the pleasure which they yield. It is curious, by the way, that the most ecclesiastically-minded of English laymen should have been chosen to write the life of the least clerically-minded of English clergymen (Sydney Smith, in the 'English Men of Letters' series). One grudge only has the poor book-buyer against Mr. Russell—that he has to pay for some of his good stories two or three times over. For example, in his sketch of Liddon we have the following: "How singular," he said to me, as we stood before the portrait of a bewigged and bloated prelate—"how singular to reflect that *that person* was chosen in the Providential order to connect Mr. Keble with the Apostles!" Very good; but when we meet the same story again in *Collections and Recollections* it does not seem so good, and when we find it yet a third time in *Fifteen Chapters of Autobiography* it does not seem good at all, and we are in the mood for demanding back our money.

² I am not overlooking the rather scrappy biography by Moody's son. The best accounts of the great evangelist's work in this country that I know are to be found in G. A. Smith's *Life of Henry Drummond*, and in two articles by Dale in the *Congregationalist*, March and April, 1875.

there not room, too, for more biographies of the type so happily represented by Sir W. Robertson Nicoll's *My Father*, and Mr. Bardsley Brash's *Love and Life*? It would be good for us all to know more of that ministerial fidelity in obscure places to which the Church owes so much. Still, when all is said, our biographical possessions are very ample; let us take down a few volumes from the long rows.

II

I turn first to the Anglican section, in which, Nonconformist as I am, I find many of my best friends. Two of my favourites are Hort and Walsham How—as different as two men in the same Church could well be. How, if we are to judge by his son's account, seems to have read scarcely anything. He went on his serene and happy way unmoved by *Essays and Reviews*, *Lux Mundi*, or any others of the troublers of the peace of the Anglican Israel. But he left behind him an example of radiant pastoral activity that might put to shame even the most industrious. In Whittington, in Shropshire, where he was parish minister for twenty-eight years, his pastoral visits worked out at an average of twenty-two per week for the fifty-two weeks of the year! Hort, on the other hand, was a student and scholar to the finger-tips, who read everything from *Peg Woffington* and the *Saturday Review* to the Greek Testament and the ante-Nicene Fathers. It makes one's mouth water to read the story of his graduate days in the 'fifties of the last century, when any morning you might find on your study table a new book by Carlyle or Ruskin, a new poem by Tennyson, Browning, or Arnold, or a new novel by Dickens or Thackeray, George Eliot or Charlotte Brontë. With Hort one brackets as by instinct the name of Westcott; but alas, I have never been under his spell, and his *Life* I have still to read. I hope it is half as good as some of the stories told of the learned Bishop. 'Are you saved?'

an evangelist, it is said, once asked him. 'Do you mean,' said the Bishop, 'σωθεις, σωζόμενος, or σωούμενος?' The story may not be true, but it certainly deserves to be.

And speaking of good stories, if a prize were offered for the clerical biography which contains the largest number of them to the page I think the award should go to Miss Sichell's *Life of Canon Ainger*. For acidity and ill-nature, on the other hand, Mark Pattison's *Memoirs* would be hard to beat. That volume, moreover, has the distinction of containing the most astonishing sentence from the pen of a scholar which it has ever been my fortune to come across. Speaking of the difficulty which his father had in deciding at which of Oxford's many colleges to place his son, Pattison goes on to say that 'even at this day a country squire or rector, on landing with his cub under his wing at Oxford, finds himself much at sea as to the respective advantages or demerits of the various colleges.' He 'lands' to find himself 'at sea,' and he has 'his cub under his wing'!! And yet Pattison was, beyond doubt, one of the most accomplished men of letters of his generation.¹ Another book not to be overlooked is Mrs. Mandell Creighton's *Life* of her husband. For one reader, however, the most memorable thing in it belongs not to the Bishop, but to the late Professor Gwatkin. For twelve years Gwatkin had been teaching ecclesiastical history at Cambridge; of the quality of his teaching his books are sufficient evidence. Then came the foundation of the Dixie professorship in that subject. Gwatkin had good reason for expecting that he would be appointed. Instead, Creighton, then the vicar of Embleton, was chosen before him. Gwatkin swallowed his disappointment and wrote to his

¹ Readers of George Eliot's *Middlemarch* who are tempted to see in Mark Pattison the original of one of the characters of that book may be reminded of Lord Morley's protest: 'There never was, I think, a more impertinent blunder than when people professed to identify the shrewdest and most widely competent critic of his day with the Mr. Casaubon of the novel, and his absurd Key to all Mythologies.' (*Miscellanies*, Vol. II. p. 165.)

successful rival a letter of welcome and congratulation which is a veritable triumph of Christian magnanimity. 'For myself,' he said, 'I am ready to work under you, and to support you loyally in all that falls to me to do. So far as I know my own heart, no jealousy of yesterday shall ever rise on my side to mar the harmony and friendship in which I ask and hope to live with the first Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Cambridge.' Words like these not only purge ecclesiastical life of its pitiful and sordid jealousies, they help to keep alive our faith in the reality and power of the Christian ideal.

But of all Anglican records there are none to which I find myself going back so often as to those which centre around Newman and the Oxford movement. In many ways, of course, Arnold and Robertson, Kingsley and Maurice are for a Nonconformist more congenial company than men like Newman and Keble, Church and Paget, the logic of whose position never allows either him or them long to forget that in their eyes he is ecclesiastically but an alien and an outcast. And yet there are many who, though their Nonconformity stiffens rather than yields in the presence of High Anglican claims, freely acknowledge that they have found in the best men of the Oxford movement a certain spiritual quality, subtle yet all-pervasive, as of some rare and delicate essence, which they often miss in men of wider and more catholic schools. Of Newman and the *Apologia* there is no need to write. I am the proud possessor of a first edition which bears, with other precious things, this inscription: "R. W. Church from J. H. Newman, with thanks for assistance received." It is Newman's own presentation copy to Dean Church. When I hear men debate—and I believe they are still at it—whether Newman was really a great man, whether he was not rather a very small man with an almost super-human gift of jugglery both intellectual and moral, it is enough for me to remember that the Dean was his intimate

and lifelong friend. I think I should give up human judgement in despair if I could believe that eyes so pure and piercing could have wholly misread what lay so near them.¹ Of Church himself I have spoken and written so often that here I need say no more than that in him the Christian culture of the nineteenth century came to its most perfect flower. The *Life* by his daughter may not adequately reveal this, but at least it makes necessary no revision of our estimate of the man based on his extraordinarily rich and varied writings. Keble's *Memoir*, on the other hand, by Mr. Justice Coleridge, is, it must be confessed, a dull and disappointing book. The reader has, however, by way of compensation, the short biography by Mr. Walter Lock (in the 'Leaders of Religion' series), the essay by Principal Shairp,² and that very pleasant volume *Dulce Domum*. Among the minor prophets of the movement mention may be made of Isaac Williams, Newman's curate at St. Mary's, and the author of three of the *Tracts for the Times*. His autobiography tells the following striking story of Keble and R. H. Froude: 'Froude told me that Keble once, before parting from him, seemed to have something on his mind which he wished to say, but shrunk from saying. At last, while waiting, I think, for a coach, he said to him before parting, "Froude, you said one day that Law's *Serious Call* was a 'clever' (or 'pretty,' I forget which) book; it seemed to me as if you had said the day of judgement would be a pretty sight." This speech, Froude told me, had a great effect

¹ I take this opportunity to correct a mistake concerning the Dean and Newman made by me in an article in this Review a few years ago (now reprinted in *A Preacher's Study*). I said, on the authority of Lord Blachford's *Letters*, that Church's review of *Ecce Homo* (*Occasional Papers*, Vol. II. pp. 133-179) was written under the impression that its then unknown author was no other than Newman himself. Miss M. C. Church, the Dean's daughter and biographer, assures me that this is not so, and that had a second edition of Lord Blachford's *Letters* been called for the editor would have corrected the error.

² In his *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*.

on his after-life.' Of the Mozley brothers—Thomas and J. B.—we have no formal biographies, but the *Letters* of the one and the *Reminiscences* of the other have each their place in the literature of the movement. In later years the temper and traditions of Oxford Anglicanism are nowhere better illustrated both on their good and on their evil side than in *Francis Paget, Bishop of Oxford*. Paget was Dean Church's son-in-law and inherited something of his intellectual and spiritual quality. Dale was a great admirer of his sermons. 'Read them,' he used to say, 'read them over and over again, and you will see the kind of sermons I like.' On the other hand it is very distressing to learn that the Bishop, while readily subscribing to the funds of the British and Foreign Bible Society, refused to attend its meetings lest he should be involved in a common act of worship with Nonconformists! I shall be told perhaps that my note of exclamation is quite superfluous, that intelligent men must accept the logic of their own premises. Be it so; one can only wonder that the nature of the conclusions does not awaken misgivings as to the soundness of the reasoning which has led to them.

III

When we turn to Anglican biography of the evangelical type the range of interest suddenly narrows. Anglican evangelicalism has of course many names that are worthy: John Wesley, John Newton, and Thomas Scott, 'the Clapham Sect,' and Charles Simeon, of all of whom Sir James Stephen has written in his well-known *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*. Stephen's magniloquent style is rather trying to our quieter tastes—as when, for example, he speaks of Henry Thornton as 'the owner of a spacious mansion on the confines of the villa-cinctured common of Clapham'—but his book still deserves to be read. The lack of a really great biography of Wesley would be a literary misfortune of the first magnitude were it not that Wesley

is himself, and is likely to remain, his own best biographer. Newton is one of the noblest and most romantic figures in the history of English Christianity. If any one is in danger of being misled by the vulgar abuse to which Newton has been subjected on the ground of his relations with his friend Cowper—abuse which has recently been repeated in its most offensive form by Dr. George Saintsbury—he should read what has been written in his defence by Canon Overton¹ and Mr. Clement Shorter.² Newton's successor at Olney was Thomas Scott, the famous commentator. Newman's reference to him is known to everybody. To have your name mentioned in the *Apologia*, as Thackeray said about Gibbon, is like having it written on the dome of St. Peter's. But I may quote from a letter of J. B. Mozley : ' I have been reading the life of Scott—Bible Scott. I am wonderfully struck with the extraordinary energy and strong sense of the man, joined to his enthusiasm and disinterestedness. His discrimination and power of drawing proper distinctions, and of separating secondary from fundamental matter, are very striking. Though a Predestinarian himself, he always insisted on its being a secondary point, on which people might differ without the least drawback. This moderation on a point which, where people do hold it, they think so very critical and testing, is a strong sign of his balance of mind. He seems to have spent a considerable part of the force of his mind in keeping doctrinal ultraism down in his own party, and it appears that the Bible Commentary was originally undertaken principally with that aim. Though, on minor points of social practice, rigid and somewhat narrow, his strong sensibleness on substantial points comes out. All this, with his great sharpness, immediate perception of humbug, shrewdness, and remarkable working power,

¹ *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, Vol. II. pp. 190–197.

² *Immortal Memories*, pp. 34–36.

make him certainly a great man.’¹ No man was ever less given to indiscriminate praise than Mozley, and words like these from his pen are a more than sufficient answer to the acrid sneers of Sir J. G. Frazer.² Charles Simeon is to-day a well-nigh forgotten name. Yet a hundred years ago ‘St. Charles of Cambridge,’ as he has been called, wielded an influence in the Church of England greater, Macaulay once said, than that of any Primate. The story of his life is perhaps best read to-day in Bishop Moule’s little volume in the ‘Leaders of Religion’ series.

Bishop Moule has done more than tell the story of Simeon’s life; incidentally he has revealed why Anglican evangelicalism has so few biographies that anybody now cares to read. He speaks of Simeon’s ‘lack of literary instinct’; and in that connexion it is enough to recall the unfortunate ‘Skeletons.’³ The truth is the early evangelicals—and herein lay both their strength and their weakness—cared little for anything which had no direct relation to salvation. Literature was for them an alien kingdom which they had no ambition to enter and possess in the name of its true Lord. Posterity has avenged the slight by condemning most of *their* literature to the dust-holes of oblivion.

For the best modern evangelical biography we must go outside the Anglican Church. There are not many Lives whose publication I have anticipated more eagerly than I did that of Hugh Price Hughes. He had laid his spell on me as he did on so many of the men of my generation. Yet I must confess to a certain sense of disappointment in reading it. I hear Hughes speaking in it, but, as Sir W.

¹ *Letters*, p. 284.

² In his beautiful edition of *The Letters of William Cowper*, Vol. I. p. xxxiii. (Eversley series.)

³ The full title ran as follows: ‘*Horae Homileticae: or Discourses (principally in the form of Skeletons) now first digested into one continued Series, and forming a Commentary upon every book of the Old and New Testament.*’

Robertson Nicoll said, the voice is muffled. I wanted the old ringing word that had stirred me so often in life, and it came as through an interpreter—well and truly interpreted indeed, but still mediated, not direct. Perhaps the available material left the biographer little choice; Hughes was not a great letter-writer; but one cannot help feeling that the old files of the *Methodist Times* in which he expressed himself with such utter and unique *abandon* might have been turned to better account. The greatest biography of modern English Nonconformity, in my judgement, is the *Life of R. W. Dale*. And this is only as it should be, since Dale was by general consent the brightest luminary in our Nonconformist sky during the last century. It does one's heart good to see how, notwithstanding his unflinching loyalty to Free Church principles and ideals, the best men of the High Anglican school—men like Church and Paget and Gore—warm towards the great Birmingham preacher.

But the largest and richest section of modern evangelical biography is, without doubt, the Scottish. I wonder if Mrs. Oliphant's *Life of Edward Irving* has many readers to-day. Carlyle was not satisfied with it, and of course it is well to supplement it with what others have written, notably with Carlyle's own *Reminiscences*.¹ Nevertheless, whatever its shortcomings, Mrs. Oliphant's story is one no preacher should miss, infinitely noble and infinitely sad. We lay it down mourning with Coleridge that a spirit so pure and lofty should have been lured by false lights to so tragic a doom. I have very happy memories, though it is now many years since I read them, of Professor Knight's *Principal Shairp and his Friends*, and Dr. Donald Macleod's *Life of his famous brother*, and still happier of Dr. James Brown's two masterpieces, *A Scottish Probationer* and

¹ See also David Brown's reminiscences in the *Expositor* (3rd Series, Vol. VI). Brown, it will be remembered, was Irving's assistant at Regent Square.

Robertson of Irvine. Nearly fifty years have gone since Thomas Davidson was laid in his early grave 'on a gentle slope that lies to the sun and looks up the Jed-water,' but the fragrance of that fair, brief life is still unwasted. In the third edition of his book the editor was permitted to reveal the name of the lady to whom many of the most interesting letters in it were addressed and to add this touching note contributed by her brother: 'It was the last book she had in her hand before she went to bed never to rise again. . . . As she went out to her room on the evening I refer to, she carried the *Probationer* with her and murmured as she passed me, "The love I loved sae weel, sae lang ago."' Both Dr. Brown's books ought to be more widely known among English readers.

Of later religious biographies which we owe to Scotland it is not so easy to speak. Personal acquaintance, while it adds to the pleasure of one's reading, is apt to disturb the balance of one's judgement, and when to this is added the memory of personal kindnesses received it is perhaps as well frankly to abdicate the critic's chair. The most talked of man in Scotland about forty years ago, I suppose, was a young Free Church professor of Aberdeen named Robertson Smith.¹ The controversy which raged about his name went on until 1881, when he was formally deposed from his chair. Smith died in 1894, but his life was not published till 1912. For that reason, and for others, the book fell rather flat. Those who cannot find time for the longer record should at least read the two vivid chapters on 'The Robertson Smith Case' in Dr. Carnegie Simpson's admirable *Life of Principal Rainy*. It is typical of the difference in these things between England and Scotland

¹ It is worthy of note that about the middle of the last century, in four neighbouring parishes in Aberdeen, the very names of which are not known to one Englishman in a hundred, four boys were growing up who bore the following names: W. Robertson Smith, W. Gray Elmslie, Alexander Mackay, and W. Robertson Nicoll. The last named, who was also the youngest, is now the sole survivor.

that nearly ten years before the mild heresies of *Luz Mundi* convulsed the Anglican Church, the pros and cons of modern Old Testament criticism had been discussed and decided on in almost every religious household throughout Scotland. When Nicoll's *Life of Ian Maclaren* appeared it probably made many ministerial readers feel as did Marcus Dods, who wrote from his death-bed to its author, 'No book I ever read has made me so ashamed of my own ministry.' Of Dods himself we have no formal biography, but the two volumes of his *Letters*, though they leave the twenty-five years of his fruitful ministry in Glasgow a blank, form a very striking personal record. The frankness and pathos of the *Later Letters* moved me as few books of the sort have ever done. Perhaps no religious biography of our day has been more widely read than Sir George Adam Smith's *Life of Henry Drummond*. For that very reason I need not linger over it. When Sir George was busy with the book he remarked to a friend that he thought modern prophets were even more troublesome than ancient! Most of his readers will agree that he has scored a 'double first.' But the blue ribbon in this department of religious literature must go, in my opinion, to A. R. MacEwen's *Life and Letters of John Cairns*, which I put side by side with the *Life of R. W. Dale*. Dr. Cairns, when I first came to know him, was already a bowed and white-haired giant. The beauty and simplicity of his character were manifest to all men, but it was not until the publication of Dr. MacEwen's *Life* that I discovered the rugged strength of intellect of this man with the little child's heart. In this connexion it is worth recalling that David Masson reckoned Cairns' *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century* a stronger book than Sir Leslie Stephen's on the same subject.¹ If any man would know the things that have made Scotland great and given her her high place among the nations of the earth—her stern self-discipline, her hunger and thirst after knowledge, her

¹ See W. Robertson Nicoll's *A Bookman's Letters*, p. 79.

steadfast sense of things unseen—he may see them all mirrored in the calm, clear depths of this good man's life, 'the herd laddie' who became Principal.

IV

My space is gone, and there are whole sections of my wide theme I have not even glanced at. Something should have been said about missionary biography, and something, too, about the clerical biography of America. It is too late to make amends now, but this brief postscript, may add yet one more book to those that have already been mentioned. I have complained of the undue prolixity of one great American biography, the *Life of Phillips Brooks*; I have neither that nor any other fault to urge against Dr. W. N. Clarke's *Sixty Years with the Bible*. It is a fragment of spiritual autobiography, or to quote the author's own words, 'the story of my own life in the single character of student, lover, and user of the Bible, exhibiting the mental processes through which the change in my own attitude towards the Bible has come to pass'; and to one reader at least it has proved a record of surpassing interest. Dr. Clarke passed through the revolution to which his generation was born, and yet never came into danger of losing his faith in God and Jesus Christ. Timid souls who doubt if this can be should read and be reassured.

When Professor James had completed his biographical reading for his famous Gifford Lectures, he said, 'To call to mind a succession of such examples as I have lately had to wander through, though it has been only in the reading of them, is to feel encouraged and uplifted and washed in better moral air.' I can think of no better words in which to describe my own feelings as I look back down this long and pleasant byway of my reading life.

GEORGE JACKSON.

LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE

THERE is one lesson that clearly results from the trial through which we are passing; the necessity of extirpating from our society religious intolerance, that scourge so productive of barren strife. Not only is it too evident that in attacking people's consciences we divert towards imaginary or inaccessible objects forces which might effectively be employed in opposing palpable evils, forces which our country claims for the defence of its very existence, but events have proved that Frenchmen, in presence of a common duty, and in spite of the barriers which politics has endeavoured to set up between them, are spontaneously united in thought, heart, and will. Who could persuade a soldier who is also a free-thinker that he should feel less love than he does to his captain, under the plea that this latter is an ecclesiastic? And does the believer inquire as to the opinions of his comrade who will perish unless he comes to his aid? How could these men, who, with like faith and self-sacrifice have given themselves up to their ideal and their country, consent, once peace is restored, to come down from the lofty heights of enthusiasm into that arena of individual ambition and passion where power and rule are the only things of which men think?

But, in order that a thing may be realized, it is not enough that it is in the highest degree desirable or even desired. If there are real difficulties in the way, these may always check the most generous desires. And so we may usefully examine the problem. The will is by no means weakened by union with the reason, rather is it all the more powerful because exercised with a keener vision into reality.

The struggles dealing with liberty of conscience offer a strange assemblage of noble or legitimate claims and unworthy intrigues ; and we are greatly tempted to take up in detail the historical sequence of facts, to think of what would have happened if, at any particular time, some other line of conduct had been adopted. The effort of liberty of conscience to be denizenized within human societies is one of the essential facts of the world's history. What does the name of Socrates stand for if not the claim of right to think and teach in conformity with what is believed to be the truth ? What are religion, philosophy, and science but the triple command to cultivate the rights of the ideal, of reason and experience ?

Now, the appearance of conscience in human society naturally occasions great struggles and difficulties. Conscience is an inspiration whose origin is inapprehensible, and it is possessed of something absolute and imperative in its nature. On the other hand, the man in whom it awakens is no isolated being, like Crusoe on his island ; he belongs to a human community which has its own traditions, beliefs, and laws. The individual whose conscience is awakened naturally aspires to express his thoughts in speech and action. But if, as may be the case, his words and deeds do not accord with the maxims recognized in his community, the latter will naturally be inclined to become uneasy and mistrustful. If the individual who claims his liberty of conscience refuses to act in line with his fellow men, evidently he does harm to the community. If he obeys in body but reserves his liberty of soul, he still injures the community, because devotion is necessarily less whole-hearted when purely exterior than when it proceeds from the intellect and the affections.

Thus, liberty of conscience, through the influence it is bound to exercise on the conduct of the individual, necessarily interests the organized community ; and this latter is at once disposed to solve the problem by permitting the indi-

vidual to find, in the ideas received by the community itself, the principles of his own personal beliefs.

Again, even if conscience were to create within itself a life apart and to refrain from expressing its thoughts by public deeds, the liberty it claims would still meet with contradictions. The beliefs of conscience necessarily depend upon truth. Apart from individual consciences, however, are there not established symbols and forms of truth? By what right does an individual continue to hold thoughts opposed to recognized truths? Thus we find Socrates put on his trial, not only on the charge of compromising the security of the State by his outer acts and the instruction he gave to youth, but also on that of nourishing, in the secret of his conscience, beliefs opposed to the official teachings: e.g. his belief in the warnings of divine intervention.

In our days, it is not only traditional beliefs but science itself as built upon experience and reason that many thinkers contrast with liberty of belief. Is there any room, we are asked, for liberty of conscience, in mathematics, physics, and chemistry? In proportion as science takes possession of any one domain of reality, it drives out imagination and simple belief. When science holds the principles of all reality, i.e., both of the moral and of the physical world, liberty of conscience will have had its day, for it can be accepted with some appearance of legitimacy only when truth is but imperfectly known. And, in the mind of some of these apostles of science, the principles necessary to explain all things are now fully established, so that nowhere can liberty of conscience be any longer tolerated.

Very real and serious, then, is the conflict between liberty of conscience and the external powers. What means have been employed to end this conflict? The simplest and the most ancient is persecution. He who possesses or thinks he possesses force does not doubt but that he will succeed in suppressing unpleasant beliefs either by constraining or by destroying his opponents.

The advent of conscience in man, however, represents the appearance of a wholly spiritual power, which is determined by reasons that cannot be reduced to force; such as the ideas of truth, justice, duty. The greatest force, therefore, collapses before the most disarmed conscience. Socrates, without defending himself, calmly drinks the hemlock; and his thought enters for ever into the substance of the human mind. Christianity penetrates men's souls with prodigious rapidity and might, not only in spite of, but thanks to, persecution. In modern times, the Puritans, persecuted in England, founded the United States. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes raised against France the most bitter hatred and ill-will abroad.

How comes it about that, after such striking lessons, men have not ceased to employ force, constraint, material means, against conscience? Manifestly, at first, beliefs are expressed in external acts, against which force believes itself victoriously armed. Again, subtle minds distinguish beliefs according to the degree of vigour and vitality they attribute to them. They admit that profound beliefs cannot easily be destroyed by force. But if a belief is no more than a survival, to use a popular expression, a passive habit devoid of living faith, they think it legitimate to admit that such a belief will fall before the powerful organization set up against it.

Moreover, certain present psychological doctrines, recommended by imposing names, tend to prove that constraint, cleverly employed, is not so powerless to modify belief as one is wont to declare. Our ideas and beliefs, according to these doctrines, are in the final analysis no more than our deeds and habits expressed by conscience in its own language. Hence our attachment to our beliefs and ideas is really no more than that force of inertia which makes us continue in our modes of life. If what one believes is but the expression of what one does, force may indirectly act upon belief, for it can impose acts and impress habits.

Whatever credit this theory may have enjoyed, it has not triumphed over the classic doctrine of the autonomy and originality of conscience. They are not mistaken who regard belief as a principle which cannot be reduced to external life, and consider that acts inspired by serious beliefs are more difficult to repress than purely mechanical acts.

Now, in the emancipation of conscience there dwells a form of existence superior to the mechanism of matter or to the impersonal tendencies of animal colonies. If then it were possible arbitrarily to train the conscience and change a person into a thing, such a task would be odious, it would mean the triumph of the inferior over the superior. Aristotle's God is truth and good: he leaves force to matter. God, says Christianity, is essentially love and sacrifice. Would not the restoration of force to supreme rank and the subjection thereto of conscience mean blotting out the work of Hellenism and Christianity from the history of mankind?

Whatever influence force may exercise over belief, he who regards moral excellence and human dignity as realities will unhesitatingly condemn its use against liberty of conscience. Besides, force does not solve the problems in which conscience is engaged. Hence the use of a second method: compromise. While liberty of conscience is, *per se*, an idea, an ideal object, those who claim it do not of necessity limit themselves to the use of spiritual means. They also have recourse to force, engaging in material strife with their opponents. These wars too are followed by treaties of peace.

However artificial may seem the use of formulas and compromises in assuring liberty of mind, this means is in conformity with human habits and is of undoubted practical value. A contract has always been an effective instrument of reconciliation. Inspired by a true spirit of justice, frankly accepted on both sides and loyally put into practice,

a concordat may peacefully settle relations as delicate as those of the State as regards religious communities. A régime simply created by events appears something contingent and provisional. However skilfully forms have been made out, they have responded to the difficulties of an epoch ; there is no guarantee that they would satisfy the needs of later periods.

The words of the Gospel have often been repeated : Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. Is not this a realization of the great precept that a radical distinction must be made between the rights of the State and those of conscience ? For the State : material power, the making of laws, responsibility for public order and national security ; for conscience : liberty of thought, reflecting on the nature of things and on human destiny and holding to the ideal it regards as truest and noblest. If each of these two rivals is really itself regulating its activity by its own principle, no conflict between them is possible, for they could never meet. The one moves in the outer world of force, politics, national solidarity ; the other uses outer things only to create for itself an invisible world, inaccessible to natural forces, where it holds communion with pure spirit, the ideal, God.

The State and conscience, it is thought, are both entirely free and apart from each other, just as the infinitude of space in no way encroaches upon the infinitude of spirit. A seductive theory, though no more than a practical expedient. Is it not evident that two persons who cannot endure each other will cease fighting if they never again happen to find themselves together ?

Applied, however, to the relation between political organization and conscience, such a comparison does not hold. To suppose a world of conscience wholly independent of the external world is to substitute artificial logical concepts for veritable realities. This radical distinction between the temporal and the spiritual has no better scientific than historical foundation. Man is a whole whose elements

are mutually inseparable. Neither body nor soul can be separated, nor does conscience exist apart. Every real idea is also the beginning of an external action; every strictly human action is the manifestation of an idea.

This condition is found in the activity proper either to the State or to conscience, as regards morals or religion. The State represents force. How can we help desiring that it should be used in the realization of the truest and loftiest ideas, measuring the greatness of its duties by the extent of its power? Conscience is the domain of liberty. Would this liberty be aught else than an individual's vain mental state and barren enjoyment did it not tend to effort, and, when necessary, to strife, in modifying the world according to the ideal it conceives?

We must courageously face the truth. As regards the relationship between the political community and human conscience, a real and lasting peace is impossible, unless, amid all differences in principle and point of view, human beings show mutual understanding and esteem. The classic maxim is constantly being repeated: *Quid leges sine moribus?* Now or never is the time to apply it. Laws, undoubtedly, are capable of exercising profound influence upon morals; it is by no means a matter of indifference that they should outstrip morals if the latter fail to reform themselves.

In examining these questions, it is impossible to keep to purely political or legal considerations. It is necessary to ask oneself if consciences which regard truth and justice as laws can really come to consider religious beliefs as absurd and pernicious, or at all events, as useless and devoid of foundation. Now, if we closely examine the objections raised against religious beliefs in the name of reason and science, we find that they refer to conceptions of religion and science which are neither adequate nor legitimate. There is a contradiction between a science which regards the material element of things as the true reality, the

essence of all that is, and a religion which denies to creatures any existence and worth of their own. Science, however, may follow out as far as possible its mechanical explanation of things without therefore maintaining that mechanism is the first and sole principle of being. And religion may show God present and acting in all that is without denying to creatures true existence and action. 'God,' said Pascal, 'willed to endow His creatures with the dignity of causality.'

Thus religion is not opposed to the fact that beings should possess a certain nature, capable of being studied in itself. And science admits that the world of facts in which it moves is connected with a world of true causes which eludes its mode of investigation. Nor can it be without advantage to religion to know exactly and profoundly, by means of science, the nature of the given world. Science too, as it ascends the scale of beings, encounters regions where matter is more and more impregnated with spirit, where the real seems to be increasingly determined by the ideal.

If then religion and science, so far as they consider each other only from without, may be led to mutual mistrust or even to regard each other as irreconcilable enemies, on the other hand they endeavour to understand and know each other in spirit and in truth, they see that their co-existence is natural and necessary, and that they can and ought to render mutual services.

The minimum of mutual human obligations is what is called tolerance. In every manifestation of conscience, there is occasion to consider conscience itself, the reality and dignity of which are set beyond doubt by the most exact science. To oppress conscience is to insist on degrading humanity, on snapping the link that unites it to the ideal, on separating it from the principle of truth, justice, and beauty.

But is it enough that men should tolerate and bear with one another? Such a doctrine was repulsive to Mirabeau, who said: 'The very word tolerance seems somehow tyrannical

since the existence of the authority which has power to tolerate is an outrage on liberty of thought, from the very fact that it does tolerate and so had the power not to tolerate.' This remark is quite true. In reality, man's conscience is something more than possibility of seeking after truth and goodness. As Plato pointed out, we seek only that whereof we possess at least some idea, germ, or rudiment. 'Be of good comfort,' said the Saviour to Pascal, 'thou would'st not seek Me had'st thou not found Me.' The reason why conscience aspires after the true and the good is that in its very nature are found some beginnings of science and justice. For this reason, consciences owe one another respect as well as tolerance. Conscience, that secret and living communion with the ideal, is essentially the power of opposing material force by obedience to moral laws: this very character confers on it a positive dignity and makes it something sacred, to every intelligent being.

Nor does respect, in its turn, exhaust the whole of our duty towards the conscience of our fellow-men. The one quality which man, when attempting to conceive of God, is necessarily led to attribute to Him, is infinity in perfection. No man, then, however great his intelligence, can compass the divine nature, for the finite cannot contain the infinite. The diversity of mankind, however, enables the human race, in a measure, to ponder and examine these various aspects of divine perfection. Thus mankind, as a whole, profiting by its natural richness and fecundity, may tend to realize more and more fully that resemblance to divinity which is its end. And so, to each of our brothers in humanity, a collaborator like ourselves—differently perhaps from ourselves—in divine Providence, we owe not only tolerance and respect but also sympathy and friendship. 'Love one another'; all morality which falls short of that is a failure.

Though insoluble so long as each of the two parties nourishes a secret scorn for the other, the problem of the

relations between established power and liberty of conscience becomes simplified if every man is able to find the substratum of truth in beliefs which he does not share. Though divided in the expressions and forms of their faith in the ideal, men who are eager to fulfil to the end their destiny as human beings are united in the inmost aspirations of the conscience. Let them build upon this common basis, become imbued with their mutual duty of respect and sympathy as well as of tolerance, and legal arrangements, rendered supple or capable of extension if necessary, will readily be interpreted and applied along the lines of liberty.

To recognize liberty of thought without granting men the slightest right to manifest and translate this liberty into action would be to misinterpret the unity of human nature and the meaning and value of thought itself. Not only the individual but society is interested in the external actualization of thought. The tasks to perform in our modern societies become increasingly numerous and complicated; the State, of itself alone, neither can nor ought to claim to accomplish them all. Undoubtedly its influence is more than ever necessary in times of public danger, when co-ordination of effort is particularly indispensable. Nor can it be admitted that individuals or associations, under the pretext of maintaining their liberty, should adopt the 'dog in the manger' attitude. All alike, State, individual and association, believer and free-thinker, should devote their special powers to the task of making human society ever more keenly enamoured of truth and justice.

Amongst the manifestations of social activity, beneficence and instruction more particularly could not be the object of a monopoly. The former is based on brotherhood and is a matter of the heart as well as of the mind, of devotion as well as of organization. Instruction also deals with the soul as well as with the intellect. Xenophon, the disciple of Socrates, was wont to say that if a master cannot inspire love he is incapable of imparting true instruction

to his pupils. Science and literature, art and morals, cannot be confiscated by any one; they form the common possession of every member of a human society.

As regards religion especially, since it is essentially an education of heart and conscience, with a tendency to free man from his natural passions, to civilize him, in the highest sense of the word, it is right that the State should loyally guarantee its free practice and the conditions of its existence. Cordial collaboration on the part of all who are devoted to virtue and to their country, however different their beliefs; such is the duty our reason dictates. This too will be the blessing left to us by the immense sacrifices, the deeds of truest devotion and the superhuman efforts made in common, without respect of rank or opinion, by all the children of France.

EMILE BOUTROUX, *Membre de l'Académie.*
(Authorized translation by Fred Rothwell.)

THE FALSE DECRETALS

The False Decretals. By E. H. DAVENPORT, B.A. (Blackwell, 4s. 6d. net).

THE False Decretals, which became current in Gaul about the middle of the ninth century, form the most conspicuous member of a group—variously reckoned as four or five in number—of so-called ‘forgeries.’ Of the remaining members of the group the most important, and the only one that need be mentioned here, was the False Capitularies of the Frankish kings, which was for civil legislation what the False Decretals were in relation to Canon Law. The capitularies purported to be the work of Benedict Levita of Mayence, a more or less hypothetical personage, and are known to have appeared in 847—this last a point of some importance in the higher criticism of the False Decretals. These last-named professed to be a collection of ecclesiastical laws compiled by Isidore Mercator, a personage as hypothetical as Benedict Levita, whose name was possibly selected with a view of enhancing the credit of his compilation by suggesting that the famous Isidore, Saint, and Archbishop of Seville, was in some way responsible for its preparation. Hence the collection is not infrequently known as the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals.

This remarkable work consists of three parts. Part I, entirely spurious, contains, together with preface and introductory matter, seventy papal letters purporting to have been handed down from the period antecedent to the First General Council of the Church, the series concluding with the episcopate of Miltiades (311-14). With the exception of two apocryphal letters of Clement of Rome previously extant, these are all apparently fabrications of the compiler. Part II, comprising a collection of Councils

arranged according to their regions, is, in the main, taken over bodily from the canonical collection in use in Spain in the eighth century, and consequently known as the *Hispana*, in the compilation of which the real Archbishop Isidore is believed to have taken a leading part. To this collection, however, were added a few spurious pieces already current, the most important of which was the Donation of Constantine.¹ This second part therefore contains nothing new. Part III contains the series of papal letters. As the first admittedly genuine decretal dates only from the episcopate of Siricius (385-98),² thirty letters which are ascribed to his predecessors in the Roman Chair, beginning with Silvester, must be regarded as apocryphal one and all. From this date the authentic decretals are included, uninterpolated as a rule, but interspersed among them are thirty-five fabrications. These unauthentic decretals are generally, though not invariably, ascribed to pontiffs whose decretals do not figure in the genuine list, viz. Anastasius I (398-402), Sixtus III (432-40), and the series of eleven who bridge the interval between Hormisdas (514-23) and Gregory I (590-604). With those of the last-named pontiff the decretals come to an end, save for a single letter attributed to Gregory II (715-31).

These apocryphal letters or decretals were not, however, for the more part, composed by the compiler himself; nor do they embody entirely fresh material. All was grist that came to Pseudo-Isidore's mill, and he has freely drawn upon various sources, such for instance as the entries in the *Liber Pontificalis*, the Vulgate, Patristic literature generally, the works of Cassiodorus and Rufinus, the correspondence of Archbishop Boniface of Mayence, such collections of laws as the *Breviarium Alaricanum*, the *Lex Visigothorum*, and the Frankish Capitularies. In addition to quoting from earlier writings

¹ cf. my *Early Roman Episcopate*, p. 200, note 2, with refs.

² See my *Rise of the Papacy*, pp. 2-3, with notes and refs.

he antedates evidence for the Church order and discipline which he found established in his own day.

Mr. Davenport's opening chapter deals with what he describes as the environment of the False Decretals; and rightly so. For the more one studies this remarkable compilation the clearer does it become that it was the product of its age, and, alike in respect of subject-matter and method of presentation, the outcome of contemporary conditions. A clear understanding of these conditions is, therefore, a *sine qua non* for a critical study of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection. This essential part of his task Mr. Davenport has accomplished with skill and success. The twentieth-century reader is set side by side with the ninth-century observer, contemplates with him the riotous working of lawlessness and disorder in every walk of life, threatening every social institution, and boding ill for the Church, which was threatened by dangers from within and without. The way of escape presented a serious problem, to find a solution for which was the object with which Pseudo-Isidore took up his pen, the False Decretals being the result of his quest. Whatever may be our view of his integrity, judged by modern ethical standards, and waiving the question of the wisdom or otherwise of his attempted solution, it is but fair to allow that it was not in the spirit of a common forger that Pseudo-Isidore wrought. For, in passing judgement upon him, it must never be lost sight of that in the fifth decade of the ninth century the accepted canons of literary honesty were widely different from those of the twentieth; the modern demand for historical accuracy in matters of detail had simply not come into existence.

'The environment of the False Decretals was the local Church-State of the Franks prior to 850,' Mr. Davenport tells us. This indeed is the view of practically all competent authorities, and may be regarded as settled beyond need of discussion. Not only the sources upon which the compiler has drawn for material, to which reference has already been

made, but the fact that his language swarms with Gallicisms and Frankish legal terms, make it practically certain that the writer lived in Frankland. The indications of date, to which we shall return, are also precise ; and in the matter of date, as of general locality, we are on very firm ground.

By the middle of the ninth century the Carling Empire was already showing tokens of weakness. Charles the Great had left no successor quite equal to bearing the gigantic burden which had taxed the strength even of the greatest man and monarch of his age. With the partition of the Empire and the weakening of the central authority the spirit of disorder had begun to raise its head ; and the Church, whose interests were inextricably interwoven with those of the State, suffered not a little in consequence. A very strong hand was needed to maintain inviolate the frontiers of Christendom in face of the growing pressure of warlike and virile barbarian hordes from without, and to repress civil disturbance within ; and such was nowhere to be found. Domestic and foreign enemies again and again raided the possessions of the Church. In vain did synod after synod hurl its anathema against the violators of ecclesiastical property, and raise a bitter cry for imperial or royal protection. The Church was in peril from the secular government or, perhaps we should rather say, from want of it. Pseudo-Isidore of course looked at things from an ecclesiastical standpoint, and one of the principal objects which he had in view was to find protection against the encroachments of secular powers great and small.

But if the Church was imperilled by secular aggression, and by the inability of the civil authority to afford adequate protection, this was not the sum of her peril. Her own house was by no means in order ; and threatened by aggression from without, she was at the same time endangered by internal weakness and disorder. This latter peril was in part the direct result of the waning efficiency of the civil government, which tended to disorganize the ecclesi-

astical administration ; and in part indirectly caused by the consequent weakening of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. By way of illustration of the manner in which the changefulness of civil politics adversely reacted upon ecclesiastical polity it may be pointed out that the not infrequent partitioning of kingdoms, as for instance by the celebrated Treaty of Verdun (843), involved grave disturbances of the boundaries of dioceses and ecclesiastical provinces, while a revolt such as that of Nomenoe, Duke of Brittany (843), might involve the rending asunder of an ecclesiastical province and the unauthorized establishment of a new archbishopric. Amid changes like these, too frequently attended with violence and rapine, it was manifestly difficult, if not impossible, to maintain the routine of Church administration. As to the second or indirect result of ill civil conditions, the disorganization of the hierarchical system, it may be remarked that this for the more part appears to have centred around the positions, legitimate or otherwise, occupied by the chorepiscopus, or country bishop, and the metropolitan.

The exact status of the chorepiscopus is a little obscure. He appeared at an early date, and under the authority of a city bishop, seems to have exercised episcopal functions in the more remote districts of a perhaps unwieldy diocese. In some respects his position was perhaps not altogether unlike that of an Anglican suffragan bishop at the present day. The chorepiscopal office appears to have survived longer in Ireland than anywhere else, until the middle of the twelfth century, when an Irish synod (1152) decreed that no further appointments should be made. In the absence of his superior, perhaps on secular duty, the chorepiscopus probably deputed for him, and where such absence was prolonged, might in practice exercise little less than full diocesan authority. Little as the chorepiscopus might be to blame for acting thus, in the eyes of Pseudo-Isidore there appeared to be some danger that he would usurp

full episcopal functions, and supersede, instead of merely relieving his diocesan. In consequence it must be insisted upon that the chorepiscopus was no true bishop, but an intruder. In some cases, however, the Church historian, in view of what is known of the character and pursuits of not a few diocesan bishops of the Middle Ages, may hazard the conjecture that the chorepiscopus was a truer bishop than his chief.

Under the strong government of Charles the Great the metropolitan archbishop was more or less kept in his place ; but with the weakening of the royal authority, consequent upon the partition of the first Holy Roman Emperor's realm, the metropolitan authority gained a proportionate accession of strength. By the middle of the ninth century the metropolitan had become an autocrat ; no longer the servant and the mouthpiece of his provincial synod, he had become its master ; and the diocesan bishop was not only appointed, but, to no small extent, exercised his functions and administered discipline only in so far as his master saw fit to allow. The metropolitan, moreover, had also become a political personage of the first importance, taking part in the civil wars, and by his support, or lack of it, shaping the destiny of kings. The metropolitanate, after Charles' death, had in fact become the main buttress of the imperialist interest. These secular activities inevitably involved some neglect of spiritual duty. By this time almost *ex officio* a politician, the metropolitan was well on his way to become first and foremost a feudal lord, and only in a very minor degree a minister of Christ and a servant of the Church.

The Holy Roman Empire was in theory the one and only world-state, at the head of which, enjoying a dignity to which no mere king however powerful might presume to aspire, were two co-ordinate governing authorities, the Pope and the Emperor, viceregents in things spiritual and temporal respectively of the King of kings, the Two Swords of which

the Redeemer Himself had said, 'It is enough.' In practice, however, the relations of the twin Lords of Christendom were more or less confused, and not infrequently mutually antagonistic. Charles the Great, for instance, because the Church was weak, did not hesitate to encroach upon the functions of his spiritual colleague, treating bishops as his vassals, convoking councils, determining dogma, and, even before he became Emperor, consenting to sit in judgement upon Pope Leo III. This practice of subordinating the ecclesiastical authority to the civil sovereign was, though less effectively, continued by the great Emperor's son and grandson. Whatever mediæval theory might say, the Carlings showed not the least inclination in practice to permit the spiritual authority to lord it over the secular. Yet there was, at the same time, in many quarters, a disposition to regard the former as endued with an authority to which, in some matters at least, even the greatest princes must bow. It was, for instance, admittedly the province of the Church to succour the oppressed, and her intervention was often a determining factor in the administration or maladministration of justice. Under certain circumstances the bishop had power to insist upon revision of a sentence regularly pronounced. As interpreters of God to men the hierarchy possessed a large power of criticism of the policy and conduct of secular princes, however highly placed. Even so early as the reign of Lewis the Pious (813-40) they passed on from criticism to action, and did not stop short of the deposition of the king, whom they subsequently restored; in which very striking exercise of their authority they enjoyed the support of public opinion. By the mid-ninth century the ecclesiastical authority had already displayed a marked tendency to encroach upon the sphere of the civil, which had begun to show marked signs of weakness.

A complete survey of the entire contents of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals would be an undertaking impossible of accomplishment in a single short paper. The authentic

matter, which forms about one half of the entire contents, will therefore be suffered to pass unmentioned; while, so far as the inauthentic is concerned, it will be necessary for us to confine our attention to such portions as appear to be intended to provide a solution to the practical difficulties indicated above. In this connection Mr. Davenport adopts a rather happy and suggestive nomenclature which we shall do well to follow, distinguishing the texts of more practical import, in relation to what appeared to the compiler to be the crying needs of the time, as defensive, constructive, and aggressive.

The defensive texts are such as are concerned with the protection of the Church against secular encroachment. For the more part they lay down nothing new, but formally insist upon the observance of current theory, which is represented as being the *primæval* law of the Church, to support which contention ancient authority is duly provided, in the shape of decretals or papal letters having the force of law. An accused cleric, for instance, must not be summoned before a secular tribunal; he might claim to be tried by his bishop alone, with a right of appeal from the court of the latter to a provincial council presided over by the metropolitan. Should the accused be a bishop his case must come before a provincial council with right of appeal to the Pope, a right moreover of which he might avail himself without awaiting the council, if he entertained the least suspicion of its fairness; or he might have recourse to *judices electi*, chosen by himself from among his com-provincial brethren. This was the existing practice, restated however, by Pseudo-Isidore with the proviso that the Pope—the fifth, otherwise the seventh canon of Sardica notwithstanding—might decide upon the place of trial. In addition to all this, a provincial council might only *hear* an episcopal case, judgement being reserved to the Pope. These regulations rendered the defence of a bishop the more easy; and they were supplemented by others which made

condemnation difficult, if not impossible. It was not easy, for instance, to find a competent accuser, all laymen, inferior clerics, and even clergy of equal standing if suspected of personal bias, being barred; even in the unlikely event of an accuser being found he must enlist the support of no less than seventy-two witnesses as competent as himself. If the defendant bishop had been already deprived, he could demand postponement of trial until he had been either restored to his see or translated to another; in other words the property as well as the persons of members of the episcopate was to be jealously safeguarded. The foregoing are some only of Pseudo-Isidore's rules of procedure which rendered episcopal trials as irksome as possible; and they were capable of being turned to account with almost equal facility against metropolitan as against secular authority.

Turning now to the ecclesiastical disorganization, with which the constructive texts of the False Decretals were more particularly concerned, so far as this was the result of civil anarchy it was beyond any remedy that our compiler was able to suggest. He could merely assert that ecclesiastical boundaries were unalterably fixed, and urge bishops and metropolitans not to encroach upon each other. But to counter the disorganization for which the hierarchy itself seemed to be more directly responsible he drew a picture of an ideal ecclesiastical organization, with the Pope as the apex and keystone of the whole system. The chorepiscopus was ignored; and the metropolitan shorn of all real jurisdiction, retaining but an empty precedence among the bishops of his province as a sort of *primus inter pares*, his ecclesiastical status being further diminished by the interjection between him and the Supreme Pontiff of a new order of primates.

There remain now only the aggressive texts, which attempted to regulate the vague and confused relations

¹ See my *Early Roman Episcopate*, p. 226.

between ecclesiastical and civil authority—to the advantage of the former, as a matter of course. The layman, from the Emperor downwards, must take no part in Church government, or accuse a priest, or dispose of ecclesiastical property. The Pope, not the Emperor, was to have the final word in all such matters, and to the former alone it pertained to convoke councils. If the Frankish clergy needed protection they ought to look for it from the Bishop of Rome, not from the Frankish king. Even in civil affairs the clergy, as the earthly representatives of the King of kings, ought to possess the controlling influence. It was theirs to exercise censorship upon the actions of all men, and where such ran counter to God's law—this last a vague term, the connotation of which was not always determined on purely spiritual grounds—without scruple to declare them null. Though this may or may not have been their conscious intention, had the principles thus inculcated, and fortified by precedents drawn from ecclesiastical legend rather than the real facts of history, made themselves good as accepted precepts of conduct and life, the ecclesiastical authority would have secured not mere independence, but complete supremacy. Such consummation would no doubt have harmonized well with the aims and ideals of that mighty contemporary pontiff Nicolas I (858-67), who, however, without altogether ignoring, himself made no great use of the False Decretals. Yet their growing currency during his great pontificate undoubtedly strengthened his far-reaching claims.¹ Pseudo-Isidore, without intending it, had in fact produced his compilation just in time to render real assistance at a moment when the papal power underwent a remarkable development.

This brings us to the question of the date of the False Decretals, a question which may be dismissed in a very few words. The False Capitularies, with which Pseudo-Isidore was admittedly acquainted, appeared, as already remarked, in 847; this date therefore affords a *terminus a*

quo ; while a reference to the False Decretals themselves in 852, by the famous Hincmar of Reims, supplies a *terminus ad quem*. Not earlier than 847, or later than 852, if we date the publication of Pseudo-Isidore's work at about 850 we shall certainly not be wide of the mark. Eight years later Nicolas I ascended the papal throne.

Let us now for a moment turn from the work to the worker himself. What was the specific purpose which Pseudo-Isidore had it in mind to accomplish by his literary labours ? Was his outlook limited to the local conditions in, say, the province of Mayence, or Reims, or Tours, each of which has been suggested as the place of origin of the False Decretals ? The first-named is unlikely ; but the *cause célèbre* of Ebbo may be plausibly adduced in favour of Reims, and the depredations of Nomenoe in favour of Tours. Without disputing that either Reims or Le Mans may have been the birthplace of the Pseudo-Isidorian work, in which case the local conditions may have been not without influence upon the mind of the compiler, the elaborate character of the compilation itself does not favour the contention that he was solely concerned with a local and personal case. A second theory to the effect that his purpose was universal and aggressive commends itself to Mr. Davenport no more than the foregoing. That the compiler was an ambitious man consciously working for the future greatness of the Church appears on the face of it far less probable than that he was a man obsessed with the present ills that afflicted her and the need for immediate reform. The latter he sought to promote by an attempt to re-establish the ancient practice as pictured in the legends of the Church, which he had gained from various sources, and himself regarded as faithfully mirroring the past. Of the potentialities of the procedure and principles for which he pleaded he thought but little, his interests were centred

¹ cf. my *Mediaeval Papacy*, pp. 70-75, for Nicolas I, and some further remarks with reference to the Pseudo-Isidorian collection.

upon the present needs rather than the future greatness of Mother Church. His real purpose would therefore seem to have been the effecting of a practical reform in the present rather than the initiation of a new movement in the interests of a wide extension of ecclesiastical power. Pseudo-Isidore's work, then, appears to have been defensive rather than aggressive in purpose and aim. For him the Canon Law had existed full-orbed from the first planting of the Christian Church; and the compendium which he compiled, in blissful ignorance of the first principles of literary and historical criticism, was intended to be a fair presentation of ancient regulations and procedure to which his own disordered age would do well to hark back. The apocryphal character of his work is now universally admitted, but Pseudo-Isidore himself, whoever he may have really been, we may suffer to pass as a reformer, not as a rogue.

For no less than six centuries the authority and genuineness of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection passed without question, though in a more critical age it could hardly have survived for a day. The compiler had, in matter of fact, done his work clumsily enough; making his first and second century bishops write in the Frankish Latin of the ninth, quote documents which were non-existent in their day, and give rulings upon questions which did not arise until they had been long sleeping in their graves! These are some only of the more glaring crudities which at once appear when this remarkable work is subjected to even the slightest critical examination. But long years were to pass ere this test was applied, and before the day of exposure arrived the False Decretals had contributed not a little to the making of history. But, though the influence of this collection of letters in course of time become far-reaching enough, its immediate influence was very small. Within the frontiers of Christendom the revolting duke or lawless baron, bent on enriching himself

at the expense of his neighbours, recked little of the authority of the forgotten popes invoked by Pseudo-Isidore, while foes from without, the Northman or the Saracen for instance, cared even less. Bishops and synods still urged their complaints, and appealed to the Decretals in vain. The constructive texts availed little. The decline of the chorepiscopus was rather a result of the rise of the arch-deacon and other natural causes than of Pseudo-Isidore's strictures. The star of the metropolitan still remained in the ascendant, and the primate came not. The aggressive texts availed if possible less. Any access of political influence acquired by the bishops of Gaul was less the fruit of Pseudo-Isidore's pen than of the needs of monarchs like Charles the Bald, who exalted the bishop to serve his own interests, not those of the Church. In Rome the Decretals were little used for some time after their publication, though they did no doubt somewhat confirm the Pope's control over provincial councils, and his judicial authority in episcopal cases. As Mr. Davenport sums up, 'In their defensive character their immediate influence was impossible. In their aggressive character it was indistinguishable on the Church in Gaul, and it was only just distinguishable on the Papal See.' Imperceptible at first, the influence of the False Decretals continued to grow, and by the mid-eleventh century they were regarded as affording precedents for almost every claim of the Church, and for any claim to authority that the Pontiff saw fit to assert.

This was, as we have already observed, far from being their intention ; and it is surely one of the ironies of history that the False Decretals, while they failed to accomplish the specific object which their compiler had in view, actually did accomplish that of which he had never dreamed. Intended to protect bishops against metropolitan encroachments, they eventually contributed to put bishops as well as metropolitans under the heel of the Pope.

V. ERNEST BEET.

WESLEY'S STANDARDS IN THE LIGHT OF TO-DAY

THE question of doctrinal standards is one of the most difficult that confronts the Church, especially in an age of widening knowledge and changing outlook. Some of the most advanced thinkers are impatient of all standards, but most moderate men realize that they are necessary, first to prevent the diversion of the property of a Church from the purposes for which it is held, and second to provide a norm which shall secure ministerial loyalty to those truths which the particular Church regards as fundamental. To-day, in most Churches, there is a wide-spread desire for the simplification of standards, and for the permission of the widest liberty which is compatible with faithfulness to the essentials of the gospel.

The difficulty of the question arises from the fact that as the centuries advance knowledge takes possession of new territories, thought penetrates deeper and climbs higher, and the coinage issued from the mint of truth has no guarantee of perpetual currency. Man's horizon widens, thought-forms and speech-forms change, and no generation can so express the truth as fully to satisfy its successors. To admit that the last word in theology was spoken at Nicea or Chalcedon or Westminster would be to plead guilty to mental and moral arrest. Paradoxical though it may sound, loyalty to the fundamental truths of a confession may in course of time lead to the revision of that confession. It may well happen that the true spiritual descendants of those who draw up a creed are not those who believe its letter, but those who read into it a deeper spiritual meaning, which they desire to see expressed in the language of their own day.

Those who exercise a certain economy in their subscription to creeds and who plead that 'the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life' are always open to the charge of dishonesty. Of course deviation of belief may become so wide that the charge may be justified, but is this serious accusation to be brought against any and every departure from the plain meaning of a confession? The question is not as simple as it is sometimes made to appear. The conservative has an immense logical advantage when he appeals to the letter of the standards, but it is often simply a logical and not a moral advantage. Is the conservative prepared to subscribe to two propositions, (1) that the Church knows all that can be known on earth of Christian truth; (2) that the Church has already stated the truth as adequately as she can ever hope to state it? If not, how is any advance possible so long as a minister is to be held guilty of dishonesty if he deviates in the slightest degree from the standards to which he has subscribed? The only way of progress left open is that of secession or schism. The prophet who sees new light and truth, though he may be building on the foundations laid by the founders of his Church, has no option save to rend the body to which he belongs and to add another chapter to the pitiful history of Church disunion. Most Christian men will say that, except where the change of belief is of a fundamental character, this is an alternative which must be avoided at all costs. The Church must find a way of progress which is compatible with loyalty to the truth, moral sincerity, and the unity of the Body of Christ.

Different branches of the Church have attempted to solve the problem in various ways. The British Presbyterian Churches are bound by the Westminster Confession, which is dominantly Calvinistic in its trend. Most of these churches have from time to time sought relief by means of Declaratory Acts. In 1910 the Established Church of Scotland secured the assent of Parliament to a formula

to be read before subscription : 'I hereby subscribe the Confession of Faith, declaring that I accept it as the Confession of the Church, and that I believe the fundamental doctrines of the Church contained therein.' In the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church of Scotland (now combined as the United Free Church) 'Declaratory Acts were passed in 1879 and 1892 to define on certain points the sense in which the Confession was to be understood, disowning the view that the Confession inculcated persecuting principles in relation to the duties of the civil magistrate, and the view that its doctrine of sin and grace taught that human corruption has destroyed human responsibility and the power to do virtuous actions, or that some infants are eternally lost, or that men are fore-ordained to death irrespective of their sin, or that Divine grace is not extended to any who are out of reach of the ordinary means.'¹ The English Presbyterian Church, too, has drawn up Articles of Faith in order to define the doctrines of the Westminster Confession which are to be regarded as *de fide* and vital. As is well known, many Anglican clergymen have for long groaned beneath the burden of the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, but as yet no relief has been forthcoming.² The United Methodist Church, which was constituted in 1907 by the union of the United Methodist Free Churches, the Bible Christians, and the Methodist New Connexion, adopted in place of Wesley's *First Four Volumes of Sermons* and *Notes on the New Testament*, which had been the standards of the constituent Churches, twelve Articles of Faith. These articles were, however, not embodied in the United Methodist Church Act or in trust deeds, and under certain safeguards the Conference has power to vary them from time to time. This is the only British Church which has complete spiritual autonomy.

¹ Dr. W. A. Curtis in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, III., p. 878.

² The Synodical Declaration, May, 1873, gave no real relief (see Prothero, *Life of Dean Stanley*, p. 390, Nelson's edition).

Our present purpose is to consider the Wesleyan Methodist Standards in the light of to-day.

I

Wesley's first Model Deed (1763) provided that those appointed to preach in his chapels should preach 'no other doctrine than is contained in Mr. Wesley's *Notes on the New Testament* and *Four Volumes of Sermons*.' The situation to-day is governed by the clause in the Model Deed (1832) which enacts that 'no person or persons whomsoever shall, at any time, be permitted to Preach or Expound God's Holy Word in the said chapel, &c., who shall maintain, promulgate or teach any Doctrine or Practice contrary to what is contained in certain *Notes on the New Testament*, commonly reputed to be the Notes of the said John Wesley, and in the *First Four Volumes of Sermons* commonly reputed to be written and published by him.' It is open to the Trustees' Meeting and the Leaders' Meeting to proceed against any minister whom they 'shall believe' to be erroneous in doctrine.

It is interesting to note that in the first trust deed, that of the Orphan House at Newcastle, there is a provision which gives John and Charles Wesley and after them the Trustees power to appoint preachers 'to preach and expound God's Holy Word in the said House, in the same manner as near as may be as God's Holy Word is now preached and expounded there.'¹ This, as Dr. Simon has pointed out, 'is easily detected as the precursor of the well-known doctrinal standard clause.' Wesley's clear purpose was to secure the property for the use of preachers who should expound the Scriptures from his own evangelical standpoint. Further consideration showed him that this clause was too vague, and that it was necessary for him to define his doctrinal standpoint more exactly. This he did in the

¹ Dr. J. S. Simon in *Proceedings Wesley Historical Society*, IX., 2, p. 37.

Notes on the New Testament and the First Four Volumes of Sermons.

The *Notes on the New Testament* were written in 1754 and 1755. They were based largely on Bengel's *Gnomon* (published 1742). Wesley acknowledges his debt in his preface: 'Many of his notes I have translated, many more I have abridged, omitting that part that was purely critical, and giving the substance of the rest.' In his introduction to the Book of *Revelation*, he says, 'The following notes are mostly those of that excellent man; a few of which are taken from his *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, but far more from his *Erklärte Offenbarung*. . . . Every part of this I do not undertake to defend. . . . All I can do is partly to translate, partly abridge the most necessary of his observations; allowing myself the liberty to alter some of them and to add a few notes where he is not full.' The words with which he closes this introduction may perhaps be taken as expressing the spirit in which he wrote all the *Notes*, 'I by no means pretend to understand or explain all that is contained in this mysterious book. I only offer what help I can to the serious inquirer, and shall be rejoiced if any be moved thereby more carefully to read and more deeply to consider the words of this prophecy.' Dr. Simon has written wisely concerning the application of this book as a doctrinal test, that 'it needs to be handled with great discrimination. Such application calls for the exercise of the highest powers of the judicial mind. It is not enough to pick out a sentence from the *Notes* and make it a weapon of attack or defence. We have to examine the sentence, compare it with other opinions expressed in the book, and especially to find out whether it has a history.'¹

Until recently it was commonly held that the *First Four Volumes of Sermons* contained fifty-three sermons. But the researches of the late Rev. Richard Green and of Rev. Dr. J. S. Simon have proved that the phrase in the

¹ Dr. Simon in *Proceedings W.H.S.* IX., 5, p. 102.

Model Deed applies to the first four volumes of Wesley's *Sermons*, published in eight volumes in 1787-8, and that the total number of sermons is forty-four. The Conference of 1914 declared its acceptance of this interpretation.¹ The result is that the sermons entitled 'The Witness of the Spirit (II),' 'On Sin in Believers,' 'The Repentance of Believers,' 'The Great Assize,' 'The Lord Our Righteousness,' 'The Scripture Way of Salvation,' 'The Good Steward,' 'The Reformation of Manners' and 'On the Death of Mr. George Whitefield,' are no longer counted among the Standards.

It may be well at this stage to draw attention to two or three points :

(1) Subscription to the Standards does not imply acceptance of all the opinions and interpretations expressed in them, but only of the 'doctrines and practices' inculcated.

(2) When Wesley and the Conference adopted a model deed containing a doctrinal standard clause, their purpose was not to impose on the preachers a fixed and rigid system of theology, but to take the steps that seemed necessary to protect their property from the abuse of erroneous teaching.

(3) The fact that the Standards of Wesleyan Methodism are not Articles of Religion, but expositions of the Scriptures, would seem to indicate that its *primary* standards are the Scriptures, and that there is a sense in which the *Notes* and *Sermons* are but *secondary* standards. We have seen that in the Newcastle deed Wesley did actually set up the Scriptures as the standard for his preachers. He could not leave the matter there, because he saw that all manner of schools of thought are wont to seek support from the Bible. But his appeal was ever to the Scriptures, and he was always open to be convinced that his interpretation was erroneous. A controversialist attacked his *Note* on 2 Cor. 4. Wesley admitted himself at fault and wrote, 'This

¹ *Proceedings W.H.S.* IX. 2, and *Minutes of Conference*, 1914, p. 373 and Appendix XXVII.

is wrong. It is not the meaning of the text. I will put it out if I live to print another edition.' Again in his *Note* on Heb. xii. 9 (the *Notes* were published at the end of 1755) he says that 'perhaps' the words 'intimate that our earthly fathers are only the parents of our bodies, &c.,' but in 1783 he says of a certain treatise that 'it proves to demonstration that God has enabled man, as all other creatures, to propagate his whole species, consisting of soul and body.'¹

In the Preface to the *Sermons*, Wesley directly allows an appeal to the Scriptures.

'But some may say, I have mistaken the way myself, although I take upon me to teach it to others. It is probable many will think this; and it is very possible that I have. But I trust, whereinsoever I have mistaken, my mind is open to conviction. I sincerely desire to be better informed. I say to God and man, "What I know not teach thou me." . . . Point me out a better way than I have known. Show me it is so by plain proof of Scripture.'²

The Standards, therefore, allow an appeal from themselves to the Scriptures. The question, of course, arises who is to arbitrate on the appeal, as Wesley is not with us? It is neither unreasonable nor unfair to argue that the arbiter is Wesley's duly designated successor, viz.: the Conference.

II

The evidence is overwhelming that Wesley did not intend the Standards to fetter the thought of his preachers in speculative matters, or to be used as an instrument of oppression by one section against another. Let us look at the testimony of the Standards themselves. The *Note* on 1 Cor. xiv. 20, is 'Knowing religion was not designed to destroy any of our natural faculties, but to exalt and improve them, our reason in particular.' On 1 Cor. xi. 18, he writes that the word 'heresy' in the modern sense was 'invented merely to deprive mankind of the benefit of

¹ Dr. J. S. Simon in *Proceedings W.H.S.* IX. 5, p. 103.

² *Works* (4th edition), V., p. 3. cf. 'General Rules' of the United Societies' (*Works*, VIII., p. 261), 'His written word, the only rule and the sufficient rule both of our faith and practice.'

private judgement and liberty of conscience' (cf. *Note* Tit. iii. 10). Two of the Standard sermons are entitled, 'A Caution against Bigotry' and 'Catholic Spirit.' It is not implied that Wesley encouraged a latitudinarian spirit. On the contrary he described 'indifference to all opinions' as 'the spawn of hell, not the offspring of heaven.' But a perusal of these sermons shows that to him the things which mattered were belief in God, faith in Christ and His redemptive work, being 'right with God,' love of God and of our neighbour, and faith and love proving themselves by good works.

It is hardly necessary to point out that *Notes* and *Sermons* have not the definite and systematic character of Articles of Religion. Creed-making is a delicate task which involves skilful workmanship. Those who have studied the great Creeds and Confessions of Christendom know how nicely certain statements are balanced, and how carefully words have been chosen, and even coined in order to express fine distinctions necessary to clarity and definiteness of thought and expression. But Wesley tells us that in formulating his Standards he deliberately avoided everything technical and philosophical and wrote for plain people. In the Preface to the *Sermons* he writes :

'I now write, as I generally speak, *ad populum* . . . I design plain truth for plain people ; therefore of set purpose I abstain from all nice and philosophical speculations : from all perplexed and intricate reasonings ; and as far as possible from even a show of learning, unless in sometimes citing the original Scripture. I labour to avoid all words which are not easy to be understood, all which are not used in common life ; and in particular those kinds of technical terms that so frequently occur in Bodies of Divinity.'²

Again, in the Preface to the *Notes on the New Testament*, he writes :

'It will be easily discerned . . . from the Notes themselves, that they were not principally designed for men of learning, who are provided with many other helps, and much less for men of deep experience in the ways and word of God. I desire to sit at their feet and to learn of them. But I write chiefly for plain, unlettered men, who understand only their mother-tongue, who yet reverence and love the Word of God and have a desire to save their souls.'

¹ *Works*, V., p. 469.

² *Works*, V., 1.

All this is excellent when practical instruction is the purpose in view, but it is not thus that great Confessions of Faith are written.

The truth is that Wesley was not a great constructive theologian. He had an unerring instinct for the essential verities of the Evangelical Faith, but he had little interest in abstruse metaphysical and theological problems. He only took part in the Predestination controversy because he was persuaded that vital practical issues were at stake. His strong common sense saved him from discrediting the speculative element in theology, but he was more at home on the practical side of the subject. In his *Note* on Rom. xiv. 19, he says, 'Practical divinity tends equally to peace and to edification. Controversial divinity tends less directly to edification, although sometimes, as they of old, we cannot build without it.' When this is said, there is no intention to minimize the importance of Wesley's contribution to doctrines which relate to the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer, but here he was in the region of experience rather than of speculative thought. It is not without significance that the *Standard Sermons* contain no discourses specifically on the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, or the Atonement. These truths were fundamental articles of Wesley's faith, and they underlie both the *Sermons* and the *Notes*, but he did not impose on his preachers a clearly-defined or systematic interpretation of them. No student of the *Notes* can fail to be struck by the comparative dearth of material that can be called doctrinal in the technical sense.

The bearing of all this on our discussion will, it is hoped, be clear. When Wesley imposed Standards upon his preachers, *his concern was to secure a succession of men who should proclaim the great facts of the Gospel of Redemption, and not to formulate a closed system of theology.* As Chancellor Burwash, of Toronto, has written :

'It was not to control their personal opinions in speculative matters, but to secure the preaching of a free, full, and present salvation, received through repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, witnessed by the Holy Spirit to the individual consciousness, leading to all holy life and motive, and consummated in Christian perfection. His standards called for a type of evangelical teaching and preaching, leading to an individual experience and life opposed to mere formal religion and to Antinomianism. His standards were standards of gospel *preaching*, destined indeed to work out a theology, but by no means anticipating the construction of a theological system or enforcing that system when in course of time it might be developed.'

We will now proceed to investigate the doctrinal teaching of the Standards.

1. THE SCRIPTURES.—Wesley's doctrine of Inspiration as laid down in the Preface to the *Notes* is somewhat rigid, but the passage in which it is stated is made up entirely of extracts taken *verbatim* from Bengel's *Gnomon* :

'The Scripture of the Old and New Testaments is a most solid and precious system of divine truth. Every part thereof is worthy of God; and all together are one entire body wherein is no defect, no excess. . . . An exact knowledge of the truth was accompanied in the inspired writers with an exactly regular series of arguments, a precise expression of their meaning, and a genuine vigour of suitable affections. . . . In the language of the Sacred Writings, we may observe the utmost depth, together with the utmost ease. All the elegancies of human composesures sink into nothing before it: God speaks not as man but as God. . . . And the language of His messengers also is exact in the highest degree: for the words which were given them accurately answered the impression made upon their minds by the Holy Ghost.'

Other passages, however, modify these statements. In the Preface to the *Sunday Services of the Methodists* (1784) he says that many Psalms and parts of Psalms have been left out 'as being highly improper for the mouths of a Christian congregation.'² This passage is taken from outside the Standards, and the question arises whether it is

¹ *The Methodist Review*, January, 1912, p. 39. cf. 'Our re-perusal of the *Notes* has deepened the impression that when Wesley "legalized" it as a standard he did not do so to present his opinions on religion in general, but to secure the preaching of the characteristic Methodist doctrines in perpetuity. When he spoke in the *Notes* of the doctrines that are so conspicuous in the *Sermons*, we are conscious of a new tone in his voice. He is himself, and Bengel is almost silent.' (Dr. Simon, *W.H.S.* IX., 5, p. 105.)

² *Works*, XIV., p. 289.

permissible to appeal from Wesley *within* the Standards to Wesley *outside* the Standards. The intelligent student will, of course, always make such a comparison, but from a purely legal standpoint there can be little doubt that it is inadmissible. Were it otherwise, the Standards would not be merely the *Notes* and *Sermons*, but would include everything that Wesley wrote on kindred themes after 1763. In our investigation we shall, therefore, confine ourselves strictly to the Standards.

(a) In the Preface to the *Notes*, Wesley both admits and adopts some of the principles of textual criticism. He says, 'neither will I affirm that the Greek copies from which this translation was made, are always the most correct; and, therefore, I shall take the liberty, as occasion may require, to make here and there a small alteration.'

(b) The Standards recognize the validity of some of the principles of a reasonable higher criticism. They admit that the New Testament writers often handle the Old Testament with considerable freedom.

'When this and several other quotations are compared with the original, it plainly appears the apostles did not think it necessary exactly to transcribe the passages they cited; but contented themselves with giving the general sense though with some diversity of language' (*Note*, Matt. ii. 6). 'It should be remembered that the Apostles constantly cited the Septuagint translation, very frequently without variation. It was not their business in writing to the Jews, who at that time had it in high esteem, to amend or alter this' (*Note*, Heb. ii. 7).

Again, the Standards acknowledge that the New Testament writers made use of *sources*, and that the possibility of their taking over errors from their sources does not detract from the reality of their inspiration. The *Note* on Matt. i. 1 reads:

'If there were any difficulties in this genealogy, or that given by St. Luke, which could not easily be removed, they would rather affect the Jewish tables than the credit of the evangelists; for they act only as historians, setting down these genealogies as they stood in those public and allowed records. . . . Nor was it needful that they should correct the mistakes if there were any.'

In Wesley's day, the Church had not re-discovered

Jewish Apocalyptic literature, but some of his comments on the Book of Jude are a striking proof of his open-mindedness. On verse 9, which tells of Michael's contention for the body of Moses (an incident taken, according to Clem. Alex. and Origen, from the *Assumption of Moses*), he writes, 'It does not appear whether St. Jude learnt this by any revelation or from ancient tradition. It suffices that these things were not only true but acknowledged as such by them to whom he wrote.' Again on verse 14 f., which contains a quotation from the *Book of Enoch*, he writes, 'St. Jude might know this either from some ancient book or tradition or immediate revelation.' The admission that the N.T. writers sometimes used sources and that they may have contained mistakes which were taken over without correction is a considerable modification of the somewhat mechanical view of inspiration set forth in the Preface to the *Notes*, not in Wesley's own words, but in those of Bengel.

2. THE TRINITY.—The Standards do little more than reproduce the language of the Scriptures as to the trinity of God, and refrain altogether from any metaphysical exposition. Wesley's sermon on the Trinity is outside the Standards, but it contains a passage which it is of interest to quote both as showing his genuine breadth of mind and his personal attitude to subscription to creeds :

'I insist on no explication at all ; no, not even on the best I ever saw ; I mean that which is given in the creed commonly ascribed to Athanasius. I am far from saying, he who does not assent to this 'shall without doubt perish everlastingly.' For the sake of that and another clause, I for some time scrupled subscribing to that creed ; till I considered (1) that these sentences only relate to wilful, not involuntary, unbelievers ; (2) that they relate only to the *substance* of the doctrine there delivered, not to the philosophical *illustrations* of it. I dare not insist on any one's using the word Trinity or Person. I use them myself, without any scruple, because I know of none better ; but if any man has any scruple concerning them, who shall constrain him to use them ? . . . I would insist only on the direct words, unexplained, just as they lie in the text.'

3. THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.—The Standards teach

¹ *Works*, VI., p. 187.

the *universal* Fatherhood of God, as may be seen from the following *Notes* :

Matt. vi. 9. *Our Father*—‘The Father of the universe, of angels and men.’

Luke iii. 8. *Adam, the son of God*—‘That is, whatever the sons of Adam receive from their human parents, Adam received immediately from God, except sin and misery.’

Luke xv. 32. *This thy brother*—‘Amazing intimation, that the best of men ought to account the worst sinners their brethren still.’

Acts xvii. 28. *We are also His offspring*—‘one of the purest and finest pieces of natural religion in the whole world of pagan antiquity.’

Yet the Divine Fatherhood and human brotherhood are only consciously realized in Christ.

‘The moment they believe they are sons, and because they are sons, God sendeth forth the Spirit of His Son into their hearts, crying, Abba, Father’ (*Note*, Jno. i. 12). ‘God, men . . . appear in a new light and stand related to him in a new manner, since he was created anew in Christ Jesus’ (*Note*, 2 Cor. v. 17 ; cf. Sermon x.).

4. THE PERSON OF CHRIST.—The Standards do no more than assert the perfect Deity and perfect humanity of Jesus Christ, and their unity in the Person of the God-Man (*Note*, Heb. ii. 9). Wesley places the two Natures side by side, and does not attempt to show how they are unified in one Personality.

‘The eternal Word . . . united Himself to our miserable nature with all its innocent infirmities’ (*Note*, Jno. i. 14). ‘In His Divine nature the invisible image, in His human, the visible image of the Father’ (*Note*, Col. i. 15). ‘His Father with respect to His Divine nature, His God with respect to His human’ (*Note*, 1 Pet. i. 3).

Any limitations are to be explained by reference to His humanity and not to His whole Personality.

Mark vi. 6. *He marvelled*—‘As man. As He was God, nothing was strange to Him.’

Mark xiii. 32. *Of that day*—‘As man He was no more omniscient than omnipresent, but as God He knows all the circumstances of it.’

Jno. xiv. 28. *My Father is greater than I*—‘As He was man. As God, neither is greater nor less than the other.’

The mental, moral, and spiritual growth of which Luke speaks refers to His human nature only, and not to His Personality in its integrity (*Notes*, Luke ii. 40, 52). Wesley’s comment on the kenotic passage, Phil. ii. 6–8, is ambiguous, ‘He emptied Himself of that divine fullness, which He

received again at His exaltation. Though He remained full, yet He appeared as if He had been empty, for He veiled His fullness from the sight of men and angels. Yea, He not only veiled, but in some sense renounced the glory which He had before the world began.' It will be seen, therefore, that the Standards simply affirm the perfection of Christ's divinity and humanity, and within those limits allow full liberty for speculative theological constructions of His Person.

5. THE ATONEMENT.—The Standard *Sermons* do not contain a formulated doctrine of the Atonement, neither can any consistent theory be based on the *Notes* on Scripture passages relating to the subject. It is said that God 'treated Christ as an enemy, while He bare our sins' (*Note* Mark xv. 34). By His death He purchased salvation for all believers and paid a debt (*Notes*, Jno. iii. 15, 1 Jno. i. 9). His death was a ransom and made full satisfaction for the sins of the whole world (*Note*, Jno. x. 18). 'This ransom, from the dignity of the person redeeming, was more than equivalent to all mankind' (*Note*, 1 Tim. ii. 6). On the cross He bore the punishment due to our sins (*Note* 1 Pet. ii. 24), and justice is satisfied (*Note*, Rom. iv. 5). By dying, He appeased the wrath of an offended God, and dissolved the dominion and power which Satan had over us through our sins' (*Notes*, Col. i. 14, Rom. iii. 25, 1 Jno. ii. 2).

When Wesley speaks of the Cross as appeasing the wrath of an offended God, he goes further, as is now generally agreed, than the language of the Scriptures warrants. His comments contain echoes of Patristic and mediæval theories of redemption from the devil, of the satisfaction theory of Anselm, of the penal theories of the Reformers, and of the governmental theory of Grotius. It is impossible to deduce a self-consistent doctrine from these materials. Wesley leaves us where Paul does, not with a formulated doctrine of the Atonement, but with lines of thought based on the glad tidings that 'Christ died for our sins.'

6. **THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.**—The Standards teach that man is infected with inherited corruption, owing to Adam's fall, and that all are implicated in the guilt of Adam's sin, but how Wesley does not explain (*Notes*, Rom. iii. 23, v. 12, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 47; Eph. ii. 3; *Works*, VI., 51–61). The sermon on 'Original Sin' teaches that the unregenerate man is utterly depraved, and that there is no good whatever in him. But this is modified by the teaching as to *prevenient grace*,¹ and by the comment on Jno. i. 9, 'Who lighteth every man—'By what is vulgarly called natural conscience, pointing out at least the general lines of good and evil. And this light, if man did not hinder, would shine more and more to the perfect day.'

7. **THE WORK OF THE SPIRIT.**—The Standards teach Salvation by Faith, having its source in the grace of God, and expressing itself in works of righteousness, Regeneration, Adoption, Assurance begotten of the Witness of the Spirit, Sanctification, and Perfect Love. There is no need to give references. These were the central themes of Wesley's preaching, and to bear witness to these great truths the Methodist Church came into being.²

Dr. Simon has shown that at one point the *Notes* and the *Sermons* contradict each other. In the sermon on Justification by Faith Wesley argues that

'all works done before justification are not good in the Christian sense, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ . . . ; yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not (however strange it may appear to some, but they have the nature of sin.'³

He is here basing himself on Art. XIII. of the Church of England. But in his comment on Acts x. 4, he says of the prayers and alms of Cornelius,

'Dare any man say that these were only splendid sins or that they were an abomination before God? And yet it is certain, in the Christian

¹ *Works*, V., 102; VI., 57.

² *Notes*: Jno. iii. 3; Rom. iii. 24; iv. 24; viii. 28; xii. 6; 1 Cor. vi. 11; 2 Cor. v. 19; viii. 12; Heb. vi. 11.

³ *Works*, V., 54.

sense, Cornelius was then an unbeliever. He had not then faith in Christ, so certain it is that every one who seeks faith in Christ should seek it in prayer, and doing good to all men ; though in strictness what is not exactly according to the divine rules must stand in need of divine favour and indulgence.'

When Wesley drew up his abridgement of the Thirty-nine Articles for the *Sunday Services of the Methodists*, he omitted Art. XIII.¹

8. THE CHURCH, THE SACRAMENTS, AND THE MINISTRY. —

(a) *The Church.* Wesley had a clearly defined doctrine of the Church,² but it is not in the Standards. The only passage to which reference need be made is the *Note* on Col. 1. 18, in which he says that Christ 'is the supreme and only head both of influence and of government in the whole body of believers.'

(b) *The Ministry.* Bishops and Presbyters were synonymous terms in the early Church (*Notes*, Phil. 1. 2, 1 Tim. iii. 8, Tit. i. 5). How unsacerdotal was Wesley's conception of the ministry may be seen from the following *Note* on 2 Cor. i. 24: 'We see the light in which ministers should always consider themselves, and in which they are to be considered by others. Not as having dominion over the faith of their people, and having a right to dictate by their own authority what they shall believe or what they shall do ; but as helpers of their joy by helping them forward in faith and holiness.'

(c) *The Sacraments.* The following are the chief passages in the Standards which refer to *Baptism* :

'It is certain our Church supposes that all who are baptized in their infancy are at the same time born again ; and it is allowed that the whole Office for the Baptism of Infants proceeds on this supposition. Nor is it any objection against this that we cannot comprehend how this work can be wrought in infants. For neither can we comprehend how it is wrought in a person of riper years. But whatever be the case with infants, it is sure all of riper years who are baptized are not at the same time born again.'³ In his sermon on 'The Marks of the

¹ See art. by Dr. J. S. Simon in *Proceedings W.H.S.*, IX., 5.

² See Rigg. : *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 63-71.

³ *Works*, VI., p. 69.

New Birth,'¹ he denounces those who claim that they are born again on the ground of their regeneration in baptism. Even those made children of God in baptism may later become children of the devil.

'Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and a seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive Church bestow this on any unless through this means' (*Note*, Acts. xxii. 16).

'Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it' (*Note*, Jno. iii. 5).

It cannot be said that there is any clear doctrine here. Wesley seems to be struggling with antithetical trends of thought. All that can be deduced is that those who believe in the baptismal regeneration of infants are within the Standards, and that baptism is the sign and means of the impartation of a principle of grace, but that in itself it is no guarantee of salvation.

As to the *Lord's Supper*, all that occurs in the Standards is a repudiation of transubstantiation (v. *Note*, Luke xxii. 19), and the following, 'All who desire an increase of the grace of God are to wait for it in partaking of the Lord's Supper: for this also is a direction Himself hath given. . . . "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come"; ye openly exhibit the same, by these visible signs, before God and angels and men; ye manifest your solemn remembrance of His death, till He cometh in the clouds of heaven.'² This hardly goes beyond the Zwinglian doctrine.

9. *ESCHATOLOGY*.—The Standards offer no single gleam of hope for the finally impenitent. There is no probation after death. 'No man can do anything towards working out his salvation after this life is ended' (*Note*, Jno. ix. 4). The impenitent are doomed to endure everlasting *material torment*.³

'In the Valley of Hinnom the children were used to be burned alive to Moloch. It was afterwards made a receptacle for the filth of the

¹ *Works*, V., p. 208.

² *Works*, V., 182.

³ cf. Sermon on 'Hell' (which is not in the Standards): 'If there be any fire, it is unquestionably material. . . . Does not our Lord speak as if it were real fire? No one can deny or doubt of this' (*Works*, VI., p. 365).

city, where continual fires were kept to consume it. And it is probable, if any criminal were burned alive, it was in this accursed and horrible place. Therefore, both as to its former and latter state, it was a fit emblem of hell' (*Note, Matt. v. 22*).

'Either the punishment is strictly eternal or the reward is not; the very same expression being applied to the former as to the latter. . . The wicked shall then go away into everlasting fire in the view of the righteous' (*Note, Matt. xxv. 46; cf. Rom. viii. 19, ix. 21*).

That is the clear teaching of the Standards, and if they are held to be literally binding in all their parts there is no escape from it.

This inquiry confirms our contention that Wesley's purpose was to secure the preaching of the fundamentals of evangelical truth, and that he had no intention of imposing on his preachers a cut-and-dried system. Interpreted as Wesley intended them to be, the Standards do not fetter freedom of conscience or thought within the boundary of the redemptive gospel of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. But when this is admitted, all difficulties are not removed. There are other considerations which demand attention.

IV

As we have seen a doctrinal standard clause is inserted in our Model Deed in order to prevent the use of our property for erroneous teaching. This means that in certain circumstances the final interpreter of our Standards might be not the Conference but the House of Lords. Our Church has mercifully been little troubled with 'heresy' cases, and, so far as the present writer knows, no such case has ever been carried to the Civil Courts. It is earnestly to be hoped that such a happy state of things may long continue, but it is impossible to shut our eyes to possibilities which might arise should the Church ever pass through a time of theological stress, or desire to enter into closer organic relations with any other Christian Communions. The circumstances attending the union of the United Presbyterian Church and the Free Church of Scotland are full both of warning and instruction. Along with other

causes, it is leading all the Churches to consider anew the relation in which they stand to the State. Free Churchmen often speak of the bondage of the Church of England arising from the facts that she cannot revise her doctrines without the consent of Parliament, and that in cases of alleged heresy the supreme court of jurisdiction is the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But in the ultimate analysis are we ourselves in this respect in much better case? The present position is unsatisfactory for two reasons at least.

(1) Civil Courts are not constituted, nor are they fitted for the interpretation of doctrine. Any one who has read the report of the hearing of the Free Church of Scotland case by the House of Lords¹ cannot fail to be impressed by the severely legal outlook of most of the judges. They brushed aside the Declaratory Act of the Free Church, and were guided entirely by what they conceived to be the literal meaning of the Westminster Confession. It is pathetic to read the incursions of some of them into the mysteries of Predestination and Free Will. But a document like the Westminster Confession is far more easily studied by the layman than a body of divinity contained in sermons and fragmentary notes on the New Testament. It does not require a very vivid imagination to conjure up the sight of rival lawyers making eager search for passages or expressions in support of the doctrines they are briefed to defend, and of learned judges confronting them with other extracts, not so favourable to their cause. The spectacle is hardly one that would make for edification.

(2) But even if the judges were all trained theologians, the objection to the interpretation of doctrinal standards by the Civil Courts would be hardly less strong. The Church cannot adequately fulfil the commission of her Master unless she jealously guards her independence and autonomy in spiritual things. There is room for wide differences of

¹ See R. L. Orr, *The Free Church of Scotland Appeals*, 1903-4.

opinion as to the relations of Church and State, but this much is absolutely clear, the Church has sold her birth-right if she allows the State to be the arbiter of the truth which she is to be permitted to declare. Whatever varieties of opinion may exist in our Church, there are none amongst us who would willingly endow the State with such authority.

V

In what direction, then, are we to look for a solution of the problem? Few, if any, would be in favour of the abolition of Standards altogether. Most would agree that they are a necessity to provide a norm and to secure unity and continuity of teaching as to the essentials. Some Churches have drawn up new Articles of Religion. This is a course to which there are obvious objections. The Wesleyan Methodist Church made an experiment in this direction more than a hundred years ago. The Conference of 1806 appointed a committee consisting of Dr. Adam Clarke, Dr. Coke, and Mr. Benson to draw up 'A Digest or Form expressive of the Methodist Doctrines.' As a result they produced Articles of Religion,¹ which were sent to the Synods, but owing to the 'great pressure of business' at the Conference of 1807 the consideration of the subject was providentially deferred *sine die*.

The Declaratory Acts passed by the Presbyterian Churches are not an encouraging precedent, as the Civil Courts do not recognize their validity unless they have parliamentary sanction. But Declaratory Acts which have such sanction are in a different category. The Methodist Standards are of permanent value as the 'Standards of gospel preaching,' which they were intended to be. As such let us retain them. But has not the time come when we ought at any rate to consider whether the Conference should not solemnly and unitedly declare that it is itself

¹ *Publications of W.H.S.* No. 2.

the final interpreter of the doctrines of our Church, and should take steps to secure parliamentary sanction for this declaration? It may be that we should go to the Legislature for a wider measure of autonomy, to include other things than doctrine, but that is outside the purpose of this paper.

A new world is being born before our eyes, and the Church must gird herself afresh for her tasks. She will speak with authority and command the respect of a democratic age only if she stands before men as spiritually autonomous and free. Christian ministers will not win the ear of the rising generation unless they are delivered from every suspicion (however groundless) of an unworthy economy and reserve. The Church must believe in the immanence of the Spirit of Christ in the present and in the future as in the past. The living Spirit of Truth is our abiding Companion, and if we walk humbly in His fellowship we shall not stray. The manifold changes which are taking place are perplexing many, but we shall display the truest loyalty to the faith of our fathers if we face, without fear, the changes of *outward form* through which it is passing in order that it may become the faith of our children.

Faith of our fathers ! God's great power
Shall soon all nations win for thee ;
And through the truth that comes from God
Mankind shall then be truly free.
Faith of our fathers ! holy faith !
We will be true to thee till death.

H. MALDWYN HUGHES.

THE WAR IN PARAGUAY

Paraguay : by W. H. KOEBEL. South American Series.
(London : Fisher Unwin.)

THIS excellent account of one of the smallest but most interesting of the South American Republics is worthy to rank with its author's previous works on Chile and the Argentine, and will be welcomed by all who desire to know the present state of the Western world, and to forecast its future. Here are chapters on the history of the country from its discovery down to yesterday, on its physical features, and on the possibilities of its commercial development ; all bearing the marks of good judgement and extensive research. But to us the most interesting have been those on that most devastating and horrible war of modern times, which was waged by President Lopez against the whole might of Brazil, the Argentine, and Uruguay, and which, after causing untold misery for five years, ended in the almost total destruction of the Paraguayan nation. To this war the LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW devoted a long article more than forty years ago, which, falling later into the hands of the present writer, kindled an interest which has never waned. This interest, indeed, could only be intensified at the present time : for that almost forgotten catastrophe presents a series of most remarkable parallels to the one which is now upon us. Arising as it did out of the wicked ambition of one man, and exhibiting very clearly the dangers of unrestrained militarism, it also shows the Nemesis that waits on villany, and illustrates the ways in which Divine Justice vindicates itself, though it may be *pede claudo*, on those who scorn its precepts. Even in its details and lesser incidents this relatively small war displays many curious

analogies to that of 1914, and proves once again that there is nothing new under the sun. The likeness has not escaped Mr. Koebel, nor indeed can it escape any instructed student.

Paraguay, as a glance at the map will show, is, compared with its antagonists, a tiny State. At the time of the outbreak its population can scarcely have exceeded twelve hundred thousand souls. These few, however, had long been at the disposal of a single forceful mind. In 1814 the country had fallen under the domination of the renowned Dictator, Dr. Francia, so well known from the Essay of Carlyle, who saw in Francia another of his 'Strong Men,' and who was therefore inclined to make light of his thousand crimes for the sake of the one quality which to Carlyle and his kind seems a virtue. 'Like a drop of surgical antiseptic liquid'—so runs Carlyle's dithyramb—'very sharp, very caustic, corrosive enough, this tawny, tyrannous Dr. Francia . . . Is it not a blessing this Paraguay can get the one veracious man it has, to take lease of it?' In plain prose, Francia was a successful desperado; but he was not without definition and direction in his plans. His main policy was one of isolation, to keep Paraguay entirely shut off from the outer world; and this policy he maintained by a system of terrorism like that of the Committee of Public Safety. Such was the dread which he inspired, that men spoke of him with whispering awe twenty years after his death. Espionage, in a land of lies and tale-bearers, was carried to extremes scarcely heard of elsewhere. Sons betrayed fathers, mothers betrayed daughters; and the punishments which followed detection, or mere suspicion, were terrific.

Francia died in 1840, and was succeeded by his nephew Don Carlos Lopez, who was elected President by a body of which he nominated every member himself. Carlos was, however, on the whole a good ruler: oppression was reduced to what in Paraguay was considered a minimum;

foreigners were no longer excluded, and civilization was advanced by the aid of European engineers and business men. In fact, if the country no longer enjoyed the quiet of the Jesuit age as described by Southey and others, it experienced under Carlos a prosperity which, to the generation following, might seem Saturnian.

In 1862 Carlos died, and an 'election' followed. The deputies from the ninety-two provinces met in Asuncion. They found themselves surrounded by troops, and realized very quickly that they must vote for Don Francisco Solano Lopez, son of the deceased President, or take the consequences. Two deputies remonstrated; both vanished speedily from human ken. The rest chose Don Francisco President and Commander-in-Chief, at the same time voting him a salary four times as large as his father's.

Don Francisco was of mixed Indian and Spanish blood. At the age of twenty-eight (namely in 1854) he had visited France, then in the opening glory of the Second Empire, and had returned with a burning idolatry of the first Napoleon, whom he resembled in many personal characteristics, and endeavoured to emulate in his career. From France he brought back also a French uniform for his soldiers, and some knowledge of French military discipline. More important—he brought with him a French lady of doubtful reputation, known in Paraguay, from her Irish ancestry, as Madame Lynch. This woman's husband was still alive; it was therefore impossible for him to marry her; but her influence was none the less commanding on that account, and it was exerted exclusively to urge him on the path of ferocity and ambition. She had, says Masterman, two projects—the first, to contrive by some means to legalize their union; the second, to make him the Napoleon of the New World, and herself a luckier Josephine.

Lopez had matured his plans of conquest before the death of his peace-loving father. Already he had formed near Asuncion a vast camp, in which the extraordinary

number of eighty thousand men received drill and other military instruction. Lopez understood the methods of his model. The press was completely under his control; and the official *Semanario* described him as the mildest and most pacific of rulers throughout his bloody and aggressive career. But public opinion, even in Paraguay, was capable of expressing itself; and Lopez, hearing the murmurs which were occasioned by the military preparations, resorted freely to those 'preventive arrests,' with which more modern examples have made us familiar. Those arrested scarcely ever appeared again. All means, in fact, were employed to suppress disaffection, and to promote what Don Francisco called by the sounding name of 'patriotism.'

For a war—and any war, provided that it promised success and 'glory,' would have suited Lopez—pretexts were never likely to be hard to find in South America at that time. The neighbouring countries were all torn with intestine factions; and it was easy for a designing enemy to attach himself to one of these factions in order to gain some sort of footing in the distracted land. At this time Monte Video was in the hands of the 'Blanco' party, having expelled General Flores, the leader of the 'Colorado' or rival schism. In April, 1863, Flores invaded his native land, and was soon at the head of a formidable army. He was supported by Brazil, which had its own quarrel with the Uruguayan Government: and the Brazilian support, at first unofficial, developed in 1864 into declared war. Finally, Monte Video was captured; the Blancos lost their power, and Flores became the ruler of the country.

Lopez, seeing his opportunity, had offered his services as mediator. Distrust of him was, however, already so keen that his suggestions were received with contempt; and there is no doubt that his pride was deeply wounded. His revenge was speedy and characteristic. A passenger steamer, the *Marques de Olinda*, was accustomed to ply

every month on the river Paraguay between Monte Video and the Brazilian province of Matto Grosso. In November, 1864, she passed Asuncion on her usual voyage. Without a declaration of war, Lopez sent a gunboat after her, captured her with passengers and crew, including the Governor of Matto Grosso, and converted her with all haste into a Paraguayan warship.

This outrage was only the prelude to others. The defenceless province was attacked by an armed force, its towns and hamlets given up to pillage, and its unhappy inhabitants treated with horrible savagery. Such armed opposition as the Paraguayan forces did meet with was easily overcome ; for the forts were weak, and the soldiers cowed by the suddenness of the assault.

Everything, indeed, as Lopez well knew, depended upon rapidity. He had not studied the campaigns of Napoleon in vain ; and he understood that the forces against him, if allowed to organize, must ultimately far surpass his own. He acted, therefore, with all the promptitude and decision of his great exemplar. The army, in utter disregard of the economic needs of the country, was raised to the enormous total of a hundred thousand men, not all well armed it is true, but all active and courageous. With these he determined to attack Uruguay, which, under the dictatorship of Flores, had naturally declared war on him immediately after the assault on Matto Grosso. Between Paraguay and Monte Video lay the Argentine province of Corrientes. Lopez demanded a free passage. The Argentine Government, having no quarrel with Brazil, refused : Lopez, as if he had not enough on his hands already, crossed the frontier, seized the capital of Corrientes, and captured some ships which lay in the river. The result was the formation of a Triple Alliance between Uruguay, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic. Some of the articles in the Treaty of Alliance are worthy of quotation. Lopez is accused of having ‘injured the Republics,

in despite of solemn treaties and the international usages of civilized nations'; he is charged with 'committing unjustifiable acts and disturbing the relations of his neighbours by abusive and aggressive proceedings;' and the allies declare that, 'being persuaded that peace, security, and the well-being of their respective nations are impossible while the present Government of Paraguay exists, they are resolved to change that Government while preserving the independence and territorial integrity of Paraguay; and, with that end, they form a defensive and offensive alliance.' The war was not, in fact, to be waged against Paraguay, but against Lopez. Should Lopez fall, the war would *ipso facto* determine; but, till that consummation was attained, each of the allies bound itself not to make a separate peace. Such was the combination of foes which Lopez, by his policy of frightfulness, had stirred up against himself.

Already he might have seen fearful omens of coming disaster. His army, recklessly recruited and improperly fed, had been thus early attacked by disease. Thousands perished; and the effect of so hastily withdrawing great bodies of men from civil tasks was too visible as the spectre of famine began to stalk through the fields. It was indeed necessary for Lopez to be swift. Hitherto he had acted through his generals; but now, five weeks after the conclusion of the Triple Alliance, he put himself at the head of his army, expecting a speedy success which might at least divide his enemies. Nor were his anticipations unreasonable. His troops, though wretched if measured by a European standard, were more numerous, better disciplined, and better officered than the miserable rabble which boasted the name of the army of the allies; and they obeyed unhesitatingly the orders of their supreme head. Nor was the cohesion of the alliance so firm that an initial disaster might not have sundered it.

The first step was, if possible, to master the Brazilian

fleet, which lay at the junction of the little river Riachuelo with the mighty stream of the Parana, a few miles below the city of Corrientes. It consisted of nine vessels; Lopez had only eight, smaller and worse-armed; but so sure was he of victory that he ordered his admiral, Meza, to steam past the enemy, and then to attack them from below, thus, in the case of success, effectually preventing their escape. This manœuvre only narrowly missed achieving the desired end. A Brazilian ship was actually boarded, and for a moment the hostile commanders, taken by surprise, were panic-stricken. Energy and decision would at this point have secured an easy and almost bloodless victory. But Meza, old, slow, and incompetent, did not know how to press his advantage; his subordinates were drunk and incapable; and the Brazilians, recovering from their surprise, soon rallied their forces, took the offensive in their turn, and attacked their weaker assailants with the ram. Three Paraguayan vessels were sunk, and others disabled. The *Marques de Olinda* herself, the *fons et origo malorum*, was so seriously injured that, though she did not sink in the battle, she became unmanageable, and drifted helplessly to destruction in the shallows.

This failure was to Paraguay much what the Marne was to be to the German invaders of Paris: the symbol and the cause of a ruined ambition. Had Lopez been victorious at Riachuelo, he would almost certainly have been able to dictate terms of peace at Monte Video or Buenos Ayres; for neither of those capitals was in a position to stand a bombardment. After his defeat he must have recognized that ultimate success was out of the question. That he was able to hold out so long was due to no abilities of his own, but simply to the amazing dilatoriness of the allies, who had no idea how to follow up their triumph. Lopez himself was fully conscious of his peril, and showed his consciousness of it. Meza was severely wounded in the battle; Lopez told him that if he recovered he should be

shot for cowardice. Fortunately for him, the wound proved mortal.

A second disaster shortly followed. General Roblés was sent with a fine army into Argentina; and a portion of his force was detached, under Colonel Estigarribia, to march direct upon Monte Video. This detachment numbered twelve thousand of Lopez' best troops, well armed and equipped. As for food, they were, like Marmont's corps before Austerlitz, to live on the country as best they could. But Lopez was no Napoleon. Marmont had maps; Estigarribia had to march eight hundred miles without one. The result could not be doubtful. The troops starved, straggled, and lost their way. At Uruguayana they were met by the Emperor of Brazil in person with an overwhelming force, and compelled to capitulate. Needless to say, though the *Semanario* still prated of victories, Lopez saw his doom, and, after the fashion of tyrants, vented his rage on the innocent. The cry of treason was raised; Roblés was arrested and shot, and hundreds of harmless people, chiefly women, were put to death or subjected to imprisonment and torture to expiate the suspected guilt of their husbands and brothers. The records of these atrocities, as given in the pages of Masterman, Thompson, and others, are a painful addition to the long chronicle of man's cruelty to man.

But the inactivity of the allies soon came to the rescue. They did indeed drive the Paraguayans out of Corrientes; but then, though they had an army of sixty thousand men, and though their victorious fleet had received considerable reinforcements, they actually remained quiet for six months. Such a respite was not likely to be left unused by a man of energy like Lopez. Early in April, 1866, he led his army to a surprise attack upon the batteries on the River Paraguay. Foiled in this attempt by one of the accidents of war, he again assailed the allies. A desperate battle ensued at the Bellaco. The Paraguayan troops, led

or rather driven by their savage officers, attacked the enemy in their entrenchments, and carried the main defences; but, badly disciplined as they were, fell into confusion at the decisive moment, and, overwhelmed with a destructive fire, turned and fled. The slaughter was frightful; fifteen thousand were slain outright or mortally wounded. The Bellaco, we are told, all but annihilated the Spanish population of Paraguay. Henceforward Lopez had to fill his ranks with old men, boys, and Indians.

Again the allies threw away their chances. Itapiru, it is true, was captured; but the allied generals remained otherwise absolutely inactive for four months. Lopez utilized the breathing-space to fortify himself in the lines of Curupaity. There, when the allies had allowed him to make them all but impregnable, they attacked him in September, 1866, and suffered a terrible reverse. Had Lopez been able to trust his men in the open field, he would have advanced from his defences, and totally annihilated the opposing forces. But he had no longer a *Grande Armée*: his followers were now the soldiers of Bautzen, not those of Austerlitz. Although the conscription had been frightfully crushing—we are assured that the appalling number of two hundred thousand had been driven into the army—yet disease, battle, desertion, and capture had reduced this huge total to scarcely more than twenty thousand raw recruits. Lopez had already proposed terms of peace. At this moment, while the prestige of his victory was still fresh, he renewed them. His conditions were the *status quo ante bellum*: the allies, in return for his abandonment of Matto Grosso, were to retire from Paraguay. In a word, he bade his enemies study the war-map. His terms were at once rejected; the allies insisting, as the condition preliminary to entering into negotiations, that he should resign the Presidency and leave Paraguay. This gave him the opportunity of posing as a lover of peace and humanity,

whose well-meant efforts to put an end to bloodshed had been foiled by an obstinate enemy.

The President continued his desperate endeavours to increase his army. Regiments of children were actually used at the front. A regiment of women was formed, reviewed by the 'Lady President,' but never (despite many stories to be contrary) sent to a firing-line. The country, was, in fact, reduced to the last stages of exhaustion, and one vigorous effort on the part of the allies would have been sufficient to end the war. Vigour, however, was the last quality they exhibited. It was not till after many months that they ventured to approach the fort of Humaitá; and even then their bombardment was sluggish and inefficient. It resulted, it is true, in the evacuation of Asuncion; but Humaitá itself still held out, although the Paraguayan navy consisted now of but five small wooden vessels, while that of the enemy was over a hundred, of which several were ironclads. So slack was their blockade of Humaitá, in fact, that Lopez was enabled to carry out one of the most daring feats of the whole war.

First misleading the enemy by a feigned attack, he cleverly removed most of his guns, leaving dummies in their place, and, without attracting the notice of his besiegers, carried his army away to San Fernando, a strong position fifteen leagues above Humaitá. It was a full month before the allies, miserably served by their scouts, ascertained that they were besieging an almost empty encampment. Lopez had stuck at nothing to make his retreat possible. He had with him at Humaitá a large number of prisoners, whom he was equally unwilling to leave behind and to take with him. All, officers alone excepted, were cruelly massacred. Necessity, in his military view, knew no law.

Three thousand men were left to hold Humaitá against thirty thousand besiegers. This small and starving band, with a desperation worthy of a better cause, maintained themselves for some weeks longer, and even gained a

considerable victory over a storming column. Finally they yielded to starvation, and abandoned the place. But they were overtaken by the Brazilians, surrounded, and summoned to surrender. What followed may be described in the words of Masterman: 'In their desperate misery the Paraguayans fired on the flag of truce; and then day after day shot and shell was poured into an unresisting crowd, and still the same answer. Their aimless, useless obstinacy is terrible to think of, yet it was almost sublime in its silent heroism and self-abnegation. Too feeble to fight, too worn out to hope for escape, they refused all mercy, and died as they lay. At length, after six days' carnage, a priest induced Colonel Martinez (the commandant) to yield, and the scanty remnant capitulated at his orders. Lopez treated this surrender as a dereliction of duty, and added one more to the terrible list of his crimes by *shooting the mother and wife of Colonel Martinez for his so-called desertion!*' Certain officers and men who had contrived to reach San Fernando were treated as traitors.

At length, after wasting many months, and spending some tens of millions of money, the allies' general, an incompetent named Caxias, resolved on something that should be decisive. He determined, as he had complete command of the river, to move his army beyond Lopez, to construct a road behind him, and to attack him in the rear, while the Argentines blocked him in front. The road was completed, the army, thirty thousand strong, landed without opposition, and the most onerous part of the task was thus carried through. It was now only necessary to attack with circumspection, for the army of Lopez was weak both in numbers and in confidence. Its situation, however, was strong, being protected by the rushing torrent of the Ytororo, and by a succession of woods and marshes. Caxias ought to have advanced slowly, and to have utilized his great preponderance in artillery: but his dispositions

were so bad, and the resistance of the Paraguayans so obstinate, that he lost no fewer than three thousand men in the mere crossing of the bridge over the river. His position now was almost worse than that of the enemy; for his army was in a place to which supplies could only be brought with great trouble and danger. It was thus imperative that he should fight again, and speedily. He therefore assaulted the enemy at a disadvantage; and, though his numbers were still vastly superior, only won the victory after frightful losses. The Paraguayans resisted with their usual frenzied stubbornness, and perished almost to a man.

On December 17, 1868, the Brazilians attacked and destroyed a regiment of Lancers; on the 21st, a division of General Barreto carried the lines of Pikysyri. Shortly afterwards, the main body assaulted the strongest point of the Paraguayan defences, and lost more than three thousand men in taking them. On the 24th the Argentines appeared, and the case of Lopez seemed at last hopeless. The allies accordingly sent him a message, demanding that he should lay down his arms, and thus save the lives of the scanty remnant that still followed him. The reply of the baffled tyrant was remarkable—though we have seen documents like it since. He took the tone of an injured and lofty-spirited hero, whose devotion to peace was unquestionable, and who had been attacked by unscrupulous foes, in the midst of profound quiet. He and his devoted soldiers were now fighting, as they had always fought, solely for the liberty and security of their native land; and the whole guilt of the slaughter, both past and to come, would lie on the heads of his envious enemies. After this reply, nothing was left to the Brazilians but to carry the attack through.

Lopez, though energetic in counsel, and reckless of the lives of others, had the personal timidity which, as it is said, marks the present King of Bulgaria. As soon as the

assault began, he moved his tent a mile or two to the rear. His soldiers, with a courage that ought to have shamed him into heroism, fought and fell like the Spartans at Thermopylae. They were now but two thousand, yet so desperately did they sell their lives that they actually repulsed the twenty thousand Brazilians. No wonder their bravery extorted the highest admiration from all who saw it. It was, however, vain. Next day the Brazilians returned to the attack, and, with the help of the Argentines, finally slaughtered the garrison, which to the end refused quarter, to the last man. The miserable poltroon, for whom they thus died, had already fled.

A few days later, Angostura capitulated. Henceforward nothing was left to the insensate President but a miserable series of flights. At Cerro Leon he was met by the faithful Madame Lynch, a few officers, and some hundreds of tattered and starving soldiers. The Brazilians advanced on Cerro Leon. Lopez thereupon crossed the Cordillera, leaving Colonel Caballero, perhaps the best of his surviving officers, to defend Azcurra. Once again the relentless foe pursued; the Brazilians, under the Comte d'Eu, who had superseded Caxias, came up to the position, and surrounded it on all sides. Caballero was summoned to surrender, but, with the strange obstinacy shown by the Paraguayans throughout this terrible war, refused all terms. He had but fifteen hundred wretches under his command, many of them boys from twelve to fifteen years of age, and the Brazilians had ten thousand soldiers; but he fought to the last. The battle, or rather the massacre, was fearful; women and children perished with the armed men; no quarter was asked or given; and the Paraguayans were annihilated. Caballero was taken alive, and killed in cold blood. This terrible slaughter took place on August 12, 1869. But Lopez still lived; and while he was alive the object of the war was yet unattained. As soon as he heard of the disaster, he celebrated a *Te Deum* for a pretended

victory, and then ordered yet another retreat. His few remaining guns were harnessed to teams of miserable women, and dragged slowly through the swamps and over the passes. A remnant of soldiers still followed him; and he was able for some months yet to elude the search of the Brazilian cavalry, and to maintain himself in the almost inaccessible mountains. When he abandoned a hamlet, he burnt it lest it should shelter his pursuers; the beasts of burden which he could not use were slaughtered; women when they sank beneath their loads, were left to starve, or, if a fit of mercy took him, shot by the roadside.

In February, 1870, news reached the Brazilian forces that he was on the banks of the River Aquidaban, a tributary of the Paraguay. His position would be a few leagues to the north of Concepcion, and two hundred miles north of Asuncion. He had still a thousand men and seventeen guns; but the exhausted band made no resistance. In utter indifference they stood or lay to be cut down by the advance-guard of their foes. The Brazilian losses were but five men wounded. Lopez himself fled, but was pursued and overtaken. Summoned to surrender, he refused, and was thereupon slain. The war was at last over.

Few worse architects of ruin have ever existed than Lopez. He left behind him in Paraguay scarcely two hundred thousand living human beings; and of these less than thirty thousand were grown men. The country was a desert, the people prostrated, hopeless, broken. For six years a Brazilian army occupied the land, and crushed it, if possible, more than it was crushed already. But for the rivalry between Brazil and the Argentine, indeed, Paraguay would have ceased to exist as an independent State. Fifty years have passed, and a new generation has arisen; Nature has covered the battlefields with her kindly mantle of oblivion; but long indeed will it be before men forget the ruin wrought by the evil passions of this man in one of the fairest regions of God's earth.

E. E. KELLETT.

THE PROSECUTION OF OUR LORD

THE period of world history during which our Lord lived was in some respects curiously similar to these days. The Roman Army was becoming more and more essential to the empire, and the old laws of the Republic were slowly giving way before the pressing necessities of the political situation. The Roman populace were unsettled in their religious convictions, and change was everywhere in the air when our Lord challenged the might of Rome and all the shams of the established Jewish and Pagan religions.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there should now appear a continuous output of controversial literature regarding this period dealing with the trial of our Lord, the methods and laws of Roman Provincial Administration, and the powers of client princes under the Caesars.

A new work on the subject of the date, history, and legality of the Prosecution of Jesus, by Professor R. W. Husband, of Hanover, U.S.A., published by the Princeton University Press, is the latest of these writings, and it sheds much light over the legal proceedings which ended in the Crucifixion of our Lord. Professor Husband's investigations tend to re-establish many conclusions which have in recent years been discarded, or at least threatened by modern critics. He once more fixes the date of the Crucifixion as Friday, April 3, or by the Jewish Calendar Nisan 14 in the year A.D. 33, and it will be difficult to upset his arguments advanced from internal and external evidence as to this point. He overwhelms the commentators who have argued that Luke made a mistake in chap. iii. 1, when he speaks of John Baptist's ministry beginning in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, and by a close study

of Pilate's words, 'Ye have a custom that I should release unto you one at the Passover,' taken along with Roman records and the Jewish Calendar, he works out his date with remarkable mathematical accuracy.

The next conclusion is that the arrest of Jesus took place at midnight, and was effected by the regular police force, which may have been assisted by some of the Temple guard, but he will not believe the Romans were concerned in the arrest. It is difficult to follow the learned Professor at this point, for he omits to weigh certain facts and at the same time explains away some of the Gospel records in a very summary fashion.

He insists that St. John's statement, 'The Jews sought to kill Him,' is a misleading statement caused by inexperience and partisanship, and apparently presumes that criminal procedure when Cicero appeared as attorney might be the same in Palestine in A.D. 33.

No doubt our Lord was tried under the Julian law of Treason (*Majestas*), but this law had been amended a few years before A.D. 33 by the usurper Tiberius to suit his own personal aims. It was enacted that evidence of mere intention (*voluntas*) to rebel could be received by the court, whereas formerly an overt act was essential to a charge of treason. Then, too, a man accused of treason might be called on to prove his own innocence, and the court was empowered to apply torture to extract evidence from him. Throughout the Roman Empire there were being held State trials based on very slight evidence, and the law entitled any Roman citizen to prosecute a charge of treason without running the risk of a counter-charge of malicious prosecution.

A man could be arrested on suspicion of treason just as at the present moment a man can be arrested without warrant under the Defence of the Realm Act, if he be suspected of being a German spy or a deserter. Professor Husband regards it as certain that the Roman authorities

never asked Pilate's sanction for the arrest, so he feels compelled to reject the accuracy of the Gospel record (John xviii. 12), which distinctly says the 'Chiliarch' or Military Tribune in charge of the Roman garrison was present at the arrest. Now this Tribune was doubtless a Roman citizen (compare the Tribune's statement regarding citizenship to Paul in Acts xxii. 28), and his presence really meets all the legal difficulties which worry Professor Husband, because such a Tribune required no sanction from Pilate to effect the arrest; he could do so merely on suspicion of our Lord's treason, and the subsequent proceedings before the high-priest were no doubt due to the need of drafting without delay a formal indictment.

Pilate himself was at that time in a grave political difficulty. He had been appointed Procurator through the influence of his friend Sejanus, who was responsible for this odious amendment of the Julian Law, and Sejanus had conspired against Tiberius and had just fallen a victim to his own law. Friendship with Sejanus was in A.D. 33 enough to render any man liable to suspicion of treason, so much so that one Consul had just censured the other for being half-hearted in rooting out the satellites of Sejanus. Tacitus tells us that at this time people were incriminated under the *Lex Majestas* for some casual remark in the Forum, or at the dinner table, so that Judas Iscariot was playing a not unfashionable rôle.

Furthermore a grave financial crisis was spreading throughout the Roman Empire, and Tiberius was trying to meet the difficulty by levying heavy tributes and confiscating the estates of all persons suspected of complicity with Sejanus. Was it then surprising that Pilate should both shrink from applying this law and tremble when the Jews threatened to report him to the Emperor if he did not do so? The Jews knew all this, and when they secured the help of the Military Tribune they had the whip hand over Pilate.

In his anxiety to prove that the Sanhedrin really

desired to act judicially, Professor Husband leaves out all consideration of these facts. He refuses to credit St. Matthew's statement that the Jews sought for false witnesses against Jesus, and turns a deaf ear to all the evidence that our Lord was the victim of a political and ecclesiastical plot. This evidence can be summarized as follows :—

(1) At the Feast of Tabernacles of the previous year the Sanhedrin had ordered the arrest of Jesus by the Temple Guard, but the speech of Nicodemus, attacking the legality of the order, upset this plan. (John vii. 50.)

(2) Our Lord said there was a plot to kill Him (John viii. 37, 40, and 59), and the first attempt of the Pharisees to have Him stoned in accordance with Mosaic Law (Lev. xxiv. 16) was long before the last Passover.

(3) Jesus was charged with the use of magic and with blasphemy after healing the blind man at Siloam, and there followed the second attempt to stone Him, recorded in John x. 33.

(4) The Sanhedrin had fully considered the case of Jesus at their meeting recorded in John xi. 47 and 57, which was clearly the meeting when it was decided to rely on a charge of treason. The Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians then sank their differences with a view to attaining His downfall, though each party had different reasons for doing so. The Pharisees found their spiritual authority undermined, the Sadducees saw their objections to the supernatural overthrown and their narrow nationalism superseded, while the Herodians feared that the populace would rally round the new Rabbi as a rival to Herod.

(5) It was notorious that Jesus was in antagonism to the religious sects, the social conventions, and the political aspirations of the Jews, for He publicly denounced the Pharisees as hypocrites and vipers; He associated with Gentiles and outcasts, He called Herod a 'fox,' and worse than all He attacked vested interests by throwing the money-changers out of the Temple! The attempt to

utilize Jewish law to prevent such conduct having failed, the Jews determined to have recourse to Roman law, and St. Luke plainly says so in his Gospel, chap. xx. 20. If the Gospel records really leave any room for doubt as to whether a plot were actually hatched, surely the annals of Tacitus and contemporary accounts of the spies (*delatores*) employed at this period justify the acceptance of the story of Judas and of the 'false witnesses.'

The Rev. Stephen Liberty, M.A., has recently published a book on the *Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (Oxford University Press), in which the politics of the Sadducees, Pharisees, and Herodians are well described. The Sadducees wanted 'Jerusalem for the Jews; supremacy over the Galileans and Samaritans. and the undisturbed enjoyment of the Temple revenues.' They secretly sympathized with the bravos and brigands who held meetings in the Court of the Gentiles (the Den of Thieves), and whose leaders, including Barabbas, favoured physical force. The Pharisees were expecting Messiah to turn out the Romans, but acquiesced in the Roman alliance because of their hatred of the half-breeds of the House of Herod. The Herodians hoped by wire-pulling at Rome to secure the political aggrandizement of the Jewish State.

All these aspirations were threatened by the doctrines of Jesus, who demanded that the Court of the Gentiles be used for spiritual purposes as ordered at the dedication of Solomon's Temple 'that all people of the earth may know Thy name' (2 Chron. vi. 33); that the Samaritans be treated as neighbours; that the sword should not be used; that Caesar should have his own; that the propagandist work of Jonah among the Gentiles should be the sign of Messiah, and that an excommunicated man might be His disciple. The Sanhedrin deliberately decided that our Lord's death was the only way to safeguard their 'rights' and that political necessity compelled them to do a wrong thing. Hence the prosecution of Jesus.

While parting company with Professor Husband in certain points let it none the less be said that his description of the procedure is certainly of great interest. He maintains that the Sanhedrin presented an indictment against our Lord with three counts: (1) Perverting the nation; (2) forbidding payment of tribute to Caesar; (3) claiming to be a king. The prisoner was asked to plead, and tried to induce Pilate to define the charges, but then admitted that He was a King. There was evidence taken for the prosecution and for the defence. Pilate asked the prosecutors to withdraw their charge, but they refused, and the writer concludes that the course of the trial was legal, and in accord with Roman law, and the conviction was also legal and was justified, provided the evidence was sufficient to substantiate the charges.

It must certainly be admitted that if false evidence were accepted to the effect that our Lord forbade the payment of tribute, together with evidence of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem and the armed resistance to arrest by St. Peter and St. James, there was a serious case under the *Læa Majestas*, but no special pleading by Professor Husband will convince us that Pilate did not see clearly that it was for envy that the Jews were charging Jesus, and that he would have acquitted the prisoner had it not been for fear of being charged with friendship with his fallen patron Sejanus.

R. C. HAWKIN.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

THE subject of intercession for the dead has obtained a great deal of attention owing to the war, and men of various churches and of very different theological views have given expression to their mind on this subject in the light of the enormous loss of young life caused by the present terrible conflict. Then, too, the proposal of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America to include prayer for the dead in their revised Prayer-Book is another instance of the way in which the subject has been coming to the front. It is, therefore, a matter of real importance to discover, first of all, what Holy Scripture teaches on the subject, and then in the light of much discussion and difference of opinion in Anglican circles, to endeavour to find out what the Church of England really teaches.

I.—THE MEANING OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

Are they prayers for the unconverted dead? This is not the case in the Church of Rome. That Church holds firmly the finality of this life as an opportunity for accepting or rejecting Christ. Nor is it so, generally, in the case of Anglicans who pray for the dead. They, too, realize the force of the appeal to 'now' and 'to-day' as the accepted and only time of salvation. Prayer for the dead could be understood if we believed in another probation, in another opportunity after this life; but this is not the teaching of the Romish Church or of the majority of extreme Anglicans. It should never be overlooked that prayer for the dead does not necessarily involve belief in Purgatory. Such prayer was offered ages before the doctrine of Purgatory arose, and is practised to-day in the Greek Church, which rejects Purgatory as Roman. Prayer

for the dead implies belief in benefit accruing in some way without any belief in mitigation of purgatorial suffering.

The prayers must therefore be for the Christian dead. This is the meaning of the practice in the Roman Church, and in the case of those in the Anglican Church who adopt the custom. They both pray for the converted dead, and say, 'May they rest in peace, and may light perpetual shine on them.'

But why should we pray for the Christian dead? They are 'with Christ' (Phil. i. 23) in conscious fellowship. They are 'present with the Lord' (2 Cor. v. 8). They are 'with Him in Paradise' (Luke xxiii. 43). They are blessed; for 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord' (Rev. xiv. 13). The New Testament outlook concerning the blessed dead is one of joy, peace, and expectation; we are to remember their past life, imitate their faith, and praise God for them. It seems to be unnecessary, and even cruel, to pray, 'May they rest in peace,' for it reflects on their present peace, joy, and satisfaction in the immediate presence of Christ our Lord.

II.—THE FOUNDATION OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

Prayer must be based on God's Revelation. Prayer finds its warrant in promise. It is evident that prayer, if it is to be real and definite, must be based upon the Word of God as its warrant and encouragement. The Bible is accordingly full of teaching on prayer. There are examples of prayer, encouragements to prayer, models of prayer, and records of answers to prayer. The Bible is the embodiment of God's revelation in Christ, and as such it is at once the foundation and guide of our prayers. God's revelation is thus the source and spring of our human response, and prayer is based on God's promises as revealed in His Word. At the same time, Holy Scripture is the safeguard and limitation of all prayer; for it is obvious that we cannot

pray for everything that might conceivably come into our minds, but only for those things that are included in the revealed will of God. Thus, when our Lord said, 'Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in My name, He will give it you' (John xiv. 23), the 'whatsoever' is limited by the phrase 'in My name,' which teaches us that it is only as we ask *in union with God's revealed will* that we can really pray and be assured of answers. We can only pray definitely or satisfactorily in so far as we have the divine warrant for praying.

This practice of prayer for the dead must therefore be based not on sentiment but on Scripture. In a matter of this kind it ought to be clear that our desires are not a reliable guide. God, who is love, must understand our yearnings, and we may be sure He would not keep back anything profitable to us. And yet, as we shall see, there is not a single command or promise or example of such prayer in Scripture. May we not argue fairly on this point from the silence of the Bible? As God has not revealed Himself in regard to this matter, it is impossible to pray with assurance, because prayer must be based on Revelation.

Revelation is clearly for this life. God's Word is almost silent as to the details of the future life, and absolutely silent as to any relation of prayer to that life. As to the unconverted, the present life is decisive and final in relation to opportunity; and as to the converted, while there is doubtless growth in the kingdom of God in the state after death, as there must be to all eternity, yet not one syllable is to be found in God's Word to tell us that our prayers can either effect or affect that growth. If they see the face of Christ, they surely do not need our prayers. And our knowledge of that life is so small that prayer cannot be intelligent, only sentimental, uninformed. Certainly there is progress and not stagnation; but *why* should we and *how* may we pray? 'Thy Kingdom come' is not prayer for the dead, because we say 'on earth as in heaven.' Prayer

for others is bounded by this life ; and after this, prayer is swallowed up in praise.

Prayer for the dead is of course quite intelligible on the Roman Catholic theory of Purgatory, though, as already seen, it is not inevitably bound up with it. Yet if souls pass from here imperfect, and need purification for eternal glory, it is easy to understand how, according to Roman Catholic principles, prayer can be made for them. But with the rejection of any idea of a purgatory, the practice of prayers for the dead tends to fall to the ground. And whether connected with purgatory or not, the practice is not warranted by Scripture or the Anglican Church. Even those who associate prayers for the dead with the communion of saints are compelled to limit their prayers to the most general terms, and thereby entirely to alter the idea of prayer from the definite petitions and intercessions which we use on earth. The only justification of prayers for the dead would be to pray for them as definitely and pointedly as when they were here. But this would be to deny the teaching of the New Testament concerning their joy and blessedness in the presence of Christ.

The question then arises, Is there anything in the Bible which includes the Christian dead in our prayers ? Can we discover anything in Holy Scripture from which we may infer that prayer for the dead comes within the scope of the promise, ' Whatsoever ye shall ask in My name ' ?

Can we find any instance of prayer for the dead in the Old Testament ? Not one. Is there any example or precept as to prayer for the dead in the Gospels and in the life and works of our Lord ? Not one. Can we discover any example or encouragement in the life of the early Church as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles ? Not one. Is there to be found any clear testimony to prayer for the dead in the Apostolic Epistles ? Not one. Is there any instance of prayer for the dead in the Revelation ? Not one.

The following passages are sometimes used to justify the practice :

‘ Every one shall be salted with fire, and every sacrifice shall be salted with salt ’ (Mark ix. 49). But what is included here on the subject before us ? The text is clearly a symbolical statement concerning spiritual discipline in this life. ‘ The fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is ’ (1 Cor. iii. 13). But the whole passage clearly refers to the testing of Christian faithfulness at the judgement-seat of Christ ; there is not a hint of prayer for the dead. ‘ Baptized for the dead ’ (1 Cor. xv. 29). But whatever be the true interpretation, there is no reference to prayer. ‘ He went and preached unto the spirits in prison ’ (1 Pet. iii. 19). This passage, whatever it means, has no reference to the Christian dead, but to certain spirits ‘ which some time were disobedient.’ ‘ The gospel was preached also to them that are dead ’ (1 Pet. iv. 6). Whatever interpretation we give to this passage, there is no reference to prayer for the Christian dead.

The only passage in the New Testament that can be adduced as a possible warrant is 2 Tim. i. 18. It is urged that Onesiphorus was dead when St. Paul wrote. The elements of the interpretation of this passage are somewhat as follows :

(1) It is entirely uncertain whether Onesiphorus was alive or dead. No one can possibly decide one way or the other. This is not a very hopeful way of deriving an important doctrine from the passage. (2) The assumption that he was dead is therefore entirely gratuitous. In 1 Cor. i. 16 and xvi. 15, compared with Rom. xvi. 10, 11, we see that households can be referred to without the head of the house being dead. (3) Then the view that Onesiphorus was dead probably runs foreign to the context. If we compare verse 15, we see that some had forsaken St. Paul but that Onesiphorus had not been ashamed of the prisoner and his chain (vv. 16–18) ; then Timothy is

urged to the same boldness (*cf.* ch. ii. 1, 'Therefore'). There is nothing here to warrant the idea of the death of Onesiphorus. (4) Even supposing Onesiphorus was dead, it might be possible to express a wish like this for a friend without in the least admitting the principles on which prayer for the dead can be taken seriously. Dr. Swete, believing that Onesiphorus was dead, points out that, even so, the prayer is 'for his acceptance in the day of Christ, and not for his well-being in the intermediate life.'¹

Looking over the entire revelation of God we cannot help observing two things: (a) In the Levitical code there are minute instructions as to all sorts of sacrifices, and yet, with sacrifices for the dead, familiar all around in heathen religions, not a hint is given about them in the Mosaic law. (b) The New Testament, while so emphatic on the efficacy of prayer under all circumstances of life, never once extends the practice to the next world, even though often alluding to the dead and the future life.

From Scripture, therefore, the one fount of essential truth, we have no warrant, no foundation for Prayers for the Dead, but everything that looks in the opposite direction.

We have next to consider

III.—THE EARLY HISTORY OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

It is generally thought that the Jews prayed for the dead, and that a passage in 2 Maccabees xii. points in that direction. Jewish liturgies of the present day certainly have them. But it has been pointed out² that the passage in Maccabees does not necessarily involve prayers for the dead, nor is it certain that the present Jewish liturgies are of pre-Christian date. In any case, however, we have no record of our Lord and His Apostles observing such a

¹ Swete, *The Holy Catholic Church*.

² C. H. H. Wright, *The Intermediate State*, pp. 28-43. See also an article in *The Expositor* for April, 1915, by the Rev. J. W. Hunkin, which arrives independently at the same conclusion.

custom, and it would be very precarious to base a Christian practice of such moment on merely Jewish grounds, even if we were sure of them. Nor are we justified in arguing in support of the practice from Christ's silence.

In the Christian Church it is to be carefully noted that the earliest form of the phrase indicated by R.I.P. was not 'requiescat' but 'requiescit,' which states the fact, 'he rests in peace.' The earliest inscriptions of the catacombs, too, are 'in pace,' 'in Christo,' &c., without any prayer.¹ All primitive history points to the remarkable joy and definite certainty associated with Christian funerals, the thought of the beloved one being with the Lord overpowering all else. The future had no shadows, and praise, not prayer, was the attitude of these believers.

Dr. H. B. Swete, himself in favour of prayers for the dead, after a careful survey reaches the conclusion that there is nothing to show communion for the departed during the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods.² Surely this absolute silence right on to the end of the second century is impressive and significant.

When prayers for the dead actually began in the Christian Church, they were very simple and marked by a true reserve because of our ignorance. They were merely prayers for the soul's rest, and that it might be placed at God's right hand. But the mind of man is impatient of restraint, and so something more definite was wanted to pray for. The order of thought and feeling seems to have been somewhat on this line, though of course not always definitely and consciously, nor all at once, but extending through several centuries: (1) Prayer implies need. (2) Need suggests imperfection. (3) Imperfection involves progress. (4) Progress indicates purification. (5) Purification demands suffering, and from this came the fully developed mediaeval

¹ De Rossi: *Inscriptiones Christianae urbis Romae septimo saeculo*, (vol. i.). B. Scott: *The Contents and Teachings of the Catacombs*, p. 159.

² *Journal of Theological Studies*, July, 1907, p. 500

doctrine of Purgatory, which, as we have seen, means purification based on the fact that the full penal consequences of sin are not all remitted in this life.

It is unnecessary to stay to discuss all this in detail; but this much may be said: (1) We can readily see how far it all is from New Testament simplicity; and (2) Suffering is not necessarily remedial and purifying; it often hardens. Joy is on the whole quite as purgative as suffering, and some would say that it is much more so.

This was the state of the case before the Reformation; and we are at once brought to

IV.—THE TEACHING OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

This calls for careful attention and study, and we have to note the following stages of the history.

In 1549 came the first Reformed Prayer-Book, and in it were prayers for the dead, distinct and definite. The prayer now called the Prayer for the Church Militant was then headed, 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church,' and a petition for the departed was included in the prayer. There were also prayers for the dead in the Burial Service. But the Visitation Articles of 1549, which enforced this Prayer-Book, ordered 'that no man maintain Purgatory, . . . or any other such abuses and superstitions.' So that our Reformers prohibited the doctrine of Purgatory while continuing to pray for the dead. This is proof that prayers for the dead are not necessarily connected with the Roman doctrine of Purgatory.

In 1552 came the second Reformed Prayer-Book. From this prayers for the dead were deliberately omitted, and the words 'militant here in earth,' added to the heading of the prayer. The Burial Service was altered in accordance with this, so as to express the present joy of the holy dead, 'with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity.' This change from 1549 deserves careful notice.

The Bishop of Ripon¹ correctly calls this 'the absence of direct and unambiguous prayer for the departed.' But it is something more; for what is quite certain is that direct and unequivocal utterances of prayer for the faithful departed were then removed, and have never been restored.

One of the Homilies speaks in unmistakable plainness of the needlessness of prayers for the dead.

Now, to entreat of that question, whether we ought to pray for them that are departed out of this world, or no? Wherein, if we cleave only unto the Word of God, then must we needs grant that we have no commandment so to do. . . . Therefore, let us not deceive ourselves, thinking that either we may help other, or other may help us by their good and charitable prayers in time to come. . . . Neither let us dream any more that the souls of the dead are anything at all holpen by our prayers; but, as the Scripture teacheth us, let us think that the soul of man, passing out of the body, goeth straightways either to heaven, or else to hell, whereof the one needeth no prayer, and the other is without redemption. The only purgatory wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ, which if we apprehend with a true and stedfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if He were now hanging upon the cross. . . . If this kind of purgation will not serve them, let them never hope to be released by other men's prayers, though they should continue therein unto the world's end. . . . Let us not, therefore, dream either of purgatory, or of prayer for the souls of them that be dead; but let us earnestly and diligently pray for them, which are expressly commanded in Holy Scripture, namely for kings and rulers; for ministers of God's holy word and sacraments; for the saints of this world, otherwise called the faithful; to be short, for all men living, be they never so great enemies to God and His people.²

This was published within about twenty years of the Prayer-Book of 1552. It will be noticed that the condemnation is of the practice *per se*, and not merely when associated with Purgatory. Bishop Drury says this shows the view that was taken by leading Elizabethan divines, and throws at least an important sidelight on the facts already adduced.³ In 1559 one of the reasons in Gest's letter to Cecil against the restoration of the Prayer-Book of 1549 was that it contained prayers for the dead.⁴ At the revision of 1662

¹ Dr. Drury, *Churchman*, January, 1909, p. 21.

² The *Homilies*, pp. 337-340. ³ *Churchman*, *ut supra*, p. 28.

⁴ Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 52.

a proposal was made to omit the words 'militant here in earth,' and at one stage a prayer for the dead was actually inserted by some of the Revisers, but rejected by Convocation; and there the matter stands to this day, a thanksgiving for the departed alone being added.

This is the Church of England history on the subject, clear and definite, and surely capable of only one meaning. In support of this position it can be shown that the Reformers and their immediate successors, men like Cranmer, Jewel, and Whitgift, all rejected prayer for the dead.¹

It is said, however, that there are two passages where we pray for the dead. (1) In the Post-Communion Collect. 'That we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His passion.' But surely the Church above has obtained 'remission.' These words were drawn up by the men who deliberately omitted prayers for the dead in 1552. (2) 'That with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom,' but this is a statement about *them*, and a prayer for *ourselves*. It is in the prayer for the *Church Militant*, and that phrase covers the whole prayer. We thank God for the departed, we do not pray for them.

Such is the Church of England history and doctrine. And if it be said, as it has been sometimes, that prayers for the dead have never been forbidden in the Church of England, we reply that this is true in word but false in fact. What is the meaning of the changes in 1552? Either they mean something or they do not. If they do not, or did not, why were they made? Indeed, we may ask what any of the Reformation changes meant? In the beginning of our Prayer-Book we have, 'Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained.' Prayer for the dead was one of those things that were abolished. Omission, therefore, clearly means prohibition. To say simply that a thing

¹ Blakeney, *Book of Common Prayer, its History and Interpretation*, pp. 457-8, ed. 1886.

is 'not forbidden' would justify almost anything that an individual clergyman might choose to adopt.

The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) distinguishes between private and public prayers for the dead, and says that the Church has deliberately excluded such from her services.¹ Thus Bishop Andrewes had them in his private devotions, but cut them out of the Public Service for the Consecration of Graveyards.²

In the course of a review of a book advocating prayers for the dead, the *Guardian* frankly admitted that the practice was only justifiable on the assumption that the condition of the departed is not fixed at the time of death. When the wording of the prayer at the Burial Service is remembered, 'With whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are in joy and felicity,' it is not difficult to see the position of the Church about the state of the faithful at and after death. There is no doubt that the Prayer-Book in its final form excluded all explicit prayers for the departed from the public services. All Souls' Day has not been recognized by the Prayer-Book, and was omitted at the Reformation from the Table of Feasts and the Calendar.³ All this gives force to the Bishop of Ripon's conclusion that 'the statement that such prayers are nowhere forbidden (except in the Homilies) is not complete or fair unless the above fact (about the rejection of the practice proposed in 1662) is placed side by side with it.'

We must not fail to notice how the New Testament meets the supposed demand for prayers for the dead.

V.—THE SAFEGUARD AGAINST PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

The New Testament generally is our best safeguard. The burden there is on 'now.' The whole stress is on the

¹ *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, vol. ii., p. 408.

² See Dr. Drury, *Churchman*, *ut supra*, p. 28.

³ *Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline*, vol. iv., pp. 45-48, 1024.

present. We are to pray for others now, work for them now, endeavour to save them now. We intercede for them now because of their *need*. There is no revelation of need *then*, but just the opposite.

The doctrine of justification, specifically, is our perfect safeguard. The root of prayers for the dead is failure to realize what justification means. We are 'accounted righteous before God' from the very moment we accept Christ. This justification settles at once and for ever our position before God. Our spiritual standing is unchanged through life, and our title to heaven is at once and for ever given. Justification is not repeated, it is permanent; and this settles the question of heaven and God's presence once for all. We must ever remember that the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is not connected with sanctification, but with justification. It is not part of a process for making Christians holier, but a supplementary process rendered necessary because all the penal consequences are not remitted in this life. Purgatory is required because the debt is not fully discharged here. But what saith the Scripture? 'There is therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit' (Rom. viii. 1). If only we teach, preach, live, and enjoy that blessed truth, we shall never use prayers for the dead.

VI.—RECENT DISCUSSIONS

The question has naturally obtained renewed attention through the war, and certain statements of representative men compel a fresh consideration of the position of the Bible and the Church of England. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a sermon on November 2, 1914, and in his *Diocesan Gazette*, seems to have modified the view expressed in his evidence before the Royal Commission already quoted. While on the one hand he is strong against the danger of abuses, such as we find in the sixteenth century and con-

tinued in certain quarters to this day, yet on the other he is of opinion that there must be no discouragement of the 'devout soul in prayer for the loved one out of sight.'

I desire loyally to maintain the distinction, markedly drawn by Bishop Andrewes and other great Anglican divines, between those beliefs, based upon definite Scriptural proof, the teaching of which is incorporated in our public formularies, and on the other hand opinions and beliefs which fall short of such definite proof. If the distinction be borne in mind, I have no doubt at all that prayers for the dead are permissible to loyal sons and daughters of our Church so long as they do not imply a condition of the departed which our Article XXII. ('of Purgatory') has definitely condemned.

In the same direction are the words of the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Moule) in his *Christus Consolator* (pp. 96-98), thereby marking a definite change from his *Outlines of Christian Doctrine* (p. 97), where, speaking of the arguments used in favour of prayer for the dead in the early Church, as having met with 'frequent criticism,' he says: 'these defences are inadequate, against the total silence of Scripture.' The recent utterances of the Bishop are as follows:

Upon the grave and tender problem of prayer for the departed, the Bible, so I venture to think, after long reflection, is absolutely reserved. . . . Misgivings about prayer for the dead are wholly justified, if the prayer in question means necessarily prayer for deliverance from gloom and pain, rather than a breath of loving aspiration sent after the spirit into its abode of light, asking, as a certainty may be asked for, for the perpetual growth in the emancipated being of the graces and the bliss of the heavenly rest, and its holy progress and education in the knowledge of its Lord. It is undoubted that such prayer for the departed is found in the fragmentary remains of very early Christian literature, certainly within half a century of the last apostles. Never there, nor ever in the inscriptions of the Roman catacombs, I think, does it suggest a purgatorial belief. It might almost be said to be, as regards its spirit, as much salutation and aspiration as petition. But in form it is prayer. And I for one cannot condemn such exercises of the soul, where reverent thought invites to it, in the private devotions of a Christian.¹

These are significant utterances, and indicate a desire (due to the circumstances of the war) to modify the Church of England rule about limiting prayer to that which can be

¹ Footnote by Dr. Moule: 'Its introduction into public worship is, in view of differing beliefs, another matter, on which I do not speak here.'

definitely proved from Holy Scripture. Now while it is natural to feel intense sympathy with those who have lost loved ones in battle, the question must still be faced in the light of Holy Scripture, for it is part of the purpose of the Bible as the Word of God to guide, guard, and control our natural desires and cravings. The following considerations, it is submitted, should therefore be kept clearly and constantly in view.

(1) When the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline issued its report in 1906, a chapter was devoted to the subject. The Commissioners stated that the Church of England had never formally condemned prayers for the dead, as distinguished from their public use in her services. Representative divines of the Church, it was pointed out, have again and again protested against the necessity of a connexion, such as is by Roman Catholic writers constantly assumed to exist, between the doctrines of purgatory and prayers for the departed. The Commissioners at the same time made it clear that they dissociated themselves from all public services and prayers for the dead, concerning which evidence was given, according to their opinion, 'significant of teaching which is entirely inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England.'

(2) It is obvious on the Archbishop's admission in his sermon that 'no explicit prayers for the departed at all were admitted into the public language of the Church, and people were taught to rely in these public offices upon that alone which can be definitely proved by Holy Scripture.'

(3) Then comes the inquiry whether the prayer recommended by the Archbishop is for the Christian or for the non-Christian dead. His words suggest the former; and if so, the entire problem is raised of the relation of the Christian soul to God. If the soul has passed away as a believer, then its *title* to heaven through justification is assured, and prayer in such a case cannot be for anything else than growth in grace. But have we any warrant from

Scripture for such a prayer? To ask the question is to answer it. And is it logical to pray for any one who is confessedly at peace in the presence of Christ? It is generally admitted by advocates of the practice that it implies some need of purification.

(4) But another question at once arises. Is it possible in such circumstances as those of War to limit our prayers for the faithful departed? Is there not an equally instinctive desire, indeed a greater longing, to pray for those of whose salvation we are not certain? But if so, we are at once faced with the solemn and serious idea of a second probation, 'the larger hope,' and again the inquiry comes: Is this according to Scripture? There is no doubt that prayers for the dead do imply a belief in some state of imperfection which needs to be removed, and it becomes a serious question whether the traditional limitation of prayers for the faithful departed can be maintained. As already seen, prayers for the dead did not arise out of belief in Purgatory, but they have always been associated with that doctrine; and if once prayer is extended beyond the Christian dead, some form of purgatory will assuredly be demanded.

Even the words of the Archbishop are not quite clear when he speaks of the one who has passed away still growing 'in truer purity and in deepened reverence and love.' This thought of a 'truer purity' seems to imply that something in the intermediate state can minister to a spiritual condition 'truer' than that experienced below. But is not such an idea really a confusion between the soul's *title* to heaven and its *place* there? No one can question that prayer for the dead is associated in most minds with the thought of discipline after death. And in view of the fact that we know nothing about the condition of the departed, is it not fair to urge that we cannot pray for them with anything like the definiteness and assurance we enjoy in intercessory prayer for them while on earth? If our prayers are to be at once satisfying to ourselves and pleasing to God, they ought

to be strictly limited to the divine revelation in Holy Scripture. The great danger is that by the practice of prayer we shall imply that there is some change of spiritual condition between death and resurrection which we can effect by our intercession.

Under all these circumstances we would therefore again plead the following considerations :

(1) The importance and significance of the silence of the New Testament. Nothing can be more remarkable than the way in which our Lord and His Apostles never refer to prayer for the dead. 'Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord' (Rev. xiv. 13). Observe the Bishop of Durham's significant words : 'The Bible . . . is absolutely reserved. I cannot think therefore that the warrant for such prayer is a fact of revelation.'

(2) The witness of the early Church. Bishop Moule claims for the practice a time 'within half a century of the last Apostles.' But this, as we have seen, is not supported by Dr. Swete. A practice for which there is no real proof earlier than the end of the second century, the time of Tertullian, can hardly be called primitive ; and, as Dr. Swete has shown, prayer for the dead is certainly by no means prominent, indeed scarcely noticeable at all, in the earliest Church.

(3) The history of the Church of England. The changes in 1552 and 1662 tell their own story, and though there are a few who, like Cosin, have intended prayer for the dead in some of the phrases of the Prayer-Book, no one can doubt that the balance of evidence is overwhelmingly on the other side.

It is frequently urged that we pray for the dead when we ask in the Church Militant Prayer, 'that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom,' and also in the words in the Burial Service, 'that we, with all those who are departed in the true faith of Thy holy name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss.' But it may be asked :

(a) How can this be the purpose of the Reformers when such vital changes were made by these very men between 1549 and 1552 ? (b) Is this the real meaning of the words ? Surely 'we with them' is different from 'they with us.' Their position is clear, for they are 'departed in the faith and fear of God,' but 'we' are still here. Further, if the Church Militant Prayer is to have this interpretation, it will imply that participation in the kingdom of heaven by the faithful departed is somehow or other dependent on our lives : 'give *us* grace . . . that (*they*) may be partakers.' The impossibility of such an idea hardly needs to be mentioned. But if the statement is properly interpreted to be equivalent to 'like them we,' there is a perfect balance of thought and expression. And if, as it has been well said, we wish to go with a person, it implies that the person is assuredly going.

(4) Our ignorance of the future state, and therefore the impossibility of intelligent prayer. What do we really know of the future life ? Practically nothing ; and at the same time absolutely nothing in regard to any bearing of our prayers thereon. How, then, can we be of service to the dead by prayers for them ? Either our prayers benefit them or they do not. To limit prayer for the departed to 'a breath of loving aspiration sent after the spirit into its abode of light' is hardly likely to be adequate and satisfying for long to those who are accustomed to the practice.

(5) May we not also inquire whether the war, with all its strain and stress, great as they are, can really make such a change as is involved in praying for the departed ? If the practice was wrong before, it must still be wrong ; while if it is right now, it must have been right before. Such a revolution as is here implied cannot be justified even by the war.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Notes and Discussions

A POET-STATESMAN'S MESSAGE FOR TO-DAY

THERE are two kinds of statesmanship. An eminent statesman may be an eminent opportunist. He may have ready insight into the superficial signs of the times and, knowing how much his countrymen at the moment will, or will not, do and bear, he can adroitly trim his sails to suit the prevailing wind, and at least scud before it to the nearest harbour. But a truly great statesman is a great prophet. He studies the needs of his country and his generation rather than their wants. He has as keen a discernment of the nation's faults as of its excellences, and he judges well concerning the present because he has studied the past and can, like a prophet, anticipate the future. Not that in the old popular sense of prophecy he can predict exactly what is going to happen—a gift not granted to mortals and in itself either idle or mischievous—but because he perceives with unerring insight under what conditions alone the highest hopes of the present can be realized and its imminent dangers overcome. Very few poets indeed have been also statesmen—they might perhaps be numbered on the fingers of one hand. But in so far as the poet has ever been able to give political guidance, it has been in virtue of his insight as a prophet. His mastery of eternal principles has enabled him to shed light upon the passing problems of the hour.

Such men were Dante, Milton, and Wordsworth. The last-named of these uttered a century ago messages the echoes of which are strangely re-awaking around us at this moment. It is interesting—in the old days it would have been incredible—to find from an officer's letters from the front in Flanders that the copies of Wordsworth in the camp library are in constant request. And no less practised a publicist than Mr. A. V. Dicey has quite recently published through the Clarendon Press, an Essay on 'The Statesmanship of Wordsworth,' which is sure to prove attractive to lovers of the poet, but which ought to be read by those whose thoughts are completely engrossed by the national and international problems of the hour. The writer of this note had an opportunity not long ago (July, 1916) of drawing attention in this Review to the patriotic spirit of Wordsworth, and there is no need to enlarge further on that subject. But a man may be a patriot without being a statesman, especially in the highest sense of the word. Has so visionary a writer as the recluse of Lakeland a hundred years ago any messages which men skilled in 'practical politics' would do well to take to heart in this fourth—and it may be hoped, last—year of world-shaking war?

Wordsworth, in the spirit of the old Hebrew prophets, denounced in no measured terms the faults of the country he loved so well. He knew and honoured her as 'a bulwark for the cause of men.' He felt for her 'as a lover or a child.' He found it perfect bliss 'to tread the grass of England once again,' and rejoiced over the waves breaking on the chalky shore of Kent that 'all, all are English.' But it was in the same month of the year 1802 that he recognized the sense in which this beloved land was 'a fen of stagnant waters,' grieving that 'the wealthiest man among us is the best,' and mourning over the disappearance of 'the homely beauty of the good old cause,' of 'plain living and high thinking,' and 'pure religion breathing household laws.' If he were living to-day he would certainly make his voice heard as a *vates sacer* of the magnificent spirit of our citizen army and of the anxious or bereaved wives and mothers at home. He would commend in the England of to-day—what he himself so nobly illustrated when there were few to stand by his side—the spirit of resolute defence of liberty and righteousness without any mean, or spiteful, or malicious feeling towards an unscrupulous and barbarous enemy. But he would not hesitate to point out our national dislike of discipline and our proneness to national self-righteousness. Wordsworth expressed himself as afraid lest 'the flood of British freedom, this most famous stream, in bogs and sands should perish,' and his love for his country shone out quite as plainly in his bracing words of rebuke, when he sought to 'wean his country's heart from its emasculating food,' as in his loftiest eulogies of his own beloved land,

Risen like one man, to combat in the sight
Of a just God for liberty and right.

Wordsworth was essentially the poet of democracy and of nationalism—two hard-worked and much abused words in these days. Those who would understand what either 'democracy' or 'nationalism' ought to mean as an ideal would do well to study Wordsworth. To begin with, he was no 'politician,' no party-man. Mr. Dicey says truly that he was 'neither a Whig nor a Tory,' but that he became 'an original thinker who at the height of his powers had thought out a social and political doctrine of his own.' It was no ordinary feat to remain true to the sacred cause of human freedom from 1791 to 1815, that is to say (1) before the French Revolution, (2) during its exultations and triumphs, (3) through its agonies during the Reign of Terror, (4) when Britain allied itself with autocrats against a people struggling to be free, (5) when that people, fascinated by military glory, became untrue to its own high ideals, and (6) when Napoleon was overthrown and reaction set in throughout Europe. Wordsworth was not a republican or an advocate of any political programme. He knew well that democracy is not a form of government, and that a demagogue is not a true democrat. But it needed a steady head when the map of Europe was rapidly being altered in the second decade of the nineteenth century to stand unswervingly by the cause of freedom and maintain as an ideal the

government of the people by the people for the people—the aims of such ‘people’ themselves being maintained in harmony with the freedom and self-government of other peoples, and with the great moral and spiritual order of the world.

Similarly it will need a steady head to preserve such ideals unsullied and unalloyed during the closing phases of the present war, the settlement of terms of peace and the period of re-construction ensuing. There is no historical study which can shed more light upon the tremendous problems now being raised than that to which Wordsworth’s ‘Prelude’ and ‘Poems dedicated to Independence and Liberty’ introduce us. Mazzini was the prophet of Nationalism in Europe for many years, but Wordsworth had been before him in proclaiming the rights of all nations, great and small, ‘to associate freely without obstacles, without foreign domination,’ in order to express each its own national idea, and live its own characteristic life. But he perceived the dangers that were sure to arise through encouraging a spirit of ‘nationalism,’ uninstructed, unregulated and unrestrained. In his later days he even became apprehensive of national autonomy and progress. He opposed Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill of 1832. But this may be attributed to the conservatism and timidity of advancing age. It is in the poems which belong to the first decade of the nineteenth century that the true Wordsworth is to be sought, and his characteristic message to this generation is to be found. Problems will arise before the next decade has passed—some of them affecting international relations in Europe, especially its Eastern portion, and others affecting the deepest interior life of nations—which could not have been anticipated by the poet. Yet it is hardly too much to say that the principles which will suffice to solve most, if not all of them, are to be found in their purest form in the verses of this poet-statesman when he was between thirty and forty years of age.

Perhaps the most striking feature of Wordsworth’s message to his own times and indirectly to ours is the indomitable resolution which he seeks to infuse into the national spirit and the invincible hope with which he rallies his countrymen to cope with the direst difficulties. It is indeed not easy for us fully to appreciate the tremendous dangers against which our country had to contend in the later years of the Napoleonic wars and the comparative scantiness of its resources. But this later Milton will not bate a jot of heart or hope. In the sonnet beginning ‘Another year! another deadly blow!’ which is dated November, 1806—that is, just after Jena—Wordsworth, like his ‘Happy Warrior,’ exults in the inspiration which in extreme danger animates the brave. Are we left alone, he asks, ‘the last that dare to struggle with the foe?’ Is it true that ‘we must stand unpropped, or be laid low?’ Such glorious peril is welcomed.

‘O dastard whom such foretaste doth not cheer!’

The position of the Allies to-day is far more favourable than that of

our fathers, though it will be quite as necessary to steel our hearts as they did before our victory is wholly won. Wordsworth struck the right key-note. He indulged in no turgid declamation or laboured invective against Napoleon, but no statesman in Europe had grasped more firmly than he the absolute necessity of his complete overthrow. There was great need in the days between Austerlitz and Waterloo of a leading voice to keep the nation true to duty, and to maintain a firm and high tone in our foreign policy. Wordsworth was the Tyrtæus of the hour. Well does Mr. Dicey say of his patriotic sonnets, 'They are the finest war-songs ever composed by a patriot to stir up the valour and the nobility of his country; they might be termed the psalms of England, and like the Psalter, they combine penitence for past errors with confidence in final victory, based on the belief in the final triumph of righteousness.'

Wordsworth preached hope when there was every material reason for despair. In two sonnets, written in 1811 and published in 1815, he contrasts 'the power of armies as a visible thing,' with the illimitable power, 'which a brave people into light can bring, or hide at will, for freedom combating.' The Britain of that day proved his own bold words to be true—'no craft this subtle element can bind.' His trumpet-blast summoning all to confidence and hope, even in the worst moment of evil days, is well known :

'Hope, the paramount *duty* that Heaven lays,
For its own honour, on man's suffering heart.'

But such hope can only be maintained when it is rooted in faith, and faith is precisely the element that is too often lacking in nations, when the last breaking strain of severe conflict comes. Wordsworth appealed to the nation's belief in that 'virtuous liberty,' of which England has so often in past days been the stalwart and sometimes the sole champion. To-day we are far from being alone; in a sense the world is on our side. But the foe is tough, tenacious, subtle, and unscrupulous. During the next period of the war, until America can make her power felt, a similar burden will be laid on this country to that which she had to bear in the last century, not for ten months, but for ten years, in resisting an apparently invincible foe. One reads and re-reads with indescribable emotion Wordsworth's thrilling appeals, now that Europe, once again bleeding at every pore, supplies a new commentary upon them.

If he were alive to-day the poet might make an even more effective appeal to the moral and spiritual energies of the nation which a hundred years ago almost alone resisted Napoleon and contributed so largely to his overthrow. In the present war, whether we regard its origin, the method in which it has been conducted by the enemy, or the vast issues at stake, we find even stronger proofs of the righteousness of our cause and the imperative need of victory in the interests of freedom for the world, than our ancestors had a century ago. Germany and her satellites have been piling one evidence upon another to prove to an incredulous world how far shameless dis-

regard of honour and the employment of vile and barbarous war devices can go, and what the victory of such a cause would mean for all the nations of the world. If there ever was an internecine conflict between brute force aided by science, military skill, and chicanery on the one hand against honour, law, good faith, and freedom on the other, it is that in which the nations are now engaged. If the present is not literally a battle between the powers of good and evil it very nearly approaches one. That does not imply, of course, that the States represented by the Allies are good and their opponents evil. In such a world as ours they fight best for the cause of righteousness who contend in no spirit of Pharisaism, but conscious of their own errors and failures and sins. The righteous cause ennobles those who uphold it. And as Wordsworth's appeal for the fulfilment of the *duty* of hope—he himself italicized the word—rested upon the fact that England, whatever its faults, had committed to her the cause of Liberty as a sacred trust, so he would assuredly appeal, with even increased moral force to-day.

The fate of Belgium and Serbia, of Poland and Armenia, of Russia for the next half century, of the Southern Slavs, Montenegro, Albania, and Greece—to go no further for the moment—still trembles in the balance. Many in this country have so accustomed themselves to rely upon a final victory for the Allies, that they have hardly contemplated what a victory for Germany would mean, or that kind of stalemate which would imply a virtual victory for the Central Powers. If democracy gains the upper hand decisively in the last rounds of this fearful contest the peace of the world will, humanly speaking, be assured for the twentieth century, perhaps for a far longer period. If autocracy and militarism are not overthrown, and no punishment is inflicted for the crimes against humanity of the last three years, civilization will have been thrown back for centuries, and freedom can only be recovered after struggles too dreadful to contemplate.

We anticipate no such calamities. But the resolute note which Wordsworth struck in the critical years after the armistice of Amiens needs to be sounded still. High ideals are only too easily lost sight of, especially amidst the squalor and abominations, the cruelties and horrors of modern war. Only victory can free the nobler Germany, which for half a century has been possessed by the demon of Prussianism. 'Make me strong and I will make you rich,' was the form in which the militaristic devil has been tempting a fine and gifted people for three generations. This kind of evil spirit is not easily driven out. But exorcism has begun, and the work must be finished if the world is to be at peace. Those who would help to expel it must admit neither the spirit of hatred nor of self-righteousness. And they will do well amidst inevitable war-weariness to refresh themselves by listening to the strains of one of the few men in history who had the right to speak to his countrymen both as a great poet and as a resolute and far-seeing statesman.

W. T. DAVISON.

THE POET OF THE BATS

I

VISITORS to the Salon du Champ de Mars cannot fail to have noticed a full-length portrait by Whistler, the portrait of a gentleman of somewhat uncertain age, standing in an attitude half chivalrous, half funambulesque, his hand lightly posed on a small cane. There is something distinguished, something factitious, about the whole figure, and on turning to the catalogue one could not but be struck by a certain fantastic appropriateness in the name, Comte Robert de Montesquiou-Fezensac, even if that name conveyed no further significance. To those who know something of the curiosities of French literary society, the picture has its interest as a portrait of the oddest of Parisian 'originals,' the typical French 'aesthete,' from whose cult of the hortensia Oscar Wilde no doubt learnt the worship of the sunflower; while to readers of Huysmans it has the further interest of being a portrait of the real des Esseintes, the hero of that singular and remarkable romance of the Decadence, *A Rebours*. It is scarcely likely that many of the people, or indeed any of the English people who saw the picture, knew that it was also the portrait of a poet, the poet of the bats, *Les Chauves-Souris*, an enormous volume of five hundred closely printed pages.

The Comte de Montesquiou, though living, and a personage, and of late a *fait divers* in the papers for purely mundane reasons, is none the less a legendary being, of whom all the stories that are told may very likely be true, of whom at all events nothing can be told more fantastic than the truth. Has he, or had he, really a series of rooms, draped in different tones, in one of which he could only read French, in another only Latin? Did he really gild the back of the tortoise, and then inlay it with jewels, so that it might crawl over the carpet in arabesques of living colour, until the poor beast died of the burden of its unwonted splendour? Did he really invent an orchestra of perfumes, an orchestra of liqueurs, on which he could play the subtlest harmonies of the senses? He certainly at one time possessed an incredible wardrobe, from which he would select and combine, with infinite labour, the costume of the day; apologizing, on a certain misty afternoon, for not employing the Scotch symphony which had once before so perfectly suited a similar day: 'but it takes my servant so long to prepare it!' On one occasion a distinguished French writer, one of the most recent Academicians, was astonished, on opening a letter from the Comte de Montesquiou, to find along with the letter a manuscript copy of Balzac's *Curé de Tours*, written in an illiterate hand. Nothing whatever was said about it, and on meeting his correspondent, the Academician inquired if it was by oversight that the manuscript had been enclosed. 'Oh no,' was the answer, 'the fact is, my cook and my butler are always quarrelling, and in order to occupy them and keep them out of mischief, I give them Balzac's stories to copy

out ; and I send the copies to my friends. *Père Goriot* I sent to Leconte de Lisle ; I only sent you a short one.'

Until a year or two ago, the Comte de Montesquiou indulged in the luxury of enjoying an artistic reputation without having done anything, or at least without having published. It was known that he wrote poems, but no one had seen them ; he had resolved to out-Mallarmé Mallarmé, and he succeeded so well that it was generally supposed that these vague, shrouded poems were the quintessence of what was perversely exquisite in spirit and in form, probably few in number, but no doubt not less faultless than original. All at once the veil was dropped ; the huge volume of the *Chauves-Souris* appeared, and the reticent and mysterious poet was found soliciting press-notices, paying actresses to recite his poems, giving receptions at his ' Pavillon ' at Versailles, and buttonholing distinguished poets, to ask them what they really thought of his poems. It is a little difficult to say what one thinks of these poems. They are divided, according to an apparently rigid but entirely unintelligible plan, into a great many divisions. All this is supposed to represent ' une concentration du mystère nocturne,' and a prose commentary, which certainly makes darkness more visible, is added, because, the author tells us, ' des sollicitudes amies veulent qu'un léger fil permette à des esprits curieux et bienveillants de reconnaître vite le labyrinthe, et, plus expressément, d'apprécier la division architectonique, voire architecturale, peut-être le meillure mérite du poème.' Probably nothing more calmly crazy than this book—in which there is all the disorder without any of the delirium of madness—was ever written ; the book certainly has its interest. The possibilities of verse for the expression of fluent, contorted, and interminable nonsense have never been more cogently demonstrated than in the pages from which I cull at random this stanza :

La nuit tous les chats sont gris,
Toutes les souris sont fauves :
Chauves-souris et chat-chauves,
Chats-chauves chauves-souris !

It is not a quality that the author would probably appreciate, but the quality that most impresses in this book is the extraordinary diligence that must have been required to produce it. There is not a spontaneous verse in it, from beginning to end ; few would seem to have required thought, but none could have failed to demand labour. At its best it has that funambulesque air of the Whistler portrait ; when it is not playing tricks it is ambling along stolidly ; but the quintessential des Esseintes, the father and child of the Decadence, well, des Esseintes has no rival to fear in the merely real Comte Robert de Montesquiou-Fezensac.

II

The Poet of the Bats persists in the publication of his great work in verse, on which, he assures us, he has been engaged for the

last fifteen years, and his 'troisième ouvrage carminal' has appeared under the formidable title of 'Le Parcours du Rêve au Souvenir.' As his intentions can never be confidently divined or described except from his own indications and in his own words, we had better let it at once be understood that 'Quelques-unes des momentanités graphiques et descriptives qui séparent et rejoignent l'aller et le retour, le point de départ et le lieu d'arrivée, l'idée préconçue, l'idéal préventif et la perspective du but visé toujours différente de la mémoire que nous laisse la région visitée; les trajets et les séjours, les relais et les étapes entre les élans et les termes, les envols et les repos, tel est ce *Parcours*, voilà ce Livre.' It is clear now (is it not?) that we have a book of travel pictures: 'voici de nouveaux et singuliers Reisebilder,' as Heredia tells us in his subtly ironical preface, which says so much and so little, which was no doubt so pleasing to Montesquiou, and which, for quite other reasons, is so pleasant to us. First we have 'Klôchers: Bretonnances'; then 'Molen: Néerlandises'; then 'Nêves: Engadinages et Suisseries'; then 'Gondola: Venezianeries'; next 'Mist: Londonismes'; and finally, 'Palmes: Algérienne.' The very titles are intended to convey a certain sense of local colour, and, with the same intention, each section is appropriately inscribed, the English one to Lady Archibald Campbell, for instance, the Venetian one to Whistler. Local colour seems, indeed, to have been the main concern of Montesquiou. How far he has succeeded will at once be evident if we turn to the section devoted to

'Ce Londres qui les Anglais nomment London'—

how curious a caprice on their part! There we read of 'Walter crâne,'

'Et combien de Rossetti,
Et de Dante Gabriel!'

We read also of

'un décor élu de ronce et de broussaille
Par Crane et Jones-Burne
Où tressaille
Du Swinburne.'

A poem entitled 'His Grace' describes the charms of the Duchess of Leinster,

'Avec cette lèvre énorme
Comme il n'en put exister.'

And can local colour go further than this?

'Des brumes
Des rhumes.
Des cabs
De Mabs.'

We scrupulously preserve the author's punctuation, as well as his spelling; both have their interest in the psychological study of

‘ Ces vieilles mille-une nuits
Débap—dépoetisées,’

as the author describes his poems, with a charming and characteristic disregard of his own language, probably intended to show that his disregard of other languages is entirely ‘without prejudice.’ In the section devoted to Brittany the local colour is obtained after this fashion :

‘ Plouzevede, Pleuc, Plogonnec,
Plourivo, Plourin, Ploufragan ;
Ploudalniazeau, Ploubazlanec,
Plouguerneau, Plouha, Plouguescan.’

Evidently Montesquiou is a careful traveller, who notes on the spot his ‘impressions d’élite,’ as he defines them. Here is the opening, for instance, of a poem, which will carry instant conviction to every sensitive memory :

‘ Buvettes,
Cuvettes,
C’est au
Bateau.’

Is there not a satisfying simplicity, a simplicity profoundly expressive, in these four lines, which the most robust or the most sentimental traveller can scarcely fail to realize ? Turn the page, and we find yet another ‘impression d’élite,’ of a like simplicity and sincerity :

‘ On était nombreux
Au départ, là-haut ;
On ne sait pourquoi,
Bien peu reparaissent pour diner.’

It is by the frankness of such details that Montesquiou becomes human ; it is by such indications that we know he has learnt in suffering what he teaches in song.

‘ Je me trouve triste
D’être touriste,’

he laments, elsewhere ; and his *ennui* is sympathetically contagious. The whole book, four hundred pages long, might be described as the confessions of a tourist who has seen everything and nothing ; a gentleman who travels ‘à la moderne, en sleeping, en yacht,’ with his eyes carefully fixed on his guide-book and his note-book ; who is so anxious to make verses about what he has seen that he forgets to look at what there is to see, and prefers to remember that ‘Jones-Burne’ is the name of an English painter ; who is, in short, equally incapable of receiving an impression visually and of rendering it in words. He is a pathetic example of that impotent desire to be something exquisitely abnormal, which, at the present moment, has taken possession of so many commonplace minds.

ARTHUR SYMONS.

A CRITICISM OF GNOSTIC THEORY

THE Gnostic systems were philosophic systems of the universe which, springing up within the Church, could not deny the Redemption in Jesus Christ. Their attitude to Christianity in general was determined by their concept of Redemption. Now the nature of redemption helps to define its method; the method of redemption establishes a doctrine of the Person and Office of Christ. Involved also in the question of Redemption is a consideration of that from which, and those in whom, the Redemption is effected: and so appear doctrines of Evil and of Destiny. From the Christian standpoint, the doctrine of Redemption may therefore well be regarded as a leading criterion of Gnostic theory. But though the Gnostic was bred within the Church, his main theme was not the Redemption from evil, but the Origin of evil. The fact of Redemption was in a sense forced upon him from without, and by it he must indeed stand or fall as a teacher of absolute truth. But the problem of the Origin of evil is his own, and in his reply to that problem we expect to find most light. While, therefore, we apply the Christian criticism, based on the fact of Redemption, we do not necessarily enter the peculiar sphere of the Gnostic at all. And though the Christian criticism is the only one that can be applied with any safety, yet our judgment of the religious incapacity of Gnosticism may in course of time be offset by an appreciation of its philosophic insight.

Though the Gnostics do not question the fact of redemption, they appear at first to hold widely different views as to its *content*. Carpocrates and Basilides would appear to have little in common. To one, redemption is a deliverance from the power of the demiurgic angel: to the other it is a deliverance from confusion and ignorance. But their notions are representative of two types of Redemptive theory, each finding its own adherents. Amongst those who vest the power of evil in the person of the Demiurge may be classed the Ophites, whose evil spirit Ialdabaoth holds down the pneumatic amongst mankind; Saturninus, to whom redemption is from Satan-inspired persecution of the pneumatic race by the hylic; the Basilidians described by Irenaeus; Carpocrates, in whose system demiurgic authority is exercised over men's souls until they have exhausted in the flesh the possibilities of sin; and the later Marcionite system.

On the other hand, Basilides, according to Hippolytus, finds evil to be an affair of ignorance and confusion. His system knows no dualism of good and evil after the Persian fashion, but only a dualism of evolutionary process, strangely paralleled in modern thought by MacDowall's theory of anabolism and katabolism, or Bergson's theory of creative evolution, though the former at least admits the existence of positive evil. Marcion, according to early critics, was in this of the same mind as Basilides: though evil did exist, its power was not lodged in a spirit of evil, but only in an ignorant and confused creator, the God of the Old Testament. The Bardesanist 'Hymn of the Soul' attributed evil to forgetfulness of the quest of

life, in the torpor produced by the pleasures and meats of the world. Valentinus bridges the gulf between these two classes, in that he accounts the presumptuous love of Achamoth to produce the substance of the material world, and the ignorant Demiurge to be its creator. He depicts an ensuing conflict between opposing personalities, but that conflict in essence is between truth and error: creation is a confused and dual work, and redemption clears up the confusion.

At bottom, this discussion of redemption, whether it be a redemption directly from the power of the Demiurge or from the confusion of his creation, may be narrowed to a single issue. The power of the Demiurge is lodged in the material world, and in the flesh, by which man is united thereto. Deliverance from the Demiurge and from confusion are, therefore, one, and the same with deliverance from the flesh. Whether the Demiurge be malevolent, as Ialdabaoth; or merely ignorant, as the Great Archon; whether he express his authority in the creation of a hylic race to persecute the pneumatic, as in Saturninianism; or in the right to retain the soul for new transmigrations until every iniquity has been committed, as in the theory of Carpoocrates, the central fact is that matter is essentially evil.

Gnosticism's real contrast, therefore, is not between righteousness and sin, but between spirit and matter, *pneuma* and *hyle*. Redemption is not redemption from sin, effected in the world and in the flesh, but redemption from matter, effected by removal from the world and separation from the flesh. Whatever the problem of Gnosticism was, it was not the problem of life.

When we come to deal with the *subjects* of redemption the shortcomings of Gnosticism are still more apparent. With the exception of Marcion, whose Gnosticism was rather practical than temperamental, the great Gnostic sects are in perfect accord as to the main fact, that redemption is not universal. Basilides confines it to the 'Sonship,' a term including only those members of the human family with a special pneumatic endowment, and so offers no hope for a considerable section, perhaps the main body, of mankind, nor for such conscious if non-moral instruments of the Not-Being as the Great Archon: for such, naught but the Great Ignorance and the removal of desire remain. Saturninus and the Ophites hold out redemption to the pneumatic race of men, but not the hylic. Valentinus boldly divides the human race into three classes. The pneumatic, chiefly Valentinians no doubt, are completely saved by nature, independently of their deeds; the psychic will be saved to an intermediate region if they choose well; but for the hylic naught remains save a hidden fire, which, springing up from the hylic abyss, will consume both them and the Hyle itself.

Of the two who offer a universal salvation, Carpoocrates somewhat vitiates his gift by the process through which it is to be attained. Winking at his blasphemy, we may still reflect that the gratification of unbridled lust, the necessary fulfilment of all iniquity, on pain of successive transmigrations, is surely a heavy price to pay for

ultimate bliss—even though there be strong souls who can accomplish all in a single span of life. Marcion's theory, happily, offers divine life to all who believe: Marcion's sins were at most sins of ignorance. From Marcion and Carpocrates we learn that earnestness and stupidity are more dangerous in compound than obliquity and intelligence.

The contrast of Gnosticism with Christianity is very great. Christianity offers salvation to all who believe. To the Gnostic men are saved or lost by nature. Of personal, as transcending mental, response to the Divine, Gnosticism knows nothing.

When we ask by what *process* the elect are redeemed from their bondage to the flesh, we receive the answer that they are redeemed, objectively by the revelation of the Gnosis, and subjectively by the hearing of the same. To Basilides, the process of redemption consists in the imparting of the Gnosis to the Sonship, by which all ignorance and confusion are dispelled, and the Sonship united with the Not-Being. To Valentinus, the elect by nature are liberated through the Gnosis, though Pistis is effectual to the partial salvation of the common Christian if he be found in good works—something of a concession to the popular superstition. Saturninus demands an asceticism, as also does Marcion, as part of the response to the Gnosis. Profligacy is the demand of Carpocrates. The Bardesanist 'Hymn of the Soul' depicts the redemption of the King's Son by means of a revelation and recollection of forgotten knowledge. To the Ophites, the declaration by Jesus that He was son of the Supreme was sufficient to refute the presumptuous announcement of Ialdabaoth that he was Supreme, and to destroy his power upon earth. To Carpocrates, Jesus led the way to emancipation from the flesh by achieving all wickedness in a single lifetime.

The process of redemption, therefore, does not imply an imparting of power into the lives of the redeemed, but only an imparting of knowledge to their minds. It is the redemption of the philosopher. Now, Christianity stands or falls, not by any display of truth or knowledge merely, but by the fact of righteousness imparted and infused. Christian experience is the guardian of Christian truth. That which satisfies the heart cannot but satisfy the mind, though there may well be a superabundance of truth that cannot be reduced to intellectual terms. For any one to imagine that an impartation of knowledge alone can give redemption is amazing: until it be remembered that such redemption is not the Christian redemption at all. The Gnostic had an intellectual, not a fully personal, problem. He sought for an order of the universe, and therein man was an incidental, and free-will of any kind was unlikely to attain to its proper dignity. So moral and physical evil were not differentiated. Thus we get back to the original fallacy that matter is inherently evil; and with the corollary, that redemption is essentially intellectual. The power of evil is indeed often applied through the flesh; redemption does often take an intellectual form: in this the Gnostic's mistake is in elevating relative truth to absolute rank. But when he regards

redemption as being at once limited to the intellect and the intellectual he makes a double error, first in reducing the character of the response demanded, and then in postulating that one half of creation is by nature unfitted to respond at all.

The attitude of the Gnostic to the Person of our Lord was largely determined by pre-conceived notions as to the inherent evil of matter, and to His function as *Redeemer* therefrom. Cerinthus teaches that Jesus differed from other men only in greater wisdom and righteousness, that the Christ descended on Him in the form of a dove at baptism, and departed from Him before the crucifixion. Basilides similarly teaches that Jesus, the son of Joseph and Mary, was enlightened by the fire on Jordan at his baptism. The Ophites speak of Jesus as a pure vessel born of a virgin, and prepared for the entry of Christ and Prunikos. They departed from him before the Crucifixion. Christ is now received into heaven, and welcomes the souls that are His. Carpocrates regards Jesus as a man like other men, but owing His power to His memory of the things He had seen with God in a former life. To these Gnostics, the manhood of our Lord was real, but only the instrument of the higher power that dwelt in Him. On a theory of the opposition of matter and spirit, this is the nearest approach to orthodoxy that can be expected.

Saturninus teaches that the Saviour was without body or birth or figure, and only appeared to be a man. According to Victorinus, the teaching of Valentinus is that Christ had not a material body but a spiritual body from heaven, passing through the Virgin Mary as water through a pipe. This makes the Incarnation utterly unreal. According to Irenaeus and Hippolytus, the Valentinian doctrine is much the same: Christ had the spiritual Christ from Achamoth, the animal Christ from the Demiurge, but a heavenly body: the material, being incapable of redemption, He could not receive. The Basilidian system of Irenaeus speaks of Christ as having appeared on earth as a man, though He was not really such: Simon of Cyrene suffered on the cross, while Jesus in Simon's form mocked the Jews. Marcion says that the Son of God came down suddenly in the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, and taught in the synagogue at Capernaum. He came to reveal the unknown Father, in the likeness, but only the apparent likeness, of man. He was not the Christ promised by the God of the Jews (the Creator), who was to be a great conqueror for the Jews. The late Professor Gwatkin's criticism of this theory is that it destroys, not only our Lord's manhood, but also His truthfulness, for He claimed—falsely, according to Marcion—to be the Christ sent by the God of the Jews. This second position, adopted by the more consistent Gnostics, was the only logical one. If matter is essentially evil, the very flesh of Christ must have been an appearance only, or He must have had a spiritual body, in some occult way capable of being touched and seen. His sufferings could not be physical, and to some, as we have seen, they did not exist.

The attitude of the Gnostics to our Lord displays at its best the weakness of their position. Starting not from the redemption in

Jesus Christ, but from their own cosmic pre-conceptions, they found it necessary to accommodate the facts of history to suit their own notions. Their heresy is not religious, but philosophic. On a false foundation nought but an unstable theory can be built.

Though Gnosticism has contributed so little to religion, it may still be asked, What is its contribution to philosophy? It made its fundamental mistake in reposing evil in matter, but it made no attempt to explain away the actual existence of evil in the world. Whether evil be called matter, or dream, or Kingdom of Satan, it remains as a fact in experience, and to its existence revelation offers no key. To the Gnostic, the origin of evil was one with the origin of the material world. It is, therefore, in his cosmogonies that we obtain the Gnostic's best thought as to the origin of evil. If we rob the Demiurge of his demiurgic powers, he becomes twice as interesting as he was, for in more than one instance he is the originator of evil, and in all cases must necessarily be the instrument through which it is produced. To the Ophites, then, the origin of evil was in the presumptuous claims of Ialdabaoth; to Basilides, in the ignorance and conceit of the Great Archon; to Valentinus, in the degradation of the spiritual nature, first of Sophia, and then of Achaioth; to Saturninus in the limitations of creative power. These are the answers given by philosophy to the question unanswered by religion. Taken separately or in mass, they are far from contemptible. The Book of Job forbids us to trace all suffering to individual sin, but offers only broken fragments of further theory. The Gnostics carry us further back; for the origin of evil we must look beyond the bounds of human experience altogether.

Another of Gnosticism's gifts to man, perhaps not appreciated at its full worth, is that of the exaltation of the notion of the female. The syzygies of Valentinus show how deeply he had seen into the fact of synthesis and differentiation in the cosmic process: though indeed it is the inordinate desire of Sophia that introduces the first element of disturbance. With the Ophites, the evil of the male Ialdabaoth is restrained and eventually restored in part by the righteous female Prunikos. In many sects there was a female Holy Spirit, but that may have been due to the influence of the Hebrew *ruach*, which is feminine, though the varying positions of the Spirit, above and below the Son, do not tend to enhance this opinion. In an age when woman was degraded and despised, when it took a St. Paul to proclaim that in Christ there was on earth neither male nor female, and when even he could not carry his ideal into practice, the philosophy that had the assurance to proclaim that the same central truth existed in the heavenly sphere and creative process was worthy of honour.

Twice in the history of the world has Christianity been face to face with Orientalism: in the first and second centuries, when it fought it to the death in the form of Gnosticism, and in the nineteenth and twentieth, when its re-appearance in esoteric and Buddhist

form has given Christianity another opportunity to understand and convert the East. Then, the Church's victory in dogma was its defeat in influence; now, it may obtain the perfect victory. But unless the Church profit by its former half-success, this cannot be: if a complete conquest of the East for Christ be desired, surely the Church must begin by an attempt to understand the Eastern symbolism.

And what better introduction could there be to Eastern habits of mind and Eastern modes of expression than Gnosticism itself?

II. STRAWSON.

METHODISM AND THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

ITSELF a revolution, Methodism was contemporary with two others—the French Revolution and the Industrial Revolution. As far as the former was concerned it was well, but its coincidence with the latter was unhappy. Historians agree that the Methodist movement tided the country safely over the period of the French Revolution. But for its calming and restraining influence over the common people the country would not have survived in safety that terrible epoch. Undoubtedly it saved England from violent revolution.

It was a misfortune, however, that Methodism flourished at the rise of the New Industry. Some might call it a great social opportunity, but it was too great for a new religious movement. Methodism was *born* at a period of economic prosperity. Thorold Rogers holds that every great religious revival occurs at such a season. The minds of men are comparatively free from mundane cares and distresses. They are at leisure, if they will, to soar to higher realms. But no sooner did Methodism wing her highest spiritual flight than vast economic disturbances began. Amidst the groans and tears of the poor, a new industrial world arose. Methodism, naturally engrossed in her work of the spiritual regeneration of the individual and the religious reform of society, hardly had eyes or heart for what was happening. Like the early Christians of the Roman Empire her mood was ecstatic and transcendent—she forgot 'the new Manchester in the new Jerusalem.' For this she lies under the censure of contemporary social reformers, and increasingly, of industrial historians. The latest of these latter are Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, in their most important new volume, *The Town Labourer, 1760–1832* (Longmans). One whole chapter of the work is devoted to discussing the attitude of contemporary Methodism. It is discriminating, but it is condemnatory. These writers declare that 'the teaching of Methodism was unfavourable to working-class movements; its leaders were hostile, and its ideals, perhaps increasingly, hostile' (p. 287). They quote deliverances of Methodist leaders and of the Conference in support of this. Dr. Coke, for instance, writes to the Duke of Portland in 1801—'I was happy to find that the three men had been expelled the late Mr. Wesley's

Society about five years ago solely for their democratic sentiments ' (p. 278). In 1819 the Secretary sends to the Home Office a copy of an address of the Wesleyan Conference at Bristol, which, whilst sympathizing with the distresses of their people, warns Methodists against those ' who render the privations of the poor the instruments of their own designs against peace, and the Government of our beloved country.' It proceeds—'remember you are Christians, and must show patience in suffering and live peaceably with all men' (p. 281). Commenting on its expression of loyalty to the Throne and its conservative attitude towards democracy, these authors say that 'it is not surprising that some of the leading working-class reformers regarded the Methodists quite definitely as enemies.' In 1824 William Cobbett wrote that 'the bitterest foes of freedom in England have been and are—the Methodists' (p. 281).

'If we look into the life and teaching of this new religion,' declare these writers, 'we can see that the whole spirit of its mission was unfavourable to the democratic movement and the growth of the Trade Union spirit' (p. 282). Methodism taught patience, and resignation to industrial wrong. Trade-Unionism, impatience, and action against it. Methodism 'softened the sense of class, and soothed the grievances of the poor; it set up a rival to the ideal of civic freedom, it diverted energy from the class struggle' (p. 285). Now this is true enough. It would be easy, did they need it, to provide the writers with additional evidence of the kind they advance. But it must not be forgotten that the democratic movements of those days, destitute as they were of political power, were usually violent, if not seditious. Their leaders, too, were frequently anti-Christian. Methodism itself also had so long and so often been charged with secret disloyalty to Throne and Constitution that it was very sensitive on the subject. It instinctively shrank from supporting any criticism of those in authority or of masters—even when just. The pre-occupation of Methodism was with Evangelical Christianity and personal religion, and anything likely to weaken it or divert attention from it was to it anathema. These writers say that 'the Methodist Movement called not for citizens but saints.' Unfortunately it did call for citizens, but subservient citizens, not democrats. 'Saints' indeed were its peculiar care.

But it must not be thought that Methodism did nothing for the exploited and oppressed common people. It lifted many of them out of the Slough of Despond—for the Methodists grew rapidly in material prosperity, and that under a severe ethic of wealth from Wesley, heeded at the outset. But more than that, it gave to the democratic movement some of its leading personalities, who derived from Methodism that sense of right, that love of justice, and that feeling of pity and compassion, which, with religious conviction, turned some of them into never-to-be-forgotten social reformers. Others, long since forgotten, worked with equal devotion for freedom and justice.

These authors admit that the Methodists cannot be accused of

'ignoring man's duty to his neighbour.' No reader of Wesley's life or writings can justly accuse him of this! Social service played a considerable part in his apostolical activity. If he did not challenge the beginnings of the new industrial system as Wordsworth did, Wesley was a pioneer in popular education, secular and religious. Hannah Ball, of High Wycombe, and Sophia Cooke, co-worker with Raikes, were Methodists, and by 1785 a quarter of a million working-class children were in the new Sunday Schools, which, our authors admit, were of real value to the democratic movement. The Wesleys at Bolton provided the first unpaid teachers in them; and if in 1814 the Conference did forbid the teaching of writing—so useful to the workers then—the custom persisted long after, for it might be seen any Sunday up to 1876 in a Cheshire Sunday school. Then Wesley was a pioneer in providing good cheap literature for the people, people's banks and loan societies, work for the unemployed, medical aid, and legal help. Had his Christian ethic of wealth been accepted by the employing class, the horrors and wrongs of the Industrial Revolution would never have arisen. Nor were all his preachers socially blind. Thomas Taylor, in 1779, writes from York, 'There is but little trade in the Circuit, and where there is little trade there is seldom much increase in religion. The people are chiefly farmers, and, in general, in a great state of bondage to their wealthy landlords, to whom they are a kind of vassals, and in general dread them more abundantly than they do their Maker. Certainly they are some of the greatest slaves in England, for they labour very hard and live very poorly.'

Take the leaders of the Factory Acts Movement—Richard Oastler, Michael T. Sadler, M.P., Lord Shaftesbury, John Fielden, M.P., and John Rayner Stephens! It is not widely known or remembered that both Oastler and Sadler were cradled in Methodism, and both in early life served as local preachers. Lord Shaftesbury owed his spiritual life to a Methodist servant. John Fielden had been a Wesleyan Sunday-school teacher and Rayner Stephens a Wesleyan minister. Only men who 'made a conscience of what they did' could have secured the Factory Acts. Methodism gave them conscience. Rayner Stephens, who, by the way, was not 'expelled for attacking the factory system' (p. 279, note), but had to resign for addressing a Disestablishment Meeting, became a leading Chartist and social reformer. He was a Methodist to the bone. His father was a minister, President of the Conference in 1827. Our authors admit that the working men and women of the North owed much to his 'mobilizing rhetoric' (p. 18). In later years they welcomed their orator in tens of thousands back from the prison where he had suffered for their cause. His monument may still be seen at Stalybridge. Other great Chartists also owed their souls and their Christian principles to Methodism. William Lovett, one of the ablest and noblest, was brought up a Wesleyan. Thomas Cooper, the Chartist poet, had been a Wesleyan local preacher. Samuel Bamford, 'the Radical,' owed his inspiration and his equipment to

Methodism. The six 'Dorchester Martyrs' were Methodists, two of whom, George Loveless, of Tolpuddle, and his brother, were local preachers. Joseph Butterworth, M.P., the philanthropist, was a Wesleyan ! So the record is not wholly black.

More than that, it may be said that the moral dynamic of Methodism was fundamental in social value—none the less her own, if involuntary. It aroused the whole nation from spiritual slumber, quickened every faculty, and affected every realm of life. As Mr. Kirkman Gray says, 'The Methodist Revival was the first expression of the need to shake off prudence in morals and the slumber of dogma,' and if, with him, 'it is hard to see how progress is to be gained in democracy without those who popularize ideas and stimulate to action,' then Methodism performed that colossal task for democracy and the nation. Other kinds of contemporary social service might surely be left to and expected from the older Anglican and Dissenting Churches. One religious movement could not, in detail, do everything, though it might have been more liberal-minded. The fact remains that, though a brand-new religious revolution was unable to understand, still less morally control a brand-new industrial revolution contemporary with it, it did produce such ethical and spiritual forces, such Christian idealism and enthusiasm as have supplied democracy, and more than democracy, with a succession of passionate reformers.

Methodism did not prevent, probably could not have prevented, the evils of the Industrial Revolution. But it cannot be said wholly to have failed the people in their misery if it brought to masses of them inward peace and joy, strength for life and character, lofty hopes, a noble outlook, comfort, and fellowship. It filled many an otherwise drab, hopeless, helpless lot with life, light, and spiritual gladness. It helped such both to live and to die. It did more. In words with which the chapter we discuss concludes, 'by the life and energy and awakening that it brought to this oppressed society, it must, in spite of itself, have made many men better citizens, and some, even better rebels.' This is an admission of our case.

Methodism is again faced with an Industrial Revolution, and may fail to support democracy, not from excess of heavenly vision but from lack of it. It is quite possible that after the war, from high prices, inadequate wages, crushing taxation, the combination of great capitalists with the State, and their skill in organization, that our decimated and impoverished democracy may be again submerged, and cruelly exploited and oppressed. Methodism cannot ignore this contingency. She will, and not otherwise, recover her soul and her influence for the gospel, if she will boldly stand for justice to the workers, and 'play the man for our people, and for the cities of our God.'

S. E. KEEBLE.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Edited by James Hastings, D.D. Volume IX. Mundas-Phrygians. (T. & T. Clark. 32s. net.)

DR. HASTINGS is to be heartily congratulated upon the overcoming of the manifold difficulties which must have been encountered in the preparation of the ninth volume of the greatest of all his encyclopaedic undertakings. Most of the articles by foreign scholars are the work of Frenchmen, but Dr. August Dorner, of Königsberg, writes on *Obedience*; otherwise, Germany is represented by the Professor of Sanskrit at Tübingen and a Lutheran missionary.

The first composite article, on *Music*, extends to fifty-seven pages, and has sixteen sections. 'All worship should be congregational,' says Professor Westerby, 'except the anthem, which, as the "sermon of the choir," is an instrument for good.' The influence of the Wesleyan revival on Modern Hymnody is fully recognized; 'it brought about real congregational worship.' The energy and fervour of rhythm were, however, 'carried to excess in the florid repeating tunes of last century.' In many modern tunes, 'sentimentality, an element not necessarily weak or bad, has been overdone, probably as the result of the Mendelssohnian wave, the effect of which is not yet spent.'

Dr. Rufus M. Jones writes, with insight and charm, the Introduction to the article on *Mysticism*, and two of the sections included under the heading, 'Christian Mysticism,' namely those which deal respectively with such features of mystical experience as are found in the New Testament, and with the writings of Protestant mystics. 'The New Testament contains a very slender showing of mysticism in the technical sense. . . . No sacred "mystic way" is indicated, but all souls lie open-windowed to God, and may have a revelation of Him, "the eyes of the heart being enlightened."' Most illuminating is the comparison drawn between St. John and St. Paul: 'The influence of the Johannine writings on mysticism has been far greater than that of the writings of any other New Testament author, and yet the term "mystic" does not as properly belong to St. John as to St. Paul. St. John is primarily a theologian. . . . We do not find primarily in him an interpretation of experience, but rather a theological interpretation of Christ as "the Way."'

A lucid and comprehensive article on *Perfection (Christian)* is contributed by Dr. Frederic Platt. It is an historical as well as an expository treatment of this great theme. The main features of the Methodist doctrine are presented in well-balanced statements. 'The doctrine of a complete deliverance from all sin was regarded as the logical and experimental outcome of the proclamation of a free, full, present salvation as the gift of grace to every penitent sinner.' In the closing section, entitled, 'Present-day Tendencies,' Dr. Platt acknowledges defects which, 'in practice,' have been exhibited by most theories of Christian perfection, especially 'an exaggerated individualism and a preference for the unsocial habit of life.' He shows that 'the tenor of New Testament teaching is that the perfection of the individual Christian is not something apart from his relation to the Christian community, but is realized in it and through it. . . . Christian perfection, therefore, is the full self-realization of the individual in society; the perfection of these is reciprocal; Christlikeness is their common goal.'

Both as regards the intrinsic value of its articles, the choice of authors, and the admirable editing, this volume is no whit behind any of its predecessors.

The Rise of the Christian Religion. By C. F. Nolloth, D.Litt. (Macmillan, 12s. net.)

Dr. Nolloth's previous work on the Person of Christ prepared his readers for an interesting sequel. It may be questioned, however, whether the author has been wise in attempting to cover so much ground as he does within the scope of the present volume. He deals with the Christian Sources for his study, incidentally discussing most of the questions of New Testament criticism; five chapters are occupied with the *Præparatio Evangelica*, including a study of Philo and of Greek and Roman Religion. He writes a short life of Christ, dealing not only with the miracles of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection, but also with the theological doctrine of 'The Two Natures.' He discusses John the Baptist, Jewish Sects, The Worship and Priesthood of the Jewish Temple, the Method and Purpose of our Lord, and the theological significance of His Death, Resurrection, and Ascension. Even then the author has but made a start, for he begins afresh with Pentecost, the Apostolic Church, the place and function of the Sacraments, with essays by the way on the doctrinal teaching of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John. And at the close the author finds room for a treatise on early Christianity and ethics, followed by another on the close of the Apostolic Age.

It is clear that such an extensive survey cannot be expected to deal thoroughly with any one of its very various themes. Further, the impression left upon the mind is not that of one organic whole. All the topics treated are germane to the one theme, the rise of the Christian religion, but it requires no little artistic skill to keep each in its due place and proportion, and make all contribute to one

well-composed, impressive picture. In this difficult task Dr. Nolloth cannot be said to have succeeded. His book, however, contains a large amount of information upon its great subject. The writer is a scholar, well-read, broad-minded, and possessed of judgement and skill. His standpoint is that of an intelligent theologian, well acquainted with current objections raised against orthodox Christianity, but bent upon proving that 'the Christian religion, as it reached, with the end of the first century, the close of its formative period, was on the whole what its Founder intended it to be.' Dr. Nolloth's treatment of his subject is frank, candid, and reasonable, and though decidedly apologetic he is neither one-sided nor narrow. The very comprehensiveness of his book will make it specially suitable for readers who do not desire a minute treatment of the many controversial subjects mentioned above, but rather a general survey of all by a scholar at once competent and devout. This they will find in Dr. Nolloth's 'Study of Origins,' and the book is as handsomely presented by the publishers as it is pleasant in itself to read.

1. *The Pauline Idea of Faith in its relation to Jewish and Hellenistic Religion.* By W. H. P. Hatch, Ph.D., D.D. (H. Milford. 4s. 6d. net.)

2. *Harvard Theological Studies. III. Ephod and Ark. A Study in the Records and Religion of the Ancient Hebrews.* By William R. Arnold. (H. Milford. \$1.50 net.)

1. This is the second of the Harvard Theological Studies. Dr. Hatch is Professor of the Language and Literature of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary, New York. He reaches the conclusion that trust in Jahveh was the basic element in Hebrew and Jewish piety. In Paul faith is at once belief, trust, and loyalty. He imparted to it a mystical character which it never had on Palestinian soil, and made it fundamental in religion and ethics. In the Graeco-Roman world religion took the form of State religions sanctioned by tradition and custom, and of mystery cults. 'The ideal of the initiate was identification with the deity, whereas in Paul it is control by Christ or the Spirit and divinization without identification or fusion with Christ.' Dr. Hatch believes that Paul thought of baptism and the Lord's Supper in a Sacramental way, but thinks it in the highest degree inaccurate and misleading to call Pauline Christianity a mystery religion. It is faith that gives to the Pauline type of Christianity its distinctive and valuable character. These positions are worked out in a way that throws new light on St. Paul's contribution to religious life and character.

2. The writer of this Study is Hitchcock Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. He regards the present state of knowledge and critical opinion regarding both the ephod and the ark of our Old Testament as extremely unsatisfactory. He rejects the statements in Deut. x. 1-5, and 1 Kings viii. 9, 21, as unhis-

torical, yet the ark cannot be dismissed as imaginary. 'For the most ancient historical records in the Old Testament bear unimpeachable witness to the existence of such an object at the very beginning of the Israelitish monarchy.' Arōn is plain Hebrew for box. It is used for Joseph's coffin, and the collection-box in the Temple. Prof. Arnold gives various critical theories as to the contents of the ark and as to the nature of the ephod, and carefully discusses the passages in which the words occur.

Kingswood Sermons. By W. P. Workman, M.A., B.Sc. (C. H. Kelly. 3s. 6d. net.)

This is a volume of real distinction. It has all the finest qualities of the best Methodist preaching. By it we should be perfectly willing that the preaching of our Church should be judged. In it there is revealed a serious man dealing with serious things in a serious way. He does not tarry in the environs of a great theme, but dwells at its very heart. To him great things matter, they are appraised at their proper worth, and they are set out in a great and noble way. The facts of religion and of life are so transcendent that they create their own significance and their own urgency. And so while there is rare scholarship and fine exposition, there are urgent pleas and peremptory claims, there is appeal and passion, and an obvious desire that those who hear shall hear indeed. It would be difficult to put the hand upon a volume of modern sermons that reveals more serious thinking, more noble exposition, more sincere pleading, than is contained in this book. The profit of reading does but suggest what would have been the profit of hearing, and one is thankful for so noble a monument of the Methodist pulpit at its very best. Now may the world assuredly know what true Methodist preaching really is.

The Will to Freedom, or The Gospel of Nietzsche and the Gospel of Christ. By John Neville Figgis, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 6s. net.)

Dr. Figgis delivered the Bross Lectures in May, 1915. His interest in Nietzsche was not caused by the war, and he sets himself to give some notion of what this poet-prophet wanted, and to see in the light of his criticism how it stands with Christianity as a house of life for men. The task is far from easy, because Nietzsche made a virtue of inconsistency. But his passion, his eloquence, his sense of beauty, give him a spell which it is hard to resist. No thinker was ever more personal. Dr. Figgis gives the facts of his life in his first lecture. The second seeks to explain his gospel. He heralds it with the cry, 'Repent ye of your virtues, for the kingdom of earth is at hand.' He believes that man is in evil case and must be lifted to a higher state by raising the ruling class into a higher order of life, a new society. 'The *Will to Power* is the expression of life.

The yea-saying to life, *i.e.*, to all reality and not merely to a part of it is the fundamental maxim of Nietzsche.' The third lecture deals with his attitude to Christianity. He said, 'The Christian concept of God, God as God of the sick, God as cobweb spinner, God as Spirit—is one of the most corrupt concepts of God ever arrived at on earth.' His account was based upon an essential misconception. He identified the pessimistic ethic of Schopenhauer with the ideals of Christianity. In dealing with 'The Danger and Significance of Nietzsche,' Dr. Figgis puts first the danger of an unbridled individualism. Then comes the concentration of attention on Power. The fact is that 'Nietzsche is a good tonic, but a bad food.' This criticism makes a fitting close to a remarkable study.

The Story of St. Paul's Life and Letters. By J. Paterson-Smyth, Litt.D. (Sampson Low, Marston & Co. 8s. 6d. net.)

Dr. Paterson-Smyth has for several years treated his Sunday morning congregation in Montreal as a great Bible-class. This book on St. Paul is one of his lecture-series. He shows that the record is incomplete. It begins in his mature manhood at the martyrdom of St. Stephen, and we have no record of the end of his course. Not one of the five scourgings or the three shipwrecks of 2 Cor. xi. finds place in the history, but the letters fill up many gaps in St. Luke's diary, and they not only give additional facts, but do much towards giving us the man himself. Some useful hints as to methods of studying the life of St. Paul are given. Fully to understand St. Paul's life we need to understand his world. A brief but well-packed chapter is given to this. Then the stages of the Apostle's history are passed in review in a most instructive and picturesque way. It is a vivid book which gives a clear view of the letters and of the labours of St. Paul. We hope it may have a great circulation, and be widely used for Bible-classes.

First and Last Things. A Confession of Faith and Rule of a Life. By H. G. Wells. Revised and Enlarged Edition. (Cassell & Co. 6s. net.)

It is nearly ten years since this book first appeared. Since then Mr. Wells says he has 'gone on very considerably.' In 1908 he wrote of 'that collective mind' which must 'ultimately direct the evolution of our specific being.' To-day he writes boldly of God, the ruling mind of the race, and the Kingdom of God unifying mankind. He has now revised Book I. (Metaphysics), and added to it; in Book II. (Beliefs) we regret to find that his 'Criticism of Christianity' (Section 18) is unaltered though a final section has been added, 'The Captain of Mankind.' In this he affirms his latest belief that 'mankind is a great adventurer, and that we are being led in fact and not in metaphor to ever greater efforts and achievements by the spirit of our race, by God, the invisible King of our hearts and lives.'

Theosophy and Christianity. By M. Carta Sturge (S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. net.)

This little book is divided into two parts. In the first the system of Theosophy as known and practised in Europe and America is expounded. In India it takes something of the colouring of Buddhism and other Eastern religions. Its doctrines of the seven-fold constitution of man, of re-incarnation, and the law of Karma are described. The next re-incarnation depends on the Karma which an individual has made for himself in the life just past or brought over, as yet unworked out, for previous lives. The second part of the volume contrasts Theosophy in its religious aspect with Christianity. The subject is well handled in this valuable survey.

Life and Liberty. By the Rev. W. Temple. (Macmillan & Co. 3d.) Mr. Temple desires to win for the Church of England the Liberty which he believes to be essential to fullness of Life. He dwells on the need for self-government in regard to endowments and administration, and considers various ways of advance. His own wish is to see the scheme proposed by the Archbishops put in operation. This would give the Church power to legislate on all matters affecting the Church, subject to Parliamentary Veto.—*Human Immortality.* By William James. (Dent & Sons. 1s. net.) This is an attractive reprint of Prof. James's *Ingersoll Lecture*, first published in 1908. He sets himself to show that immortality is not incompatible with the brain-function theory of our present mundane consciousness. It is a valuable argument, and it is very lucidly put.—*The Cult of the Reserved Sacrament.* By the Rev. F. J. Badcock, M.A. (7 Dean's Yard. 3d. net.) Mr. Badcock points out that the Early Church 'knew of no use of the consecrated species' apart from communion, nor do the Churches of the East to-day, and the adoration of our Lord in connexion with the reserved sacrament lacks the note both of external and internal catholicity. We regret to notice Mr. Badcock's reference to the Sacrament in Dissenting churches as lacking Scriptural warrant as much as the cult of the reserved Sacrament, but with that unfortunate exception his argument is freshly put and suggestive.—*God in Everything.* (Kelly. 5d. net, interleaved.) Miriam Gray tells in a set of letters how God has become absolutely real to her, so that she is more at home with Him than with one in the world. A vital subject is brought home in a most impressive and attractive way.—*Studies in St. Mark* (I.), by F. R. and W. R. Maltby, also belongs to the *Manuals of Fellowship*. It is an illuminating study, with a vigorous new translation and a stimulating questionnaire.—*Why God does not stop the War.* By Robertson Ballard. (Kelly. 4d. net.) Mr. Ballard suggests certain lines along which a solution of the problem is found, and presses home another question on the nation, 'Do we take steps to see whether our own morality is such as to deserve victory?'

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Calendar of State Papers relating to English Affairs preserved principally at Rome in the Vatican Archives and Library. Vol. I. Elizabeth, 1551-1571. Edited by J. M. Rigg. (Wyman & Sons. 15s.)

THE late Mr. W. H. Bliss made a valuable series of transcripts of documents at Rome illustrative of the relations between England, Scotland, and Ireland, on the one hand, and the Holy See and the Continental Powers, Catholic and Protestant, on the other, during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Mr. J. M. Rigg has carefully collated these transcripts with the originals at the Vatican, and has supplemented them with some new matter. He has also supplied a Preface of some sixty pages bringing out the historical significance of the papers, and their relation to the events of the reign. Fra Paolo Sarpi relates with much detail in his *History of the Council of Trent*, that Queen Elizabeth made overtures to Paul IV for reconciliation with the Holy See, but that these were summarily rejected on the grounds of her illegitimacy. The second extract from the Papal Diary, printed in this volume, shows that the French were instant with the Pope that he should declare Elizabeth 'illegitimate, and, as it were, of incestuous birth, and consequently incapable of succeeding to the throne, whereby they pretend that the crown would belong to the Queen of Scotland.' It is evident, however, from a letter of her ambassador, Sir Edward Carne, that the Pope had no intention whatever of doing this. He had to reckon with Philip of Spain, who was a suitor for Elizabeth's hand. The Catholic world at large was far from regarding Elizabeth's alleged illegitimacy as a serious obstacle to matrimony, as is evident from the Austrian and French proposals for her hand. The Pope wrote to Elizabeth on June 1, 1562: 'If the Queen of England shall be minded to return to Holy Mother Church, she has yet time; if not, God will appoint her a time in His good pleasure.' Mary Queen of Scots fills a large place in the correspondence. John Leslie, the Scottish Ambassador in England, writes in 1570 to the Scottish Ambassador in France: 'You can assure the Cardinal of Lorraine, and all there who are our friends, that so great is the constancy of our mistress in religion that she will rather part with her crown and her life together than with her faith; and that she has never listened to a word of naught that is contrary to the Catholic religion, or of any proposal of marriage save that of which I wrote to you this winter with the Duke of Norfolk.' A news letter of that time says, 'The Catholics are very strong in the border and greatly superior to the heretics, so that it is hoped they will soon be masters of all Scotland.' A letter to Philip describes an affair

between his fleet and the corsairs off Dover, and closes with the words, 'The world be witness that it is His Majesty's fleet that keeps the sea safe, and open to all nations.' When the Duke of Norfolk was put into the Tower a letter complains, 'This will be the ruin of the goodliest enterprise that one could wish for, whereat great is His Majesty's vexation, and my grief extreme.' The volume has been edited with the utmost care, and there is not a page of it which does not throw light on the tangled diplomacy of the time.

Greater Italy. By William Kay Wallace, M.A. (Constable & Co. 10s. 6d. net.)

MR. WALLACE is an American, has been with the Italian armies at different periods during this war, and has learned the precise efficiency, the calm demeanour, the stern restraint of officers and men in the face of grave danger. That has given him an insight into the new Italy 'of dynamic, resourceful energy, of deep courage, of buoyant, optimistic vitality.' He seeks to trace the rise of the Kingdom of Italy and its influences in the affairs of the world during the past three decades. The first chapter shows how Napoleon III. invited Cavour to Plombières in July, 1858, and listened to his scheme for achieving Italian unity. The Italians were disappointed with the peace of Villafranca, but the flame of nationalism had spread through the peninsula, and steady progress was made, till in 1870 the Italian forces entered Rome. Nationalism, Irredentism, and Futurism were the formative forces which brought about the unification of Italy, and to these Mr. Wallace gives his second chapter. He describes the rule of Crispi and the period of retrenchment which followed his overthrow. For eleven years Giolitti was dictator. He redressed labour grievances, satisfied the capitalist demand for privileges and protection; held sway over landowners and farmers by maintaining the customs duties on wheat. He raised the salaries of the clergy, and encouraged the Church to extend its influence in the schools. His maxim was to grant every demand made by public opinion. That forced him into the Libyan war, but he took full credit for its victorious issue. He renewed the Triple Alliance, and affirmed the importance of Italy in European affairs. He retired to private life in March, 1914. In May, 1915, he endeavoured to oppose the determination of the nation to take its part in the Great War, but was swept aside by the mighty current of public opinion. Mr. Wallace gives special attention to the relations between the Vatican and the Quirinal. During the first year of Italy's participation in the war the Vatican was able to exercise great influence. 'The lack of cohesion of public opinion regarding the war, the efforts made to prevent Italy from putting forth her full strength, and above all the undisguised sympathy which numbers of Italians, belonging to 'black' circles at Rome, professed for the Central Empires, were a direct outcome of Vatican influences.' But the patriotism of the Italian Catholics triumphed, and the neutrality

of the Italian-born Pontiff is deemed unpatriotic. The patent efforts of the Papacy to frustrate the plans of the Quirinal has wounded the sensibilities of the majority of Italians, 'while even loyal Catholics cannot forgive the Pope the fact that in the face of the grave moral crisis, brought about by the outbreak of the war, the head of the Catholic Church, when summoned to speak, remained silent, purposely avoided to commit himself, and preferred the cautious, hollow phraseology of the diplomatist to that of a shepherd of the people.' Since this chapter was written Mr. Wallace has learnt that the Vatican is making serious efforts to conciliate the Allies. The Pope has 'rid himself of certain pro-German personages of his entourage, and is endeavouring to show himself docile and conciliatory towards France.' The last chapter, 'Italy at War,' shows that superhuman efforts had to be made by her troops in the first stages of the conflict. Italy is fighting for the greatness of her national soul, and as a champion of the right of nationhood. Mr. Wallace's statements need revision here and there, but his book gives a view of Italy's recent history and her part in this war which is of real value and interest.

Diaz. By David Hannay. (Constable & Co. 6s. net.)

Diaz deserves his place among the 'Makers of the Nineteenth Century,' though his achievements as a statesman appear to have had only a passing value. He brought Mexico to a 'more respectable prominence and to greater prosperity than it had enjoyed since its original conquest by the Spaniards.' For thirty-three years he was in his one corner of the world a true maker of the nineteenth century. Mr. Hannay gives a most interesting account of his early life. He was the son of a poor and illiterate but diligent porter or workman who bought a piece of ground which he planted with maguey, the aloe from which the native liquor pulque is tapped. To sell this he opened a wayside inn and was also farrier and veterinary surgeon. Porfirio was the sixth child and eldest surviving son. His father died when he was about three years old, and the family had a hard struggle with sheer hunger. Porfirio managed to get some education as a boy, and later was placed in a seminary with a view to the priesthood. But he refused to take orders, and studied for the law. Then he took to arms, and won the confidence of the party of Juarez by communicating important information to Don Marcos Pérez, then imprisoned in a tower of the convent of San Domingo. With the help of his younger brother he scaled the walls, and, evading the sentries, managed to hold conversation with Pérez through the prison window. He steadily gained a reputation in the Republican army, and was put in charge of the Army of the East. He led his force of 2,800 safely across Central Mexico, which was guarded by an army of 30,000 under the French, and organized the three southern provinces placed under his command to take an active part in the war. A clever defeat inflicted on the

Imperialist forces at Miahuatlan raised him to the first rank among the Republican leaders. The fact that twenty-two Mexican officers whom he captured were shot shows that he was 'not wholly untouched by the element of pure savagery in which he was born and brought up.' Compared with other Mexican leaders, however, he was humane. He took Mexico on June 20, 1867, the day after the execution of Maximilian at Querétaro. Then he became a politician. Mr. Hannay says he was remarkably well put together, and had a robust constitution which bore well the strain of the poverty and hardship in which the first forty years of his life were spent. When he became President his life was simple as a hermit's. He was abstemious in food and drink, never went to bullfights and seldom to theatres. He has no need to fear comparison with any of the Spanish-American rulers. He became President in 1876, and at the end of his term in 1880 became Minister of Public Works. In 1884 he was re-elected, and held office till 1911, when he resigned and retired to Europe.

He lived modestly in a private house, and was accessible to all sorts and conditions of men. The impecunious condition of the Treasury led him to reduce his own salary from \$25,000 to \$15,000. Other salaries had to be reduced, but he took care that they should be paid regularly. 'In no other Spanish-American State has a ruler been able to increase the revenue by the growth of industry, and to secure a succession of real surpluses.' The surplus in 1906-7 was \$29,209,481. Little is known of the lady whom he married during the siege of Mexico, but in 1882 he made a very happy second marriage with a Creole lady of good education, who would have been at home in any European society. Diaz did not introduce a great work of social reform among the Indian population. For that indeed he had no proper staff. He strove to keep good order and promote material well-being. He kept 'an incurable anarchy within bounds for an unprecedented number of years,' and where he failed to secure permanent order it was probably because he had not to his hand the elements with which more could be done.

Studies in English Franciscan History. By A. G. Little, M.A. (Longmans & Co. 8s. 6d. net.)

These are the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1916. The subjects of the six lectures are The Observance of the Vow of Poverty; Failure of Mendicancy; Privilege: Relation of the Friars and Monks and Parish Priests; Popular Preaching: The Fasciculum Morum; The Education of the Clergy: The Works of Friar John of Wales; and the Franciscan School of Oxford: Grosseteste and Roger Bacon. Several of the friars who were instrumental in founding the English Province had been in close personal touch with St. Francis. Lawrence of Beauvais often talked with him. Francis gave him his tunic and sent him to England, 'gladdened with a most sweet blessing.' Martin de Barton also enjoyed the friendship

of the Founder. At first the friars in England revelled in poverty. For the first three centuries indeed they depended, with few exceptions, on voluntary alms of a more or less casual nature. When the friars used their influence in 1256 to protect the Jews who were accused of crucifying a boy at Lincoln, the common people withheld their alms. If the evidence is to be trusted they were 'willing to fling themselves against the fiercest prejudices and passions of their time, and to incur hunger, misrepresentation, and obloquy for the sake of justice and mercy.' When the standard of living rose the friars were forced to devote a disproportionate amount of time and energy to the support of themselves and their establishments, so that their general tone was lowered and their usefulness impaired. The friars broke the vow of poverty in various ways. Some received small bequests, some held private property. The friars needed all they could get, and in spite of all efforts their houses became ruinous and debts accumulated. The enemies of the Franciscans accused them of neglecting out-of-the-way villages and preferring to preach in places where they were assured of a good dinner. But they knew the difficulties, sorrows, and temptations of the people, and were not afraid to castigate vice and insist on the performance of duties. 'The teaching, on the whole, with some marked exceptions, was bracing and stimulating.' The period of their intense spiritual fervour was very short. It was followed by a period of intense intellectual activity. But their history leaves a feeling of keen disappointment enhanced by the beauty of their ideal and the greatness of their achievement at certain times. The lectures are furnished with ample reference to authorities, and are very full of illuminating detail.

History of Serbia. By Harold W. V. Temperley. (Bell & Sons. 10s. 6d. net.)

Capt. Temperley's book is the fruit of some years of travel and study in the Near East. He intended to give the story of Serbia from the revival of her independence in 1833 down to the period just before the Balkan War of 1912. It became manifest, however, that modern Serbian history would not be intelligible without reference to its splendid and tragic past. The result is a volume that was greatly needed, and which appears at an opportune moment. Capt. Temperley has found that to grapple with the history of even the Southern or Jugo-Slavs is like threading a labyrinth. The only method that offers a real chance of success is to trace the fortunes of a specific race. The history of the Serbians of Serbia and Montenegro has been chosen because 'these lands are the core of the rugged stock which has preserved or achieved freedom, and thus become a hope and a beacon to the Slavs enslaved under other rulers or imprisoned in other lands.' The physical characteristics of the block of territory are described. Serbia and Montenegro seemed too small to awaken Slav hopes, and the Austrian Jugo-Slavs dreamed of liberty under

Austria. Her annexation of Bosnia in 1908 turned their feeling towards Serbia, and when she defied Austria, crushed Turkey, and humbled Bulgaria all eyes were drawn upon her. The coming of the Slavs from the north of the Black Sea in the middle of the sixth century is described, and the rise of the kingdoms of Zeta and Rashka, the mediaeval equivalents of Montenegro and Serbia proper. The Nemanyid dynasty was the greatest of the Serbian royal houses. Stephen (1196-1228) was the first to acquire the title and status of King. The greatest of his successors was Stephen Dushan. He was a genius who carried out his plans with rare daring and energy. His death in 1355 broke up his splendid empire into fragments, and in 1389, at Kossovo, the Serbian language, civilization, nationality, and religion were lost in battle with the Turk. The last great Serbian fortress fell in 1459, and the Turkish occupation lasted till 1739. The story is brought down to our own times with a wealth of interesting detail. The later chapters, dealing with Austro-Hungarian influence and the Russophile period, are of special importance. No race has shown a more heroic desire for freedom. The Serbians are intensely national when their sympathies are enlisted. They are essentially warlike, but they have also imagination enough to realize the great political dangers and the supreme political opportunity which peace is likely to offer. 'Once the strength and ardour of the peasant is directed in the right channels by the intellectual leaders of Serbia, there is no doubt as to the result.' They chose the path of national independence, though it was beset with perils, and they have abundantly earned their right to be a nation. Captain Temperley's volume gives important extracts from unpublished documents, and has a full bibliography and detailed maps printed in colour.

The Manufacture of Historical Material. By J. W. Jeudine, LL.B. (Williams & Norgate. 6s. net.)

In spite of the fact that it supplies the reader with some useful information, at times presented in a very interesting form, Mr. Jeudine's book is on the whole a little disappointing. The ground actually covered is much narrower than the title would suggest; for the book itself is concerned with British History only, and but a limited period of that. The author's subject-matter is portioned out for treatment under four heads. The first part treats of oral tradition and the poet-lawyer historian, the principal topic discussed being the Brehon laws of Ireland. The second part is concerned with the Year Books and their contents; this part is, perhaps, the most interestingly treated of the four, and is instructive. The third part discusses the reduction into writing of tradition and customary law; this, however, is done in a manner which leaves much to be desired, and is more open to criticism than, perhaps, any other portion of the volume. We are all familiar with the time-honoured definition of an archdeacon as one who performs archidiaconal

functions; Mr. Jeudine is, however, more precise, and defines the said venerable gentleman as the man of business of a monastery—the steward or the bailiff perchance! As between these two definitions one is inclined to say that the old is better. It may, indeed, transgress the rules for definition as laid down by formal logic, and is not very illuminating, but it is at any rate materially correct, whereas the new definition is distinctly misleading. All mediaeval clerics were not of necessity monks; it were well that our author should bear this in mind. The fourth and last part is practical, and contains some useful hints as to the use of historical material.

My Reminiscences. By Sir Rabindranath Tagore. With Illustrations. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d. net.)

These reminiscences were written in Sir Rabindranath Tagore's fiftieth year, before he started on his voyage to Europe and to America in 1912. The translator says that these memory pictures give 'a connected history of his inner life and of the varying forms in which his growing self found successive expression up to the point at which both his soul and poetry attained maturity.' They begin with a dainty paper on the studio within us where pictures are painted on memory's canvas. 'Thus, over Life's outward aspect passed the series of events, and within is being painted a set of pictures. The two correspond, but are not one.' Sir Rabindranath has been prying into the picture-chamber, and offers his memory pictures as literary material. First we see three Indian boys, of whom he was youngest, being brought up together. The old cashier of the family was a great wit and used to rattle off a doggerel ballad for the boy's delectation with a picture of the world-charming bride that he was to win. The boys were under the rule of servants, whose cuffings and boxings stand out in his memory. School life and home tuition are described with many graphic details. Poetry was in the boy's nature, but when he had to recite some of his verses most of his schoolfellows were certain that they were not his own composition. He gives an attractive account of his father, who took him with him to the Himalayas, left the little cash-box in his charge and allowed him to wander freely about. The boy loved to think and brood over natural scenery more than to study. He describes the change when he was old enough to pass from the servants' quarters to his proper place in the inner apartments. It was the height of his ambition to become a poet, and to stop that poetic adventure was a sheer impossibility. He came to England at seventeen to study for the bar, but various difficulties turned him aside from that plan of life. He gives a pleasant account of the kindness of Dr. Scott and his family when he stayed with them at University College, and an amusing account of the widow of an Anglo-Indian official from whom he suffered many things. The honest beggar at Tunbridge Wells and the honest porter are a couple of happy sketches, and the description of the way in which he gained the mastery of his own powers is very interesting.

BOOKS ON THE WAR

Towards the Goal. By Mrs. Humphry Ward (John Murray. 2s. 6d. net.)

THIS is practically a continuation of *England's Effort*, showing how much further England has marched since the Spring of last year. The first volume was written at the suggestion of Mr. Roosevelt, and the ten letters of the second are addressed to him. In an Introduction he says Mrs. Ward 'writes nobly on a noble theme.' England has reached a height of achievement loftier than she attained in the struggle with Napoleon. 'Never has Great Britain been put to such a test. Never since the spacious days of Elizabeth has she been in such danger.' Mrs. Ward begins with the Navy, whose *personnel* was 140,000 at the beginning of the war. Last year it reached 300,000, and is now 400,000. She visited our Headquarters in France, saw tanks taking their morning exercise, and learnt much about the training of an army. In August, 1914, officers had to be found for half a million men in a single month. The chief source of supply was the Officers' Training Corps at the Universities and Public Schools which 'we owe to the divination, the patience, the hard work of Lord Haldane.' The O.T.C.'s supplied 20,000 potential officers. The school for officers teaches men to set wit against wit. The tricks of German snipers are explained, so that instead of the heavy toll of officers' lives, out of fifteen battalions only nine men were killed by snipers in three months. Mrs. Ward's stories of Varedde, Senlis and Gerbéviller are heart-rending, and show that, as Mr. Roosevelt puts it, 'A Prussianized world would be as intolerable as a world ruled over by Attila or by Timur the Lame.' Mrs. Ward feels that 'the goal is growing slowly but steadily nearer, that ultimate victory is certain, and with victory, the dawning of a better day for Europe.' It is an inspiration to read such a book.

Letters of a Soldier, 1914-1915. Authorized translation by V. M. (Constable & Co. 4s. 6d. net.)

The writer of these letters was a young French artist who was at the front from September, 1914, till the beginning of April, 1915, when he was reported missing in one of the battles of the Argonne. In a beautiful preface M. André Chevrillon says, 'It is singularly touching to find in the spiritual, grave, and religious temper of these letters an affinity to the spirit of many others written from the front. In the daily sight of death 'these boys seem to have faced the things of eternity with a deeper insight and a keener feeling.' He left school

for the studio at the age of thirteen, and was twenty-eight when the last letter was sent to his mother. With two or three exceptions they are all addressed to her. They are the outpouring of his heart, and reveal, as Mr. Clutton-Brock puts it in his Introduction, 'a new type of soldier, a new type of hero, almost a new type of man.' He is not a Catholic. 'He could not be acclaimed by any eager bishop as a lost sheep returning repentant to the fold; but he is not lost, nor is the Universe to him anything but a home and the dear city of God even in the trenches.' He tells his mother that 'the great stay which supports the men is a profound, vague feeling of brotherhood which turns all hearts towards those who are fighting. Each one feels that the slight discomfort which he endures is only a feeble tribute to the frightful expense of all energy and all devotedness at the front.' He feels that 'it would be shameful to think for one instant of holding back when the race demands the sacrifice. My only part is to carry an undefiled conscience as far as my feet may lead.' To him the war 'will have stirred all the good in humanity.' 'It needed this horror to make known how filial and profound are the ties which bind me to my country.' He assures his mother that up till now 'I have raised my soul to a height where events have had no empire over it.' 'I can say that God has been within me as I am within God, and I make firm resolves always to feel such a communion.' Devotion to the social ideal of brotherhood sustains him. 'Oh, what a magnificent example is to be found in Jesus and in the poor!' If he returned from the war he knew it would be 'with a soul formed and enriched.'

A Soldier's Pilgrimage. By Ernest Psichari. (Andrew Melrose. 5s. net.)

Lieut. Psichari was Renan's grandson. He was killed at Charleroi on August 22, 1914, but his literary work had already been crowned by the French Academy, and during three years' service in Mauretania he had changed his views as to religion, and on his return became a devoted Roman Catholic. This book, which he called *Le Voyage du Centurion*, won an important prize from the Academy. Maxence, the chief figure of the story, has known nothing of France but 'vice and misery.' He goes to his command in Africa with a sensation of relief that he was rid of the country which he hated. Then the desert enfolds him and contemplation nurses him back to mental health. He feels himself to be the envoy of a power that has reconquered the lands from the Crescent of Islam, and carries on her shoulders the heavy Cross of Jesus Christ. The hunger of God for the love of man comes home to the French soldier, and he surrenders himself to Christ. Psichari is himself Maxence, and it is one of the revenges of religion to see Renan's grandson glorying in the Gospels. There he sees Jesus as 'the fulfilment of all that is human and all that is Divine; in Him man and God meet, and this unique meeting has generated the spark of Charity. For, without Jesus—that

is to say, without a Mediator there can be no movement on the part of man towards God, and, therefore, no Charity.' Every reader will agree with M. Bourget in his Introduction that this is a very beautiful book. It is the story of a soul led back to Christ, subdued and enthralled by its Saviour and Lord.

L. of C. (Lines of Communication). By Captain James E. Agate. (Constable & Co. 6s. net.)

Captain Agate's letters as a temporary officer in the Army Service Corps are very entertaining. About a third of them originally appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*. They begin with an officer's training, and the problems that beset the tyro are perplexing enough, though the Captain can afford to laugh over them. By and by the army lays its spell on the subaltern, and his gifts in managing his men comes out. 'The detachment consists of labourers, cabmen and cab-washers, with an occasional window-cleaner or bricklayer. They are all equally willing, good-natured, devoid of guile and irreclaimable. In a word they are just human.' Captain Agate's triumph was won when he had to deal with fifty drivers, 'ill-favoured, shiftless, brow-beaten, sullen ne'er-do-weels.' He shepherds this flock of black sheep in a delightful fashion of his own. The chapter, 'My Friends in the Ranks' is full of vivid little sketches. The soldier servant has his chapter, and Captain Agate wonders how, when it is all over, he will ever manage to get up in the morning 'without an encouraging cup of tea, an early paper, shaving water enticingly to hand, and a voice suggesting in an uncompromising Scotch accent that "it'll be juist about the noo you'll be getting up, sorr."' He feels that he will be lost without that friendly shadow pursuing him. The lighter side of leaves and amusements is well represented, and the drudgery of providing food for the men. There is much fun in the letters, and many a literary touch that reveals the reader and scholar.

The Immortal Gamble and the Part Played in It by H.M.S. 'Cornwallis.' By A. L. Steward, Acting Commander, R.N., and the Rev. C. J. Peshall, Chaplain, R.N. (A. & C. Black. 6s. net.)

H.M.S. *Cornwallis* played her part in the immortal gamble of the Dardanelles longer than any other battleship. From her fore-turret the first shot of the first day's long range bombardment of the outer forts was fired. She was the last ship to leave Suvla Bay after the masterly evacuation. On January 9, 1917, she was sunk by an enemy torpedo in the Mediterranean. The story of a strenuous year is given in this graphic and sometimes heart-rending volume. Captain Davidson saw that the vital principle on which to work was constant movement. 'If we were at rest when the Turks began shelling, we at once put on speed, and our failure to be hit more than three times is due to the consistent following out of this rule.' The

Cornwallis found her way abroad at the end of January, 1915. No one knew her destination save the captain, and he did not tell. At last they knew that they were part of the squadron intended to force the Dardanelles. Had the Straits been ten miles wider they would have done it, but they were destined to fail, though the gamble is rightly described as immortal. The writers are not free to tell all they know, but it is evident from a few phrases that they see where the fatal blunders were made. Their record is an amazing tribute to the courage and disinterestedness of sailors and soldiers. The naval gunnery was splendid, and the feats of mine-sweepers, submarines, and torpedo-boat destroyers stir one's blood. The tremendous episode of the Great Landing on April 25, 1915, is described by various personal narratives. The losses were appalling. Every one did his utmost for the wounded, and it was remarkable how quickly they recovered from shock in the great warmth below decks, 'it seemed to counteract the collapse, which was normally expected, and the improvement in their condition in a few hours was extremely marked.' The illustrations are specially good, and the book makes us prouder than ever of the men who took part in this ill-starred expedition.

Intimate Prussia. By A. Raymond. (Black. 5s. net.)

Mr. Raymond's book opens with an 'Apology,' which describes an English student who had studied at Heidelberg, Halle, and Leipzig, and found his way to Berlin looking for 'the Soul of Germany.' The Berlin Prussian, however, was a mixture of crude imitations which covered his real nature. He set off for Königsberg to discover the real Prussian, and lodged in the house of a railway-porter, where he was able to watch the daily life of the family. His book depicts faithfully and accurately the doings, thoughts, and ideals of a Prussian household. Marriage bulks largely in it. The youngest daughter of the porter was a bright and clever girl, but her mother stoutly refused to have her trained as a teacher. Marriage was the only vocation for a woman. Frau Meyer is a model housewife, and her daughters both fulfil her highest ambitions. Student life, balls, and picnics are cleverly described in this lively volume. The harsh punishments meted out to boys and girls are revolting, and one lad commits suicide on the eve of an examination that he dreads. A ruthless system has formed 'a hard and highly polished shell upon a core of receptive but still rather crude mediaeval barbarism.'

The Re-birth of Russia. By Isaac F. Marcossou. (John Lanc. 3s. 6d. net.)

Mr. Marcossou is an American journalist who was among the first to reach Petrograd after the Revolution. He found the capital delirious with freedom and saw 'the fruits and the follies of the new liberty.' Since the collapse of the Czar's promise of a real Constitu-

tion in 1905 the unrest had been growing. The Constitution wrested from the unwilling powers was a hollow mockery. The accidental outburst of 1917 succeeded because the Empire was at war and the nation armed. The unprofessional army would not turn upon its kind. The nation was rid of its ruler almost before the populace knew it. The Court and the reactionaries were frankly and almost openly German. 'The Empress, who dominated the Royal circle, was Teutonic to the core; the structure of the bureaucracy owed its existence to the precise prototype of Prussianism.' Sukhomlinoff, Minister of War, sold the secrets that brought on the Galician reverses; Sturmer, the Premier, became paid custodian of the Kaiser's interests and served them well. When a particularly despicable project was launched the Czar was sent to the front like a child in the way of his elders. Mr. Marcossou throws much light on this abyss of intrigue and treachery. Then he sketches the course of the Revolution. The disdain for the Czar became more pronounced every day.' Petrograd was 'ecstatic with equality,' little dreaming what struggles were ahead in the period of reaction and reconstruction. Kerensky dominated the situation. A week before the Revolution began he was scarcely known outside the circles of the Labour Party in Petrograd. In a month his name became part of Russia's prayer. His father was Principal of the High School at Simbirsk, and the son became a lawyer in Petrograd. Lloyd George and Lincoln were 'his two admirations.' His ready speech and fervid oratory win him the ear of the people. 'He has a personal appeal that is almost irresistible. It is convincing because it is sincere.' Mr. Marcossou gives some of his speeches, and describes a private interview with him when he became Minister of War. Much of the future of Russia lies in his hands, and 'the man who was the cement of the Revolution will remain the Rock of Reconstruction.' America's entry into the war thrilled the heart of Russia. Colossal problems have to be faced, but as Milyukoff said, 'Russia does not forget even in the midst of her new-found freedom that one permanent bulwark of that freedom is in a peace dictated by complete victory over the common enemy.' Mr. Marcossou's account of 'The Revolution Makers' will be read with great interest. His book has much to tell that all the Allies are eager to know.

The Square Jaw. By Henry Ruffin and André Tudesq. (Nelson & Sons. In French, *La Machoire Carrée*. 1 franc. English, 1s.)

This book by two French authors describes the Battle of the Ancre, the British and colonial allies of France, the armies of the North, and gives impressions of 'No Man's Land.' The writers ask, 'Can France ever forget the day when she learned that silently, without a hitch, and under the very noses of the Germans, the British force had suddenly been extended from Loos to the Somme?' France was delighted to discover that the armies of her allies had become

so large. 'I say "delighted," not "surprised," for our Allies have taught us to forget to be astonished by anything they may do.' During his visit of two months our French friend has seen the larger part of the British front from the Somme to the Yser and has everywhere found the same spirit of determination. The men have perfect confidence in Sir D. Haig, 'the lucky,' as they call him. They are also emboldened 'by the regular growth in the number of the effectives, which, though I may not disclose these figures, exceed the estimates of them usually made in France; the tremendous development in material and in the output of munitions; the magnificent successes gained on the Somme and the Ancre, which have given rise to the certainty of being able to defeat an enemy formerly said to be invincible, &c., &c.' The fighting of the Canadians has a kind of a 'mystical quality, the passion of a young people, which made them, behind their battle lines, a family of brothers, and when they engage, an army of warriors who will lay down their lives for one another.'

A League of Nations. By Henry Noel Brailsford. (Headley Bros. 2s. net.)

Mr. Brailsford's object in this book is to consider how far such a League of Nations as President Wilson has proposed can guarantee the security of Europe. He argues justly that its success will depend, not merely on the wise drafting of its constitution, but upon the solution reached in the war-settlement of our problems of nationality, colonial expansion, international trade, sea-power, and alliances. Mr. Brailsford says much has happened since he finished his book a year ago. Much more has happened since he dated his Preface last Christmas. The United States is no longer a neutral, and therefore cannot come into the League 'disinterested and uncommitted.' The German Chancellor has fallen. A great problem is dealt with in the first chapter. If Germany is excluded from the allied markets after the war, Mr. Brailsford thinks that the boycott will not crush Prussian militarism, but will destroy German Liberalism. He holds that a new economic militarism would be set up more subtle and pervasive than the old. After discussing the proposals of the League of Peace, the problems of Nationality, the Roads of the East, Empire, Sea-Power, and Trade, and The Economics of Peace are handled in a very suggestive way. In the closing chapter, 'The Constitution of the League,' with the sanctions of the obligation and all the questions involved is considered. Mr. Brailsford says he has groped for an answer to the question: Under what political and economic conditions would the creation of a League of Nations be a hopeful adventure? and his volume will be of great service to all who are grappling with the same problem.

GENERAL

Posthumous Poems. By Algernon Charles Swinburne.
 Edited by Edmund Gosse, C.B., and Thomas John
 Wise. (Heinemann. 6s. net.)

THESE poems cover half a century. The earliest was written in 1857, the last in 1907. All save *The Death of Sir John Franklin*, in which he made a second unsuccessful attempt to win the Newdegate Prize, had been suppressed or forgotten. Swinburne's father saved the *Franklin* from the massacre of his son's juvenile verse, and Mr. Gosse is surprised that the judges were not struck by its extraordinary merits. He says, 'No successful Newdegate, we may believe, has ever excelled it in solid beauty.' Sir Roger Newdegate directed that the poems must be in heroic couplets, and it is possible that Swinburne's poem was not even read. It is a fine piece of work, and it ends on a lofty note :

These chose the best, therefore their name shall be
 Part of all noble things that shall be done.

Eleven Border ballads are placed first in the volume. They were apparently written in 1862 and 1868, and probably remained unpublished because of the feeling of the time that ballads were barbarous productions. He himself said that a kind of poetry resembling 'The old rievvers' and free-booters' loosely-jointed and rambling folk-poems might be attempted,' and he carefully preserved his own efforts. When William Morris was dying he started making a selection of Border ballads, which he declared were the finest poems in the English language. He was too weak to deal with gaps and various readings, and it was suggested that Swinburne might edit them. 'Oh, no,' he said, 'that would never do. He would be writing-in verses that no one would be able to tell from the original stuff.' Mr. Gosse gives some notes as to the ballads which are of great interest, and the ballads themselves show how justly Morris had estimated Swinburne's powers. They move in a world of wonders, and are often far from pleasant, but they have a grim and weird strength which seems to lay hold of one. The *Ode to Mazzini* was found in an old copy-book, out of which many leaves had been torn. Some parts were missing, but have been supplied from another copy which Miss Isabel Swinburne presented to the British Museum. The poet followed with ardent sympathy the propaganda of the friends of Young Italy in London. It seems to have been written early in 1857, when Swinburne was just twenty, and is the most powerful and finished work that he had yet written. He had then no means of publishing it, and the political interest soon turned in

another direction. But it has its message for to-day. Austria is asleep, 'Drunken with blood and tears.'

'The sceptre trembles in thy trothless hand,
Shrinks not thy soul before the shame it braves,
The gathered angel of a patient land,
The loathing scorn that hardly bears to name thee.'

Mr. Gosse says that the greater part of the poems here published were hidden, unknown to Watts-Dunton, at the Pines. After his death unsightly rolls of paper were discovered all round his sitting-room. When papers accumulated on his desk Swinburne rolled them up in the newspaper of the day—proofs, bills, letters, together with occasional MSS. in prose and verse. The bundle was never disturbed, and when a fresh heap gathered, it was treated in the same fashion. We are relieved to know that Mr. Gosse has kept back lyrical poems which the public taste would not tolerate, and we should be still more relieved if we knew that he had burned them.

The Unfolding of Life. By W. T. A. Barber, D.D. (C. H. Kelly. 8s. 6d. net.)

The training of the young at a period when the nation is entering upon a new development under the stress of a world-crisis is one of those problems which is forced upon us for serious consideration. To this vital issue Dr. Barber brings the experience of a teacher who in earlier life was engaged in educational work in the Far East, and more recently, as the Head master of the Leys School, has acquired the wisdom and insight which only a practical acquaintance with boy life and character can give. His lecture is a charmingly wrought symphony on the themes, No education is complete without character, and character is the product of religion—religion which acts upon the endless varieties of ability and temperament, and creates a unity of high and honourable devotion to private and civic duty. Herein he proves himself a true successor of John Wesley, whose ideals are sketched in a chapter which should be both interesting and instructive to the present generation. Wesley's methods have been outgrown, but his spirit goes on for ever. Edward Thring sustained it in his aim to make Uppingham 'Christ's school.' And the same great ideal was expressed in the assertion of the young Japanese nobleman who, when asked why he came to an English public school, is reported by our author to have answered, 'I knew you had one thing to give me that I couldn't get in our schools. It is character.'

Every teacher, whether in an elementary or secondary school, every Sunday-school teacher also, would profit much by a study of these chapters. Dr. Barber knows the peculiar standards of value current in school life, knows boy-psychology, and knows the strength and weakness of the modern system, and gives in his closing chapter an open-minded and sane conception of our duty to the next generation with its special problems and difficulties. It would be easy to

quote passages illustrative of the author's width of sympathy and clearness of insight ; it is better that the reader should himself feel the stimulus of a study which illuminates young life at so many points.

Fishpingle. By Horace A. Vachell (Murray. 5s. net.) The butler with this strange name is the real hero of Mr. Vachell's 'romance of the countryside.' He is like a brother to the obstinate but fine-spirited Sir Geoffrey Pomfret. The squire's soldier son comes from India on leave, and his father has a society heiress ready to marry him and retrieve the family fortunes, but Lionel has other views, and he finds a charming bride in the parson's daughter. It is a story full of spirit, and the village cricket match is most exciting. The squire's hobby is eugenics, and he rides it so hard that he endangers the happiness of all about him, but everything comes right at last. There are some delightful studies of character in the book, and the scene where Sir Geoffrey surrenders unconditionally is the best of all.—*The Transactions of Lord Louis Lewis.* Described by Roland Pertwee. (Murray. 5s. net.) Lord Louis is a wonderful collector and expert, and the roguish dealers who try to deceive him always come off badly. The way in which the thieves are forced to give up their plunder is very exciting, and the Cornish cabinet-maker is a living Chippendale. Three love-stories are cleverly sandwiched in between the detective exploits. Lord Louis has a heart as well as a brain, and he is evidently going to be rewarded for his long fidelity and patience. The book is full of exciting situations, and Lord Louis is a marvel of ingenuity.—*Marmaduke.* By Flora Annie Steel. (Heinemann. 5s. net.) This story holds one's interest firmly from first to last. Marrion is a woman to be proud of, and before his death in the Crimea Marmaduke has given her his whole heart. The old Lord Drummair is a powerful study. With all his faults he is quick to see what a fine woman Marrion is. Her marriage and the story of her birth and her boy's are told in a way that keeps a reader's curiosity on full stretch. It is a delightful tale, though Marmaduke's life is cut short in the Crimea.—*Potterat and the War.* By Benjamin Vallotton. (Heinemann. 5s. net.) The retired police superintendent has become a popular figure both in France and England. Potterat is busy in his garden when this third story opens. His kindness of heart comes out in his treatment of Bélisaire, the peddling poacher who has just left prison for the thirty-second time. He becomes Potterat's assistant, and is almost as interesting as his master. Potterat's wife and his boy, his churlish son-in-law, his neighbours are all here, really alive. Potterat has to leave his garden and live in a flat, but he adjusts himself to the situation. Then the war breaks out, and he chafes at the neutrality of Switzerland, and literally wears himself out with fretting and anxiety. There is a great deal of human nature in him, and it is the most lovable and attractive sort.

The 'Athenaeum' Subject Index to Periodicals, 1916. Theology and Philosophy. This list contains entries of 1,587 articles under 855 subject headings. That is an increase of 54 per cent. in the articles indexed as compared with 1915. Religion includes Christian and non-Christian, witchcraft, magic, and the occult. Articles on the Jews fill more than a column. The Index has been prepared with the utmost thoroughness, and will be of constant service to those who have to deal with the important subjects here discussed.—*The Redcaps' Annual.* (Kelly. 3s. net.) Every page in this volume will delight small children. It is full of pictures—full-page coloured pictures, and beautifully drawn black-and-white. Its stories and its verse appeal to fun and fancy, and will raise many a hearty laugh by the winter fireside. The Chinese Kite-flyers, and A Perplexing Moment—when the cat sees four boxes with a little man sitting up in each—are two very attractive pages, but the whole volume is full of good things.—*British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews.* By Albert M. Hyamson. (6d.) This is 'Publication No. 1' of the British Palestine Committee. It gives a view of nineteenth-century movements and writings in favour of the restoration of the Jews to Palestine such as one can find nowhere else. Sir Moses Montefiore, Lord Shaftesbury, and Laurence Oliphant figure largely in this most interesting survey.—*Achievements and Prospects in Palestine,* by S. Tolkowsky (Jaffa), and *Jewish Emancipation; The Contract Myth* (English Zionist Federation. 4d. each), are two pamphlets of special interest at the present time.—*The New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1916.* (Wellington: Marks.) The twenty-fifth number of this year-book has been considerably reduced in size, but no portions of the work dealing with distinct phases of the Dominion's statistics and its life and resources have been omitted. It is a cyclopaedia of facts and figures put together with great care. The population of the Dominion at the end of 1915 was estimated at 1,102,794, an increase of 6,800 during the year. An expeditionary force of infantry, mounted infantry, and artillery, with all necessary details, was dispatched early to take part in the war in Europe. It was engaged in the fighting on Gallipoli. The original force has been trebled, and additional infantry furnished. A constant stream of reinforcements has been kept up, so that the force in the field has been kept at full strength, in spite of its participation in some of the severest fighting of the war.—*Council of European Nations.* By R. C. (Elliot Stock. 1s. net.) A misnamed and disappointing booklet by a Roman Catholic who thinks the world is to find deliverance from its woes by accepting the supremacy of the Pope. We wonder that any one could venture on such suggestion in view of Rome's attitude in this war.—*One Thousand Tales Worth Telling.* By Henry Pickering. (Pickering & Inglis. 1s. 6d.) Four or five crisp little anecdotes are here given on a page with a Bible text that each illustrates. There are good indexes of texts and of subjects and persons. It is a book that will help teachers and speakers, and Mr. Pickering's aim has been to give tales strictly true.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Edinburgh Review. (July).—Prof. Alison Phillips writes on 'National Federations and World Federations.' He agrees with General Smuts that to run even the common concerns of the group of nations that compose the British Empire by means of a Central Parliament and a Central Executive would be absolutely 'to court disaster.' Far more true would it be of the wider commonwealth of nations which it is hoped to establish. When the war is over it will be necessary to keep an alliance in being, in order to maintain peace during the long and perilous process of reconstruction, but if our statesmen are wise they will watch with a jealous eye 'any attempts to convert this alliance into a permanent system of international government.' Mr. Hilton discusses 'The Foundations of Food Policy.' 'Not one of the blunders made by our Food Controller in the past six months but was made two years earlier by the German Government, only to be repaired at great cost.' Mr. Gosse pays glowing tribute to 'The Gallantry of France.' Un the first months of the war the holocaust of young men of high intellectual promise was terrible. 'There was no restraining the ardour of the young.' M. Rappoport finds 'the philosophic basis of the Russian Revolution' in the doctrines of her philosophers. 'We cannot expect the New Russia to emerge from this chaos without time and travail.'

Hibbert Journal (July).—Six articles on reconstruction after the war deal with education, religion, town-planning, and other cognate themes, but the two most instructive are a paper by Prof. Jas. Ward on personality as the aim of eugenics, and one by Mr. Bosanquet, entitled, 'Reconstruction—of what?' Put together, they emphasize the fact that what we should be most concerned to secure, if we can, is a renewal of ideas and of character—surely a sufficiently 'large order.' It used to be considered that religion was necessary for the regeneration of men, but according to the Countess of Warwick and Dr. Beattie Crozier religion itself is to be so reconstructed that it will hardly be recognizable. Lady Warwick thinks that the new religion will 'seek to mend the old earth,' and leave the rest to a Supreme Power whose ways are past finding out. It is to preach 'not Christ, but Man crucified,' and to bring him down from the cross on which he has hung so long. Dr. Crozier holds that the family is the great obstructive in human life, especially to personal religion, while 'a cosmopolitan religion is damned entirely by antagonisms of race, colour, and creed.' Asked where we are to turn for a

real religion, he replies, 'I cannot tell.' Three articles deal with survival after death—an interesting one by the Dean of St. Paul's, which urges that we should accustom ourselves to 'breathe the air of the eternal values,' but not indulge in curiosity about details; a severe criticism of Sir O. Lodge's well-known views by Dr. Charles Mercier; and a Presidential Address to the Society for Psychical Research, by Dr. L. P. Jacks, the Editor of the *Hibbert Journal*. The last is, as might be expected, very unconventional and highly suggestive. Amongst other things Dr. Jacks says that 'survival' is a question-begging term. 'What stands in the evidence is the existence of these persons where they are. There is no evidence—at least, none that I can credit—of how they got there.' Other articles deal with 'Tolerance from a Russian Point of View,' 'Juvenile Delinquency,' and 'The Pulpit and its Opportunities.'

Expository Times (July, August).—Rev. H. Bisseker writes an appreciative notice of Dr. H. M. Gwatkin, such as only a personal friend and disciple could pen. 'In him we detect,' says Mr. Bisseker, 'one of the comparatively few original voices of the day.' Rev. F. J. Rae criticizes sharply though not harshly, Mr. Wells's *God, the Invisible King*. He regrets—as Mr. Wells's best friends must do—the use in the book of 'vulgar Billingsgate,' and considers that what Mr. Wells has discovered in his new religion is—'just Christianity.' A paper by Dr. Garvie, entitled, 'Shadow and Substance,' continues his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The August number contains much interesting matter. Prof. H. R. Mackintosh characterizes at length 'Principal Denney as a Theologian.' Though the estimate given is exceedingly high, it is in the main well deserved, and all the Churches need to mourn the loss of so able a Christian leader, cut off in the maturity of his powers. Dr. Margoliouth writes on, 'The Coptic Cabala,' and Dr. Moffatt on the 'Christology of the Epistle to Hebrews.' Dealing with the same subject as Dr. Garvie's articles, Dr. Moffatt's paper presents a striking contrast to them both in style and in method. Amongst the papers entitled, 'In the Study,' one on Orpah is a gem of its kind. But why call it 'a study in Internationalism'? The Editor's notes on the Mysticism of St. Paul, the Discipline of Pain, and Dr. Gwatkin as a scholar and teacher, as well as his appreciative comments on the published sermons of Mr. W. P. Workman, Headmaster of Kingswood, may be mentioned as specially interesting.

Constructive Quarterly (March and June).—Dr. Glubokovsky, of the Petrograd Imperial Orthodox Ecclesiastical Academy, writes on 'Orthodox Russia and its Orthodox Priesthood.' It is a 'sketch of the Christian enlightenment of Russia through the medium of the Orthodox priesthood.' 'The priests are not only the spiritual guides of the people, but also the best interpreters of the national genius in general.' Dr. Du Bose, in his article on 'The Church,' says that 'the curse of the present state of Christendom is that our

differences have erected such barriers and entrenchments that inter-communication, exchange, and mutual understanding are well-nigh impossible.'

Church Quarterly (July).—Dr. Headlam has a very instructive critique of the controversy between Prof. Sanday and Mr. N. P. Williams on *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*. They present different conceptions of divine knowledge. One constructs a cast-iron system of Christian dogma, the other finds in the Christian revelation clear evidence of a revelation of divine truth given through Jesus Christ. 'It is the claim to infallibility which is the great bar to listening to the voice of that Spirit which leads us into all truth.'

The Round Table (September).—'After three years' sums up the objects for which we went to war, and shows that they are still unaccomplished. The British people have not lost their special quality of perseverance, and they will endure till Prussian militarism is defeated and discredited. 'The Internal Problem in Germany' is discussed in another valuable paper. Thoughtful Germans are beginning to recognize that their Government has brought the country to disaster. The belief has been growing that official incompetence led to war, and is fast leading to another catastrophe—defeat.

Calcutta Review (April and July).—An interesting paper, 'The Sword of Japan,' shows that the Samurai loved his sword as his own soul. The swordsmith was the highest of craftsmen, and those who could forge a blade which would stand every test without turning edge won high renown. 'A Marada Poet Saint,' by Dr. MacNicol, is about Namdev, a tailor, who lived in the fourteenth century. He was devoted to the worship of Vithoba, and spent day and night in dancing and singing the name of his god.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review (July).—H. J. Cadbury discusses the *pericope adulterae* (John vii. 53—viii. 11). No other New Testament writing has such close parallels with Luke and Acts. He holds that it was either an original part of St. Luke's Gospel, or is written by some one else in a style that completely matches that of St. Luke. 'The ever-memorable John Hales,' by Nancy E. Scott, gives a very attractive account of the famous Eton scholar. Johnston E. Walter discusses 'Kant's Moral Theology.' It amounts to this: 'that we must assume a God practically as the necessary procurer of happiness for the autonomously virtuous, while at the same time we are conscious that we have not the least ground for an intellectual knowledge of God as an objective reality.' The peace that he arranged between the theoretical and the practical reason was hollow. We are to be satisfied to act as if there were a God, while we are still conscious that we have not the least theoretical or scientific knowledge of Him.

Princeton Theological Review (April).—Dr. Warfield discusses 'The New Testament terminology of "Redemption."' He finds the ultimate base of the group of words in the Sanscrit *lie*, to cut or clip. His survey of the use of the group of words in the Septuagint and in patristic literature will be of great value to scholars. 'The Use of Iron in Ancient Times,' and 'The Bearing of Archaeology upon the Higher Criticism of the Psalms' are the other articles. Dr. Allis holds that the analogy of the ancient Psalmody of Babylon and Egypt so strongly confirms the Davidic tradition that the problem is not, How late are the Psalms? but, How early are they?

Methodist Review (New York), July-August.—Bishop R. J. Cooke deals with the difficult problem of the alien in America. He pleads that the Church should do its part to solve the problems of the State by vigorous efforts towards the evangelization of 'all men of every race and colour and tongue.' Prof. Shaw, in writing on 'Ibsen's Indignation,' concludes that 'Ibsen's own art taught him the necessity of the love which he lacked—his soul-landscape was all crag and fiord.' 'His First Sermon,' by J. L. Cole, describes an imaginary incident in Babylon twenty years after the death of Christ, in which Andrew the Apostle gives an account in the family circle of the Master's sermon on little children, suggested by the four-year-old Jonas, son of Simon Peter. Bishop Leonard describes Methodism in Hawaii and sketches 'an educational programme.' President Phillips criticizes the 'Shavian Ethics and Philosophy,' but refuses to say that G. B. Shaw is not a Christian.

Methodist Review (Nashville), July.—The Editor describes what he considers to be 'The Failure of the Higher Criticism.' He thinks that 'the thunders of war are sounding the knell of Wellhausenism with much else related thereto.' Prof. A. T. Robertson, in 'Paul and Patriotism,' shows how the Apostle of the Gentiles came to be more than a Jewish patriot—a citizen of the world and a great Christian. H. C. Howard describes 'General Booth and his Army,' and W. Kendall contributes a thoughtful paper on 'Augustine, the Theologian.' Two well-written Methodist articles are 'Francis Asbury and his Presbyterian Friends,' by S. G. Ayres, and 'Early Methodists and Cherokees,' by G. F. Mellen.

Review and Expositor (Louisville, July).—In the first article Prof. Stalker, of Aberdeen, sketches briefly the life and work of Dante, but he would be the first to acknowledge that so slight a sketch of so great a subject is unsatisfying and unsatisfactory. A very high appreciation follows of the life and character of Rev. R. J. Willingham, an active member of the Southern Baptist Foreign Missionary Board. In 'Just Across the Continental Divide,' Prof. Leavell discusses certain problems of early adolescence, and the 'three periods of life,' which he describes as those of 'absorption, adjustment, and achievement' respectively.