
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

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

APRIL, 1929

WHAT WE MAY LEARN FROM WESLEY

THE name of John Wesley has of late been once more to the front. Centenary celebrations in London and Oxford have served to recall the marvellous story of his activities, and Churches that owe their being to him have again been bidden to 'look unto the hole of the pit whence they were digged.' This is always a salutary experience, and may quite legitimately be made an occasion of thanksgiving, and even of boasting within due bounds. But if it is to have its perfect work it should be much more. It is as easy for Churches and institutions as for individuals to become self-satisfied, to settle down upon their lees, and, in their gratitude for the way in which they have been led, to forget that a long way still lies before them, and that they are still called to be adventurers and pioneers. All the Free Churches have great traditions behind them, but these must not blind them to the fact that they have a great future. They cannot live on their past, and they can only be faithful to it as they do in their day the kind of work their fathers did, and hand down to their posterity an inheritance at least as great as that which they have themselves enjoyed.

Between the times of John Wesley and the age in which we live there are certain obvious and surface parallels. They ought not to be unduly pressed, but they are at least fruitful in suggestion. In both cases we have a country exhausted by war and filled with widespread misery and discontent side by side with shameless luxury and wealth. Then, as now, religion was at a comparatively low ebb, the Churches were stereotyped and conventional, and the mass

of the population indifferent, sunk in ignorance, vice, and superstition. The Industrial Revolution, then beginning, has now worked itself out into a mechanistic and materialist view of life and the universe which is inimical to religious progress. As, in the eighteenth century, deism and scepticism alike were unable to answer men's questions or meet their emotional and spiritual needs, so, to-day, scientific materialism is confronted with the same failure, and is thus far preparing the way for revival.

But, if there are similarities between the situation which confronts us now and that of Wesley's day, there are also deep and serious differences. Human nature, no doubt, remains fundamentally the same, but circumstances, as the copy-books tell us, alter cases, and all the conditions of our life and mental outlook are now so new and strange that ancient panaceas are worse than useless. The Churches are still too much inclined to trust to time-honoured and well-used weapons, and these, though once effective enough, are now no longer able to meet either the attack or the defence of the modern world. Both the propaganda and the apologetics of Christianity need to be radically revised before they can function effectively under the new conditions. The occasion calls for a boldness, initiative, and adaptability which the Churches and their representatives too seldom show. It was to qualities such as these that Wesley owed his remarkable success, and in them, and in certain of the methods he adopted, he is still worthy of imitation.

We may note, then, in the first instance, the depth, reality, and sincerity of Wesley's own personal religion, the fount of all his actions. He was forced to speak to men of God and His grace because he was himself so sure of their power to help and save. His faith in God was much more than an academic opinion. It was a living assurance of reality which compelled him to impart it to others. As he writes in his *Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion*: 'By this faith we are saved from all uneasiness of mind, from the

anguish of a wounded spirit, from discontent, from fear and sorrow of heart, and from that inexpressible listlessness and weariness, both of the world and ourselves, which we had so helplessly laboured under for many years, especially when we were out of the hurry of the world and sunk in calm reflection. In this we find that love of God and of all mankind which we had elsewhere sought in vain. This, we know and feel, and therefore cannot but declare, saves every one that partakes of it both from sin and misery, from every unhappy and every unholy temper.' Here, then, was his authority and the source of his inspiration—a personal religious experience of the most vivid and effective kind. The question of authority in religion is one that has long vexed men's minds, and is crucial. Without entering on the whole subject, may we not say that, for the preacher at least, the primary authority must be his own experience of the grace and power of God. It is not enough in these days for him to quote the findings of Church, tradition, creed, or Bible. If he is to convince men he must be able to say, 'I know and am persuaded.' The preaching that is needed to-day must be prophetic in the sense that Wesley's was—the utterance of a man who has dwelt in the secret place of the Most High, who has heard the voice of God in his own soul, who has tasted and seen how gracious the Lord is, and who is therefore under compulsion to impart to others what he has himself received. To preach hearsay or second-hand ideas, to discuss problems in the pulpit, or balance opinions, may be interesting, instructive, or even amusing, but will never convince. Conviction in the hearer is only produced by conviction in the speaker. The word must be 'like a fire in his bones,' and only fire kindles fire. It is true, of course, that modern preachers cannot reproduce Wesley's language, or cast their message in his thought-forms, but they can emulate his spirit and his zeal. Even a modernist can preach as a dying man to dying men, if his own religion is real and has been to him the power of God unto salvation.

Religion is a life, and is not bound up with any forms of expression; but, the more true, real, and relevant are the intellectual forms in which it is cast, the easier should it be to pass it on to others. Preachers who are touched by the modern spirit may well take a leaf out of John Wesley's book. The depth and power of their own religious experience will be the measure of their success.

Another outstanding characteristic of Wesley was his concern for the souls and bodies of men. The Church of his day was sunk in indifference. Poverty, misery, vice, and ignorance, were everywhere rife, and so-called Christians stood severely aloof, gathering their garments round them. The immediate result of Wesley's work was the rise of a new scale of individual and social values, a revival of the spirit of mercy and charity, and a passionate outburst of reforming zeal. All this, however, had its roots deep in religion. As in the early days of Christianity so now, the new religious impulse showed itself in a new valuation of humanity. Wesley's belief in the universality of salvation in Christ reacted on his estimate of man as one capable of being saved. He had a message, therefore, for the most degraded of mankind, and one that proved its power in many a transformed life. To his contemporaries, however, this was something new and strange. The respectable, whether among Anglicans or Dissenters, counted it an outrage that these outcasts should be treated as on a level with themselves in the eyes of God. Charity they understood, and were willing to exercise within limits, but this new-found zeal for souls was beyond them. It is easy for us to criticize them, but we have ourselves not yet fully learnt the lessons which Wesley taught. The outburst of evangelistic zeal which marked the Revival has died down. The Churches to-day are thoroughly humanitarian in spirit. They are deeply interested in the social gospel; they willingly support great causes, like those of peace, temperance, purity, and the like; and they respond readily to all appeals

for charitable help. But the question is often asked, and not without reason, Have they a gospel? They carry on great missionary enterprises, but their interest in them centres rather in the medical, educational, and generally civilizing work. Even at that, the support they give to them is tardy and inadequate—a response to piteous appeals, which ought not to be necessary, rather than a spontaneous outflow of enthusiasm. The suggestion that the heathen are perishing, and need rescue, lingers in their hymns, but touches no note of reality, and it is the same with the heathen at home. On every hand we hear complaints that the great mass of the people are outside the Churches and living in practical paganism, but there seems to be no real concern about them and little is done to reach them. Many Churches are fully occupied with their own concerns. They have a struggle to make both ends meet, and little time or strength to spare for the outsider. Their evangelism—such as it is—is confined to the Sunday school and an occasional mission. We are generally told that this slackness is the result of modern criticism and modern theology. But it is an excuse rather than a reason. In this modern attitude there is nothing to lessen, but rather everything to enhance, our appreciation of Christianity as a unique religion, and as the power of God to the salvation of men's souls. What is needed is the same kind of concern for their salvation as animated Wesley and his followers, and the same conviction that in the full acceptance of the Christian message lies the one hope of mankind. It is true that we can no longer envisage salvation as escape from an eternal hell of suffering. But we can do better. We know that in the gospel of the grace of God in Christ we have a positive message of hope and power the acceptance of which means for men and women a new life of moral triumph and self-sacrificing service for others. We have still to preach the need of a new life and of that divine sustenance (bread and water of life) by which alone the new life can be nourished

and maintained. This message, delivered with conviction, unction, and urgency, and couched in language which men and women of to-day can understand, will still be found effective to succour, to strengthen, and to inspire.

Another noteworthy thing about Wesley was his initiative, independence, and originality. He was nothing if not practical, and he had a shrewd knack of adapting means to the ends he desired. This enabled him to overcome his innate caution and conservatism, and to strike out boldly into new paths whenever occasion required it. He was no slave to consistency, either in his methods or in his teaching. He believed in the fires of hell and in eternal punishment, but that did not prevent him from preaching the universal love of God. He had all the good Anglican's love for decency and order, but he had no hesitation in breaking out into new forms, once he felt the call to do it. Of one of his early meetings he writes, 'My heart was so full that I could not confine myself to the forms of prayer which we were accustomed to use. Neither do I purpose to be confined to them any more; but to pray indifferently, with a form or without, as I may find suitable to particular occasions.' So, too, of his earliest efforts at field-preaching. The example of Whitefield convinced him that he must not confine his efforts to the Churches if he were ever to reach the common people. It went sorely against the grain with him, but he did not hesitate. 'At four in the afternoon I submitted to be more vile, and proclaimed in the highways the glad tidings of salvation, speaking from a little eminence, in a ground adjoining to the city, to about three thousand people.' It was the same with his early organization of the Methodist Society. It was altogether *ad hoc*. His one concern was to meet effectively the needs of the moment, as they arose. His experience with the Moravians and the Holy Club at Oxford suggested methods, and he adapted them as required. When preachers were needed, and he could get them in no other way, he ordained them himself,

though reluctantly, and with much fear and trembling. In no other respect is his example more worth following to-day. It is one of the ironies of history that those Churches which delight to call themselves 'free' should be, as they so often are, hidebound in their conservatism. In these difficult days they need, above everything else, the initiative and adaptability which characterized the great founder of Methodism. They need it, in the first place, in their teaching. As a matter of mere practical politics the Church of the future will have to be a teaching Church. People are not indifferent to religion, but they are less inclined than ever to accept it on authority, and they are suspicious of the conventional and the orthodox. They seek for reality, and Christianity needs to be presented to them, not as a fixed creed or set of dogmas, but as a life and as 'power to become.' The form in which this is done must be modern and up to date—one that is intelligible to the ordinary man and takes cognizance of his mental situation and outlook. All this is a commonplace in these days. But it is a relevant question to ask, How far are the Churches really equipping themselves for this most important and responsible task? The question of the teaching of religion in day and Sunday schools presents a problem of the utmost urgency, and only the fringes of it are being touched at the present time. There is, no doubt, deep concern about the supply and training of the ministry, but we have a long way to go before either of these can be put on a satisfactory basis. Even in the Churches themselves there is often a deadweight of inertia and conservatism that seems to resent what is new in the way of teaching because it is new, and that tends to create a cleavage between young and old that cannot but prove disastrous in its results. If the Churches only lived up to their professed belief in the Holy Spirit they would realize that He is still guiding them into all the truth, and they would be ready and willing to follow Him into 'fresh woods and pastures new.' The Free Churches, at any rate,

should in this respect be eager to exercise their freedom, and live up to their belief that 'the Lord has yet more light and truth to break forth from His word.'

What is true of teaching is true also of more practical methods of Church work and witness. We are often told that people in these days are tired of institutional religion, and quite indifferent to it. If that is true, it is because in many Churches the institution has become an end rather than a means. The root of all evil in the Church is the idea that it exists for any other purpose than to make good men and women, and so help to found the Kingdom of God on earth. We need a marked transfer of emphasis from the Church to the Kingdom, recognizing in the Kingdom the end—the divinely appointed end—for which the Church exists. So our concern will be to make the Church supremely efficient in securing this end. In any good business concern, obsolete machinery soon finds its way to the scrap-heap, and a great deal of our Church machinery is quite obsolete to-day. Only a radical reconstruction of our organization and methods will meet the needs with which we are now confronted. Here, for example, is a village which, thirty years ago, had a thousand inhabitants and one Free Church. The minister of that church was a father in God to the whole country-side. He was passing rich on ninety pounds a year, and devoted his life to his cause. To-day the village is reduced to six hundred inhabitants, and it has three competing Free Churches. They are all too poor to support a resident minister, and every one admits that the last state of that place is worse than the first. Every one also knows that wild horses would not draw those three Churches together to form one strong cause. This is no isolated case. In the light of it, and of others like it, all our talk of reunion seems absurd. As long as we put denominational interests before the interests of the Kingdom of God we shall continue to put a premium on overlapping and inefficiency. In this respect, as in many others, those who represent the Churches

need to exercise more practical common sense, and to show a more self-denying concern for the interests of the Kingdom of God. The children of light need sometimes to take a leaf out of the book of the children of this world. Here John Wesley set them a striking example, which they would surely do well to follow.

Finally, throughout his ceaseless labours, Wesley showed a courage, cheerfulness, and even optimism which are worthy of all imitation. In an age when even good men had begun to despair of Christianity, he never faltered and never turned his back on hope. His was a faith that overcame, and we need it sorely to-day. It is quite right that we should face facts, that we should cherish no illusions about the present state of Christendom, and that we should criticize when occasion offers. But to do this in a spirit of whining pessimism is utterly wrong. God can forgive us all but our despair. When all is said and done, we who 'look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen' are on the winning side. Even in this materialist age men are ceaselessly crying out for God, for the living God—and where are they to find Him but in Jesus Christ our Lord? Christians should never lose sight of the fact that their message, once they can get it across, is exactly what this world needs. If there is any reality in their own religious experience, they will be aware of it as a power, and what it has accomplished in their own lives they will be eager to see it accomplish in the lives of others. Hence they will proclaim it with confidence and courage, and boldly apply it in every department of modern life. There is always something adventurous about Christianity—an eager, joyous anticipation of great things which the most depressing circumstances cannot wholly quench. Wesley knew the secret of this joy and of this courage, and it is a secret which his followers must share if their work is to be effective and their temper remain truly Christian.

W. B. Selbie.

CONTEMPLATION IN THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

AMONG English Christians at the present time there are not very many who have a clear idea of the meaning of contemplation; fewer who think of it favourably; and probably not more than a very small group who practise it perseveringly. It is vaguely thought to be the exercise of a faculty of mysticism which is peculiar to a select few; and to be the mark of a not entirely wholesome, virile type of religion; but to be more congenial to the Orientals than to Western Europeans who believe in action. It is the purpose of this paper to inquire into the grounds of this suspicion; and into the claim which has been often most convincingly put forward for the inclusion of contemplation as an ingredient in the life of piety no less necessary than prayer.

A very small volume entitled *Prayer and Intelligence*, by Maritain, translated from the French by Thorold (Sheed & Ward) gives fairly lucid instruction as to what contemplation is; and Miss Underhill's well-known book on *Mysticism* quotes ample testimonies from the experience of mediaeval saints. The nearest approach to a definition may be found in a passage quoted from Ruysbroeck, which, though too mystical to commend itself to English readers, directs attention to the heart of the subject. 'When love has carried us above all things, we receive in peace the Incomprehensible Light, enfolding us and penetrating us. What is this Light if it be not a contemplation of the Infinite, and an intuition of eternity?' Among the Protestants in western Europe hardly more than a handful will recognize in this saying the utterance of a simple-hearted, sober-minded Christian. We hasten, however, to quote words more intelligible to our modern temper, with its fanatical preference of zeal to knowledge and of the last five Commandments to the first five. 'Without contemplation no great advance will be

made in virtue and we shall never be able to help others towards it. . . . With contemplation we shall do more for ourselves and others in one month than we shall do without it in ten years' (Père Lallemant, *Prayer and Intelligence*, p. 34). Again, from the same collection of sayings, let us listen to St. Teresa: 'In my opinion we should grow more in virtue (humility) by contemplating the Divine Perfections, than by keeping the eyes of our soul fixed on the vile clay of our origin.' The Frenchman cautions the restless social reformer; the Spanish saint penetrates through the group-egoism of the pretentious evolutionist who thinks that the mean beginnings of mankind are more glorious than his destiny—that the pottery is worthier of worship than the Artificer who develops it out of nothing. It is worth while to note that those who write on the subject in such terms have the right to speak, as they are being taught by experience. Against that what have we to bring? Nothing—absolutely nothing—except a gross inheritance of spiritual lethargy, prejudice, and an insane self-satisfaction.

In other words, the call to contemplation is a challenge addressed sharply and pertinently to our racial conceit. For its demand is that in approaching our Creator in prayer we should strive to the uttermost to empty ourselves: to listen, not to speak, to become passive recipients of eternal life, before we know or can imagine what that life is. This effort can be genuinely made only by those who are learning to be humble, and who are possessed by a growing *desire* for God—a desire which is really stronger than the desire for temporal happiness, which has taken possession of us all.

The challenge—idealistic as thus stated—is also addressed to our common sense. Starting from Christ's answer to the very central and fundamental question, 'Which is the first and great Commandment?' and, feeling sure that the learning to love God has something in common with our learning to love one another, we are brought up short against

the fact that our intercourse with God is, as a rule, one-sided. That is simply a true description of all prayer which consists only of petitions uttered by man in his need; with no provision or effort made for listening to, drinking in, or understanding God's answer. But what chance would there be in ordinary life of deep and true love being felt by one individual or one group for another if all the speech were on one side? If it is supposed that the illustration is too restricted, too homely, to serve as a criticism of the great, mysterious, universal practice of prayer, we need only point out that it is on the same lines as the two most famous and illuminating metaphors used by our Lord. It may safely be said that the use made by the Saviour of the natural human associations connected with fatherhood and childhood has for all time enriched to an immeasurable degree the religious consciousness of us all. Indeed, there is this in common between the three: they all deal in natural affection as a power manifested in self-forgetfulness. When love becomes a passion, not altogether unworthy of being compared to a flame, its power, its beauty, its permanence are incompatible with the least desire for self-gratification. Conversely, self-absorption is the very essence of cold-heartedness. A normal little child, say, of three years is a being wholly intent on drinking in whatever he can receive from his surroundings, especially from his parents. What, then, should we think of the relation of a little boy to his father if he talked all the time and didn't listen because he could not understand? Love enables the human father to communicate with his child so that the little one can and does understand; not intellectually, but vitally and by feeling. The one fatal obstacle to the child's receptivity would be an unnatural sickly self-analysis, which would prompt the question, 'What am I getting out of this?' Why, then, do I spoil my relation to our Heavenly Father by acting towards Him as if I were not His child at all, but a monstrosity?

May we not suppose that, when the Lord took up the little children in His arms and blessed them, He endowed them—that is, each new generation—for all time with the rich faculty of *unquestioning receptivity*? But we must go on to note that He followed up that most divine action with the astonishing paradox that we adults—feeble in our self-regard, grotesque in our self-sufficiency, whose every upward impulse is checked, thwarted, poisoned by insane doubts and backward regards—are to 'become as little children,' whose essential and universal characteristic is that they cannot help ignoring themselves as they look forward? The Prince of Love calls upon us not to work this astounding transformation ourselves—such a behest would indeed be a mockery—but to allow the Holy Spirit to work it in us, according to the tidings of great joy that we are in Christ each one of us a 'new creature'—or, as the word may be rendered, a 'new creation.'

The demand thus made upon Christian men and women is nothing new. Teaching, as always, by the gentlest hints, our Lord has pronounced for ever His preference for the contemplative over the active life in the imperishable words addressed to Martha about her sister: 'Martha, Martha, thou art cumbered and distracted about many things; but one thing is needful (indispensable): for Mary hath chosen the good part which shall not be taken away from her.' (We may notice in passing that here is one among many claims to divinity serenely put forward by Christ. Mary was treating Him as the Source of Wisdom. He ratifies and accepts her homage; but not the greatest prophet among the sons of men could possibly have done so without revealing himself there and then as a pretentious braggart. Yet to us the words come down the centuries, 'full of grace and truth.' All Unitarians who revere Christ—and there are many—have in this passage food for reflection.) Immediately the rejoinder springs to our lips: 'For us nowadays the thing called contemplation is impossible.'

Now can this contention be denied? If not, are we not committed to the theory that much of Christ's teaching was esoteric: addressed to exceptional men and women, and, therefore, by the rank and file may rightly be disregarded? We can answer it first in St. Paul's words: 'God forbid'—that is, it is not in our reason but in our conscience that this theory is repudiated. But, if we do not repudiate it, we must grasp firmly the fact that, though the suggestion of impossibility comes from the Evil One, it is in a sense quite true. It is true as the feeling of the Apostles was true when Christ told them to feed the five thousand—that He was giving them a command which was literally impossible. But they soon learnt that the talk of impossibility, even if it be true, is not the last word. There had to be added the great *coda*, 'but with God all things are possible.' That is tantamount to saying that the command to let our prayer issue in contemplation is shown to be divine by its impossibility; for from what other source could it have come? Man could never have invented any duty so profoundly uncongenial to many races of mankind, and apparently so useless, as that of passively contemplating God, whom we cannot see. Then has Satan invented it? If he had he would be divided against himself. Satan's share in the matter is to din into our ears first that contemplation is a futile waste of time; and the father of lies gets some of us to believe that; but not many dare to say so. To the rest he insists, often with fatal effect, that it is utterly beyond our power. It is for other exceptional people, not for us.

It is to be observed that whenever we plead inability, in face of a demand which we secretly acknowledge, we think as individuals, not as members of a society. We say, '*Non possum*,' but never, '*Non possumus*.' Why is this? It is because egoism of any kind actually expels or quenches —to use St. Paul's word—the power of the Holy Spirit. Imagine a multitude, strongly and unanimously impelled

by some mighty tide of emotion, drinking in the spirit of an inspired orator with a vibrant voice like Aitken of Pendeen, and resolving there and then on some large and lofty endeavour, but at the critical moment falling back, like the 'corrupt and hesitating servant' in the parable.[1] What makes them pause and fail? Partly, perhaps, some self-consciousness in the speaker, but, anyhow, some cold and calculating self-regard in a few of the audience: 'This is all very well; but it is not what *I* want, nor what *I* can do.' Half a dozen of such who imagine the Spirit is given 'by measure' will chill the ardour of a great crowd—so terrible is the enfeebling influence of the individual on the mass. When, then, we isolate ourselves as Thomas did from the main body, disbelieving, as he did, in spiritual co-operation, how grave is our responsibility! We are spoiling by our individualism, by the analysis of our own infirmity, the response of true receptivity to the divine promptings which others are beginning to catch. How will this look on the Day of Judgement?

For we condemn ourselves to isolation whenever we repeat the dangerous formula *Non possum* in presence of a challenge which comes to us from Christ. But does it? If we think for a moment of the Saviour withdrawing Himself silently, long before night was ended, from His slumbering followers and kneeling on the cold hillside in long, untroubled communion with the Father, can we suppose that the intercourse between the Divine Persons was one-sided—simply a stream of petitions from the Perfect Man? It cannot be. It is also most significant to note how the Apostles first learnt that their own praying was a nothing. They had offered petitions since their childhood; but when they gazed, awe-stricken, on the face of their Master and

[1] Matt. xxv. 26: 'Slothful' is an unfortunate translation. The servant may have been a busy man, but he hung back from a venture which others responded to. He was trying to be good in the wrong way.

noticed how He was drinking in life itself from the Source of all Life, they felt that their own utterance was as the wailing of infants, as if they had never prayed at all. So much is given us in the pathetic but trustful petition, 'Lord, teach us to pray.' Thus, in the seven petitions which the Guild of Prayer offers daily on behalf of the mission work of the Church, the one which breathes most truly the tone of the New Testament is the second: 'Teach us to pray as Christ prayed.' For He has promised that we shall be perfect: that is, live with His life offered to us. But that human life was unintermittently sustained, guided, and perfected by communion with the Father, as St. John tells us repeatedly. 'My Father worketh hitherto and I work.' 'Yet I am not alone, because the Father is with Me.' 'My teaching is not Mine, but His that sent Me.' 'The Son can do nothing of Himself but what He seeth the Father doing.' And more particularly: 'The Spirit of Truth . . . whom the world cannot receive because it seeth Him not.' (R.V., beholdeth—the word generally means 'contemplate.') Christ could not have spoken thus unless His mind and spirit had been nourished by communion with the Father.[1]

But our use of the argument of 'isolation' may be objected to. Does not the practice of contemplation require solitude, stillness, and the banishing of the Finite as far as may be from the thoughts? Certainly it requires the banishing of the sights and sounds, the clatter and confusion of the world; but not of the thought of the 'cloud of witnesses' with which we are compassed about in our toilsome warfare. Nay, by contemplation of the divine we enter into fellowship

[1] If it be objected that these sayings are ascribed to Christ in the Fourth Gospel only, we must point out that, whatever view may be taken of the Johannine authorship, the authority of the Gospel is unimpaired. Whoever wrote it gave a picture of Christ which the Church accepted as life-like and true—after fifty or more years' experience of the supernatural life in the community which the Lord not only promised, but gave. Nobody supposes that the judgement of the Early Church on such a matter was inferior to ours.

with them; for their life is Praise, which is the outcome of contemplation of the Glory of God.

Much more might be said. Let us end with a note of the 'living hope' which cannot be taken away from us. As we slowly learn to compare the place which contemplation ought to hold and does hold in our corporate life we feel how grievously our great sin of omission has wrought on us for evil: how that it has brought upon us every kind of blindness, imbecility of judgement, faint-heartedness, and sloth, and as we 'think thereon we weep bitterly.' Yet there is in it a mighty encouragement. We recognize that the immeasurable loss of which we are conscious is our own fault—that is, it may be made good. If it is not our fault, it is the Creator's fault; but that, though we often imply it in our murmurings, no one of us really believes. If we did we should go mad.

The reward—spiritual rapture and peace, which we impiously demand as a condition of obedience—is withheld from most of us in love—because our characters could not stand it. Faith tells us it is given. *ἐν πάντι εὐχαριστεῖτε.*

E. LYTTELTON.

HERBERT HOOVER, PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Enrolled am I, and shortly then
Must buckle on my sword;
A high employ, nor lightly given,
To serve as messenger of heaven.
—NEWMAN.

MY object is not to discuss the principles and aims of any Party platform, nor to consider the political issues of the day, but to present in a biographical way the outstanding characteristics of one of the most potent personalities in America—Herbert Hoover, President-Elect of the United States. A man's chief power does not lie in the words by which he expresses some definite policy of the Government, but in the indefinable power of personality which lies behind every word and deed, and is more generally known as character. In every election the thing that counts most is the personal equation: not whether a man be a Republican or a Democrat; but what sort of man is he? That is the question about which the electors are most concerned. To prove this the decision of the American people on November 6—when all Party lines were swept away, and even the 'solid' South, known to the world as deeply Democratic—elected Herbert Hoover as President of the United States of America for the next quadrennium with an overwhelming majority generally described here in the States as a 'landslide.'

Concerning the power of the President we are already conversant. There is not given to any other man in the world such unlimited power as is vested in the President of the United States of America. He is by virtue of his office commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy; he has the power to veto all bills not meeting with his approval; and, further, it is the privilege of the President to make official

appointments, with the approval of the Senate. Through the Secretary of Commerce the President's industrial and economic power is no less than his political possibility.

Herbert Hoover was born on a farm at West Branch, Iowa, August 10, 1874. His parents were Quakers, and the deeply spiritual influence which surrounded his childhood had much to do in the making of this great man. His mother was a Quaker preacher. To this faith Mr. Hoover has adhered all the days of his life. The Quaker meeting-house honoured America in the gift of one of her greatest sons. One readily recognizes his Quaker traits in his modest demeanour and averseness to the crowd. He was never a popular man in the general meaning of that term, but he has always been a strong force among men, exerting a silent, yet certain power.

One can see from the above how readily Mr. Hoover assimilated from early life all the elements that go to make up a self-made American. His father, a blacksmith by trade, died when Mr. Hoover was only six years of age; and thus with the death of his father came the great struggle for life. When only ten years of age he was taken to Oregon to live with an uncle. Here he attended the public school, and seven years later, in 1891, he matriculated in Leland Stanfor University, California, graduating from that institution four years later.

Mr. Hoover began his remarkable career as a mining engineer. After some practical experience in the gold-mines of California, he went to Australia in 1897 to do development work for a large mining company in that country. Later he went to China as a mining expert for the Chinese Government. Just previous to his going to China he married Miss Lou Henry of Monterey, California.

It was not in the mine, but among men and women and little children that Mr. Hoover was to find his great international opportunity. At the outbreak of the great World War in 1914 he was appointed High Commissioner of the

Belgian Relief work. Possibly no name, notwithstanding the noble character of King Albert and the worthy example of Cardinal Mercier, was dearer to the Belgians during those terrible days than the name of Herbert Hoover.

Once he would have hid himself during a public reception given to President Wilson at the close of the war. He stayed outside the hall until the President had received his great ovation, and then slipped around to the side door. As soon as he was recognized the crowd rose with cries: '*Vive Hoover! Vive Hoover!*' When America entered the war, Mr. Hoover became Food Administrator for the United States.

Notwithstanding the contributions made by the environment of the early childhood of this great American, it must be admitted, remembering his service in Australia, in China, and particularly in Europe, the world has had a large share in moulding his mind and fitting him for the great task that now lies before him. Mr. Hoover knows Europe as no other American.

Because of his broad sympathies with the British, he was accused during the heat and the confusion of the election campaign as being more British than American. It was reported that Senator Reed once declared: 'That he would rather vote for the Prince of Wales as President of the United States than for Herbert Hoover!' But, whatever may be the European view, or the opinion of a trifling minority in America, 'the sovereign people of the United States have given the highest honour and distinction that is within their power to bestow to Herbert Hoover.' In the election the President-Elect carried forty States out of the possible forty-eight, giving him four hundred and forty-four of the five hundred and thirty-one electoral votes. In the popular vote Mr. Hoover's plurality, tabulated two days after the election, was something over six million votes—and still many precincts had to be heard from. This upsets all previous records and makes all former majorities sink

into insignificance. The American mind is quite decided that Mr. Hoover is the man for the presidency.

That same engineering mind which in an earlier day put new life into old mines in Australia and in China will, we believe, show itself in every phase of his administration here in America. That he is an engineer shows itself everywhere. Though an unsuccessful candidate for the presidency in 1920, Mr. Harding called him to the Cabinet in 1921. When we remember the clear, discriminating character of his mind, his power to weigh matters and assimilate the best, when we recall his eight years of service in the President's Cabinet, we believe we are safe in saying that no other man ever came to the presidency with such careful and ample preparation.

Notwithstanding his cold, calculating mind, Mr. Hoover is thoroughly human. Concerning the great task set before us he recently remarked: 'Our purpose in this nation is to build a human society, not an economic system.' He recognizes clearly the moral and spiritual problems of the common people. In his acceptance speech he came out boldly in behalf of Prohibition; he said: 'Our country has deliberately undertaken a great social and economic experiment, noble in motive and far-reaching in purpose. It must be worked out constructively. I do not favour the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment.'

The spiritual undertone of the life of the President-Elect is everywhere evident. Returning to the speech from which we quoted above, we find these memorable words:

'In this land, dedicated to tolerance, we still find outbreaks of intolerance. I come of Quaker stock. My ancestors were persecuted for their beliefs. Here they sought and found religious freedom. By blood and conviction I stand for religious tolerance both in act and in spirit. The glory of our American ideals is the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.'

America may well anticipate a period of unparalleled development in her material resources; the opening of the deep waterways from the Great Lakes to the sea; the reorganizing of industry on the safe economic order of a new day; but there is coming to America, we believe, a larger spiritual opportunity in the leadership of the new President. After being assured of his election, Mr. Hoover said in his message to the American people:

'In this hour there can be no feeling of victory or exultation. Rather it imposes a sense of solemn responsibility of the future and of complete dependence upon divine guidance for the task which the greatest office of the world imposes. That task is to give the best within me to interpret the common sense and the ideals of the American people.'

Not only do we believe that the material prosperity and the spiritual uplift of the American people are assured in the election of Mr. Hoover, we have not the slightest doubt that the peace of Europe and the friendship of the world will be greatly enhanced because of his splendid spirit of international goodwill.

LEWIS KEAST.

THE RELIGIOUS PSYCHOLOGY OF THE PHEULS

THE migration of Mohammedan races from northern Africa southwards to districts which were totally animistic did not, until comparatively recent times, reach farther south than Lat. 15°, and, if such migration penetrated into districts lying south of this line, it was on too small a scale for an apparent conversion of its indigenous population. To obtain a clear idea of the growth of Mohammedanism in French West Africa, notably in Senegal and the French Sudan, and the gulf which lies between this faith and Animism, the subject must be looked upon from a commercial point of view.

Mohammedans, like Christians, are possessed with learning and business ability, which is almost non-existent in the Animist, and, on the arrival of the white man to the west coast of Africa and its interior, it was the Mohammedan from Muretania and the northern Sudan who journeyed westwards and southwards in order to transact business.

A large district, therefore, including parts of the French Sudan (High Volta), Senegal, and French Guinea, was overrun by Mohammedans, whose superior knowledge and craft, gained by contact with the civilized world, allowed them to usurp the rights of commerce, which, hitherto, had belonged exclusively to the Animist. The result was inevitable. Faced with extinction on the grounds of their religious beliefs, and the ostracism which followed, these people professed a conversion to Mohammedanism. This penetration and firm footing that Mohammedans obtained was instrumental in forcing the Animist to adopt a religion which was thrust upon him.

It frequently happens that when an Animist passes through a country inhabited by Mohammedans, they are refused both food and shelter. The result of this persecution is that these primitive people bow to a superior dictation in order to obtain the necessities of life. It is doubtful

whether the converted Animist of these religiously conquered districts have more than a very rudimentary knowledge of the religion that they have embraced, or that ninety per cent. of those who are seen daily kneeling in prayer know more than a few words of the Arabic language. It is certain that they can recite only a limited number of passages from the Koran, for the newly converted Animists (who constitute a large majority of Mohammedans in these districts) are but slaves to the natural laws of submission.

As an example of this hypocritical form of religion may be taken the intermingling of Moslem and Animistic beliefs of the Pheuls, who inhabit a large territory on the west side of the Niger, in the district lying west of Mopti. They appear from casual observation to be good Mohammedans, practise circumcision, visit Mecca, and conform to most of the Koranic precepts; yet beneath this Moslem veneer they are Animists at heart, firmly believing in the gross superstitions connected with witchcraft.

Among this tribe, as well as among others, wizards are credited with the power of metamorphosing at night-time into wild animals, which hunt and destroy their enemies, and will even inflict injuries on holy Mohammedans. These human animals hold cannibal feasts in the gloomy recesses of the woodlands, indicating their presence by weird noises. To counteract these dire machinations, they write passages from the Koran on strips of paper, which are either swallowed, or burnt and the fumes inhaled. When a child is baptized, a piece of wood, on which is written a verse of the Koran, is soaked in water. A drop of this water given to the child will bring everlasting happiness. Charms which are used against accidents and diseases, and to bring fortune in war, in the hunting-field, or on fishing expeditions, are made from pieces of cloth on which are inscribed texts from the Koran. Thus are the higher and lower forms of religion strangely fused together, and the Animistic substratum overlaid by Moslem veneer.

The Pheuls believe in a superior god, Allah, creator and ruler of all things. They invoke his blessing in all ceremonies, such as marriages, burials, and when sympathy is required. They believe also in spirits, corresponding to angels, who are credited with even greater power than Allah himself. The aid of these spirits is called in during all their ceremonies. It must not be thought that this newly adopted religion has instilled the belief of spirits into the minds of these people; rather that they still cling to the religion of their forefathers, which they conveniently mingle with the doctrines of Mohammedanism.

Some people affirm that Mohammedanism amongst the scattered tribes of French Central West Africa is sincere; I am unable to agree with this theory. My observations lead me to think that there is no backing behind this faith, which has been accepted only through dire necessity, and because it aptly suits the social requirements. It is easy to be led astray; one must not compare local Islamism to the universal faith.

Mohammedanism is very widespread among the Pheuls, and to the casual observer they appear to be devout in their belief. But those who have lived amongst them for any length of time will, by watching their actions in relation to their religious life, better understand their mentality, though, even to the closest observer, it is difficult to distinguish between 'religious life' and 'religious mentality.' Religion seems to disturb their mind organically rather than mentally, which shows itself by the depressing influence which it appears to exert. If you were to cross the path of the natives as they leisurely proceed to prayer, they would not move away from you, neither would they heed you if you addressed them. As they leave the mosque their faces are those of saints, and one might well say that they were possessed with a religious mania.

Among the Pheuls whom I have interrogated, the act of passing the hand in front of the face has no religious

signification, for they all perform this action to rub the dust away from the forehead. Though some people will strongly affirm that these signs are of religious emotion, I would prefer to think that they are but the characteristics of a race.

A French administrator once criticized some natives of the Tongue district. As soon as he had finished reprimanding them, they betook themselves to the mosque, where the usual prayers were said, following which, and still remaining in a sitting position, they listened to the words of a chief. Their serious countenances so struck the administrator that we listened to their conversation. The old chief was relating the story of his lost tooth. 'If that tooth could only talk,' remarked someone, 'it would tell a funny story.' 'Yes,' replied the chief, 'it would tell of all the hearts that I have broken, and the flavour of the kola nuts which have given me so many wives.' The little throng seated around the chief listened to his words with the same serious expression as it bore when listening to a sermon.

A belief exists among the Pheuls that their Prophet will give a large herd of camels to the man who, when he has finished his prayers, has thought of nothing but God. A story in connexion with this belief is that a man once nearly succeeded in obtaining the coveted prize, but unfortunately, when making his fourth and last prayer, he remembered that he had not sufficient rope with which to tie together so many beasts. This story is told with the same seriousness as is adopted in prayer, or when cracking a joke. I think, therefore, we may rightly assume that the minds operating behind these countenances are thinking of profane things, such as the tooth and the camels.

How much their serious attitude is natural, and not provoked by a true religious feeling, can best be solved by studying these people in their ordinary lives. Those who have come into close contact with these newly converted Animists will be adamant on one point. If their surroundings are cheerful and congenial, they are always mournful;

they view with the same air ridiculous statements and serious propositions; good news seems to cause them no joy, neither will bad news affect them.

There appears to be an absence of any higher motive or feeling behind their religious manifestations. Nothing external, either by word or action, allows us to understand a real happiness. Unlike the true Mohammedan, there are no phrases spoken by these people which denote reverence and devout love for their Creator. I have never seen the burning of incense, or a carpet in a mosque. Music is used at some of their religious ceremonies, but it points rather to assisting fetishism than to promoting sweet thoughts to Allah.

Some people find it difficult to believe that there is no sincerity in the hearts and minds of these natives. I am inclined to think that their act of worship is due more to vanity than to a spiritual feeling. If a man prays four times a day, it is because his father or uncle prayed four times a day before him, or because he sees every one around him performing the same act. Every action which these natives perform, no matter in what category it falls, is a part of their social life. It is by prayer-time that they count the hours of the day; it is by certain religious ceremonies that they know the month; and all important events in their lives, such as baptism, circumcision, marriage, and burial, are occasions for prayers and ceremonies. It is a greater sin to miss their prayer than to steal. I cannot agree that these people pray because they are religious, rather that they appear religious because they pray so much.

CURTIS LAMPSON.

'MEASURE FOR MEASURE' AND THE GOSPELS

I WISH to call attention to some close similarities of thought between certain passages and pivot ideas of this play and certain passages and ethical standards of the Gospels. This comparison is valuable both as interpreting the meaning of this great and too little known tragi-comedy and as illustrating Shakespeare's method of imparting at will a unique and peculiar intellectual or religious atmosphere to a single play.

Most of the great tragedies and tragi-comedies of Shakespeare have a characteristic religious tone. In *Lear* we are given a world pagan and stoic—yet somehow deeply religious; the *Winter's Tale* is set in an atmosphere of Hellenistic mythology; and *The Tempest* is a purely mystical play. Now, in these plays the religion is not imposed arbitrarily on an already chosen plot from purely historic considerations, though, at the same time, it never seriously clashes with historic truth: a careful attention will show that the plot and the religious viewpoint are interdependent—that the story illustrates the religious philosophy, the philosophy justifies or criticizes the story. This fact is important, and too often overlooked. Now in *Measure for Measure* we see a curiously interesting example of this Shakespearean method. The theme is ethical, the religious colouring orthodox. Isabella is a novice among 'the votarists of St. Clare'; the Duke disguises himself as a friar; orthodox reference and phraseology are percurrent in the play; and nowhere in Shakespeare—not even in *Hamlet*—is the Shakespearean fear and abhorrence of the orthodox teaching of spirit survival after death in time, and possibly too in eternal torment, expressed more poignantly than here:

> *Claudio*:
> Aye, but to die, and go we know not where;
> To lie in cold obstruction and to rot;

This sensible warm motion to become
A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
In thrilling region of thick-ribbed ice;
To be imprison'd in the viewless winds,
And blown with restless violence round about
The pendent world; or to be worse than worst
Of those that lawless and uncertain thoughts
Imagine howling: 'tis too horrible!
The weariest and most loathed worldly life
That age, ache, penury, and imprisonment
Can lay on nature is a paradise
To what we fear of death.

But the religion of the play goes deeper than the forms and conventional intellectual symbols of orthodox eschatology. The play is primarily a problem play of ethics: and the ethics are those of pure Christianity. There is no more beautiful passage in Shakespeare on the matter of Christian redemption than Isabella's lines to Angelo (II. ii. 72):

Isabella:

Alas! alas!
Why, all the souls that were, were forfeit once;
And He, that might the vantage best have took,
Found out the remedy: How would you be,
If He, which is the top of judgement, should
But judge you as you are? O, think on that;
And mercy then will breathe within your lips,
Like man new made.

The same thought had been expressed before by Shakespeare in *The Merchant of Venice:*

. . . We do pray for mercy;
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy

—which shows the kinship of this Shakespearean idea with that in the Lord's Prayer:

And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

The theme of *Measure for Measure*, as its very name implies, is that of Matthew vii. 1:

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

The whole play turns, and is meant to turn, on this thought: and, when this fact is realized, what has been often termed a difficult and inconsequent play becomes a perfect artistic symbolism or dramatic pattern of this central idea—the crudity of conventional justice. Man has no right to judge his neighbour, since he is himself a sinner. This truth is rooted in the gospel ethics, and in this play: so it is not surprising that there should be numerous points of contact between their ideas and phraseology. For instance, here are the Duke's lines to the ascetic Angelo (I. i. 27) on the imperative need to make active use of virtue for the benefit of the world:

Duke:

Angelo,
There is a kind of character in thy life,
That to the observer doth thy history
Fully unfold: Thyself and thy belongings
Are not thine own so proper, as to waste
Thyself upon thy virtues, they on thee.
Heaven doth with us as we with torches do;
Not light them for themselves; for if our virtues
Did not go forth of us, 'twere all alike
As if we had them not. Spirits are not finely touch'd,
But to fine issues, nor Nature never lends
The smallest scruple of her excellence,
But, like a thrifty goddess, she determines
Herself the glory of a creditor,
Both thanks and use.

Compare the general thought, and especially the 'torch' metaphor, in Shakespeare with the words from the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew v. 14):

Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid.

Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light unto all that are in the house.

Shakespeare compares Nature to 'a creditor' lending money. The similarity to the Parable of the Talents in Matthew xxv. 14 is obvious:

For the Kingdom of Heaven is as a man travelling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.

The sequel is too well known to need quotation.

Now the attitude of Jesus to sexual sin is identical with that expressed in many passages of *Measure for Measure*. Here are Jesus's words (Matthew v. 27):

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery:
But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.

And Escalus addresses Angelo as follows (II. i. 8):

Escalus:
Let but your honour know
(Whom I believe to be most straight in virtue),
That, in the working of your own affections,
Had time cohered with place, or place with wishing,
Or that the resolute acting of your blood,
Could have attain'd the effect of your own purpose,
Whether you had not, some time in your life,
Err'd in this point, which now you censure him,
And pull'd the law upon you.

Angelo's reply is sound sense:

Angelo:
'Tis one thing to be tempted, Escalus,
Another thing to fall.

But it is not the sense of Jesus's teaching. Or, again, compare Jesus's words to the scribes and Pharisees concerning the woman 'taken in adultery' (John viii. 7):

He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her,

with Isabella's prayer to Angelo (II. ii. 136):

Isabella:
. . . Go to your bosom;
Knock there; and ask your heart, what it doth know
That's like my brother's fault: if it confess
A natural guiltiness, such as is his,
Let it not sound a thought upon your tongue
Against my brother's life.

The thoughts in these and other such passages are directed against self-conscious and self-protected righteousness: against the narrowness and self-deception of pharisaical pride. And the play throughout emphasizes the fact that a man who has no illusions as to his own weakness should find it impossible to judge and condemn others. Modern psychology, with its theories of 'sublimation,' tends to bring all human endeavour in substance down to the same level: and, though the distinction between high and low values in moral conduct cannot be invalidated by science, yet the psycho-analyst has much to teach the Pharisee which is salutary for him to remember.

The thought of *Measure for Measure* is in this respect eminently modern. The Duke starts the action of the play by resigning his power to Angelo. His rule has been lax, and he early asserts that one reason for his action is a desire to see order restored. But he suggests that other reasons lie behind. And a careful reading of the play puts his primary motives for his own resignation and the temporary installing of Angelo in power beyond question. Escalus tells us (III. ii. 247) that the Duke was

> One that, above all other strifes, contended especially to know himself.

That is the secret of the Duke's action. His rule has been lax only because meditation and self-analysis have shown him that all the passions and sins of other men reflect identical images in his own soul. To such a philosopher government and so-called 'justice' may begin to appear as a mockery, and become abhorrent. So he performs the experiment of handing the reins of government to a man of ascetic purity, who has an hitherto invulnerable faith in the rightness and justice of his own ideals—a man of spotless reputation and self-conscious integrity. The scheme is in the nature of a plot, or trap. The Duke engineers a scientific experiment

) see if the extreme ascetic righteousness of an Angelo ill stand the test of power:

> . . . Hence shall we see,
> If power change purpose, what our seemers be.
> (I. iv. 58.)

ngelo may find he is not what he seems—even to himself. ngelo is not shown to us as a conscious hypocrite: rather as man whose primary fault is self-deception, a man who ver guesses the shallowness of his ideals, till, with exquisite sight and artistry, he is represented as falling a prey to his vn love of purity. It is the very chastity and purity of abella that snares his æsthetic and erotic sense and ruthsly reveals his weakness. He himself cries:

> O cunning enemy, that, to catch a saint,
> With saints dost bait thy hook!
> (II. ii. 180.)

The Duke, disguised as a friar, moves through the play—dark figure, directing, watching, and moralizing on the tions of the other characters. As the play progresses id his plot on Angelo works, he begins to assume a certain ysterious dignity, and we cease to look on him as merely e studious and unpractical governor who has proved mself incapable of office: rather he enjoys the power of a ospero, to whom he shows many points of similarity, ving the same solemn and controlling destiny to play, d, like him, appearing to voice the considered utterance the author. Like Prospero, too, he begins to assume thin the dramatic universe almost divine proportions. e is once actually compared to the Supreme Power; at e end of the play (v. i. 871) Angelo addresses him thus:

> O my dread lord,
> I should be guiltier than my guiltiness,
> To think I can be undiscernible,
> When I perceive your grace, like power divine,
> Hath look'd upon my passes.

But we are prepared for this long before. In the rhymed octosyllabic couplets of the Duke's soliloquy in III. ii. there is a distinct other-worldly note, forecasting the rhymed mysticism of the final plays. He has been talking to Escalus and the Provost, and dismisses them, in his capacity of friar, and with a definite suggestion—to me at all events—of something even more authentic, with the words:

Peace be with you!

They leave him and he soliloquizes:

He, who the sword of heaven will bear,
Should be as holy as severe;
Pattern in himself to know,
Grace to stand, and virtue go;
More nor less to others paying,
Than by self-offences weighing.
Shame to him, whose cruel striking
Kills for faults of his own liking!
Twice treble shame on Angelo,
To weed my vice, and let his grow!
O, what may man within him hide,
Though angel on the outward side!
How may likeness, made in crimes,
Making practice on the times,
Draw with idle spiders' strings
Most pond'rous and substantial things.
Craft against vice I must apply:
With Angelo to-night shall lie
His old betrothed, but despis'd;
So disguise shall, by the disguis'd,
Pay with falsehood false exacting,
And perform an old contracting.

This fine soliloquy gives us the Duke's philosophy—the philosophy that prompted that original plan which set the play's action in motion. And it is important to notice the mystical, prophetic tone of the speech. The Duke is the prophet of a new order of ethics: so was Jesus.[1] That

[1] I do not imply that the Duke's views on matters of theology and eschatology are orthodox. The Duke's ethics are truly Christian: his 'faith' vague (see his speech on death, III. i. 5). Whereas Isabella's faith is orthodox, but her views on morality almost as pharisaical as Angelo's.

new order, however, is still waiting to be put in universal practice. This aspect of the Duke as teacher and prophet is also illustrated by his cryptic utterance to Escalus just before this soliloquy (III. ii. 226):

Escalus: Good even, good father.

Duke: Bliss and goodness on you.

Escalus: Of whence are you?

Duke: Not of this country, though my chance is now
To use it for my time: I am a brother
Of gracious order, late come from the See,
In special business from His Holiness.

Escalus: What news abroad i' the world?

Duke: None, but that there is so great a fever on goodness that the dissolution of it must cure it: novelty is only in request; and it is as dangerous to be aged in any kind of course, as it is virtuous to be constant in any undertaking. There is scarce truth enough alive, to make societies secure; but security enough, to make fellowships accurst: much upon this riddle runs the wisdom of the world. This news is old enough, yet it is every day's news. I pray you, sir, of what disposition was the Duke?

Escalus: One that, above all other strifes, contended especially to know himself.

This remarkable speech, with its deliberate, incisive, cryptic sentences, has a quality and purpose deeper than the purely dramatic, except in so far as a moral purpose is purely dramatic to the chief moralizer in a moral problem play. It represents the considered utterance of Shakespeare's judgement at one period, and from a certain deliberately assumed point of view, on conventional systems of justice. Its expanded paraphrase runs thus:

No news, but that goodness is suffering such a disease that a complete dissolution of it (goodness) is needed to cure it. That is, our whole system of conventional ethics should be destroyed and rebuilt. A change (novelty) never gets beyond request—that is, is never actually put in practice. And it is as dangerous to continue indefinitely a worn-out system or order of government, as it is praiseworthy to be constant in any individual undertaking. There is scarcely enough knowledge of human nature current in the world to make societies safe; but ignorant self-confidence (i.e. in matters of justice) enough to make human intercourse within a society a

miserable thing. This riddle holds the key to the wisdom of the world (probably, both the false wisdom of the unenlightened and the true wisdom of great teachers). This news is old enough, and yet the need for its understanding sees daily proof.

I have paraphrased freely, admittedly interpreting difficulties in the light of the recurring philosophy of this play on the blindness of men's moral judgements, and especially in the light of the Duke's personal moral attitude as read from his other words and actions. This speech remains, however, difficult. And yet, somehow, that does not affect its authoritative power: it is of the order of Jesus's words, whose force can carry conviction even when their meaning is obscure. It holds the poetry of ethics: I think, too, that its content, as I have paraphrased it, is very close to the gospel teaching: the insistence on the blindness of the world, its habitual disregard of the truth, exposed by prophet and teacher:

> And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. (John iii. 19.)

The same almost divine suggestion rings in many of the Duke's measured prose utterances. There are his supremely beautiful words to Escalus (IV. ii. 219):

> Look, the unfolding star calls up the shepherd. Put not yourself into amazement how these things should be: all difficulties are but easy when they are known.

The first lovely sentence—one of the unique beauties of Shakespearean prose, in a style peculiar to this play—derives part of its beauty from New Testament associations; and the second sentence has some—not very close—Gospel similarities, among them Matthew x. 26:

> . . . for there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed; and hid that shall not be known.

The Duke exercises the authority of a teacher throughout

his disguise as a friar. He speaks authoritatively on prayer to Juliet (II. iii. 29):

Duke:

. . . But lest you do repent,
As that the sin hath brought you to this shame—
Which sorrow is always towards ourselves, not heaven;
Showing, we'd nor spare heaven as we love it,
But as we stand in fear—

Juliet:

I do repent me, as it is an evil,
And take the shame with joy.

Duke:

There rest.

After rebuking Pompey the bawd very sternly, but not unkindly, he concludes:

Go mend, go mend (III. ii. 28),

which is paralleled by Jesus's words to the woman taken in adultery (John viii. 11):

Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

Both are more kindly disposed towards honest impurity than light and frivolous scandalmongers, such as Lucio, or pharisaic self-righteousness, such as Angelo's. Of all the people in the play who need his forgiveness, the Duke finds it hardest of all to forgive Lucio, the slanderer and foul-minded wit. In Matthew xii. 86, we have:

But I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgement;

which is exactly what Lucio is brought up against at the end of the play.

The Duke, like Jesus, moves among men suffering grief at their sins and deriving joy from an unexpected flower of simple goodness in the deserts of impurity and hardness. He finds softness of heart where he least expects it—in the Provost of the prison (IV. ii. 89):

Duke:

This is a gentle provost: seldom when
The steeled jailer is the friend of men.

So, too, Jesus finds in the centurion,

> A man under authority, having soldiers under me . . .
> (Matthew viii. 9.)

a simple faith where he least expects it:

> . . . I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.

The two incidents are very similar in quality.

Shakespeare, in writing this play, analyses conventional ethics and employs a truly modern psychological knowledge in the process. He criticizes rigid conventions from the viewpoint of the pure and uncontaminated Christianity of the Gospels. The pivot of the play is the testing and fall of Angelo, the typical Pharisee. And yet we must remember that Angelo is not drawn as a self-conscious hypocrite: rather as a man whose chief faults are self-deception and pride in his own righteousness—an unused and delicate instrument quite useless when tested in the world of action. Angelo does not know himself and his own weakness: no one receives so great a shock and surprise as he does when temptation overthrows his virtue. Intellectual ethics are not enough. Angelo, we hear, represses his instincts: 'scarce confesses that his blood flows' (I. iii. 51). But one must learn to know oneself better than an Angelo, and, instead of trying to direct one's whole soul and nature and the deepest instincts of man by means of a minor faculty, instead of trying, to use the Duke's words (III. ii. 289),

> To draw with idle spiders' strings
> Most pond'rous and substantial things,

rather one should let all one's actions and thoughts be the true poetry of life, in the sense of Keats's definition of poetry, 'The spontaneous utterance of a complete being.' The lesson of the play is that expressed in Matthew v. 20:

> For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

The Duke's plot thus works to perfection, and he finds his original theories of the crudeness of justice—those theories that caused his rule to appear lax—justified. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' Naturally the Duke—the prophet, like Jesus, of a new order of ethics—cannot finally condemn Angelo for falling into his own trap and proving correct his own theory that, in view of the subtlety and complexity of our natures, punishment between man and man is unjustifiable! And yet this forgiveness of Angelo has provoked adverse criticism. Any other ending would hopelessly disjoint the whole logic of this most logical of Shakespeare's plays: the whole purpose of the play—which is throughout developed with a fine consistency—falls. And, if we cannot easily forgive Angelo, there is someone who can. Mariana, who loves Angelo, sees no fault in him, or, rather, recognizes none of his actions as of any consequence:

> *Mariana:*
> . . . O my dear lord,
> I crave no other, nor no better man.
> (v. i. 430.)

Love asks no questions and knows no evil: its radiance transfigures alike the just and the unjust. This is the purest and finest ethical touch in this masterpiece of ethical problem plays. It is, too, the ultimate splendour of Jesus's teaching.

I have called *Measure for Measure* a 'Problem play on the matter of Christian ethics.' Perhaps I ought to limit this with the qualification: 'as applied to sexual vice.' Now, I do not base my argument on parallels such as those I have quoted in this essay. Personally, I had decided this to be the key to the play's nature and intention before ever I thought of writing down parallel phrases. Such parallel phrases should be considered merely as signposts: their ultimate value, in and for themselves, is negligible. I have no wish to show that Shakespeare had been recently

studying the New Testament (though its influence must have been at work) when he wrote *Measure for Measure*, even could that be inferred. Rather, I would regard these few notes as an introduction to a somewhat clearer view of one of Shakespeare's finest plays—a view which will see it as illustrating an ethical and psychological problem. It has been called 'incoherent,' 'perplexing'; it has often been considered as unduly gloomy and harsh. None of these epithets are altogether just if we regard it as a deliberate and carefully planned—almost scientific—analysis of man's moral nature. This will illuminate not certain isolated passages alone, but the whole purpose and movement of the play, including all the scenes, comic or tragic. For *Measure for Measure* introduces us into a purely ethical universe, where every one criticizes or is criticized: and this prepossession with moral problems extends from the Duke to the lowest of the characters.

The problem of the play is, in essence, that of Christian ethics. Now, that does not prove that Shakespeare was at all times a firm believer in the orthodox faith, any more than *King Lear* proves him at all times a pagan, or *The Tempest* a mystic who from his earliest days had known the final mystic vision of humanity which is there expressed. Rather, we should see that in this play Shakespeare deliberately gives dramatic form to what he knows to be the truth of man's moral nature, and leaves us at the end with more insight than advice. The Duke at the end of the play is little farther on in practical wisdom than he was at the beginning. He finds his leniency morally justified—indeed, now more than ever a moral imperative. But we do not hear what was to happen to the State. At the outset we know from the Duke that, owing to his lax rule,

> Liberty plucks justice by the nose.
> (I. iii. 29.)

We are left to wonder as to the future of Vienna. Nor is that a weakness. A problem play, as its name implies,

leaves us with a question: if it goes beyond those limits, it ceases to be a problem play. In the interpretation of Shakespeare we should be prepared to regard *Measure for Measure* and *Troilus and Cressida*—and, I should add, *Hamlet*—as questions; and the supreme tragedies, from *Macbeth* to *Antony and Cleopatra*, as statements. Now the statement of tragedy is always supremely hard to explicate in terms other than itself; but it is there, all the same. With a problem play, however, the difficulty is less. Here I have tried to suggest, within a small space, the essential problem of *Measure for Measure*. I have not attempted a detailed analysis, and have only quoted sparingly, and then mostly to illustrate the curious relation of this play to the Gospels. But, I think, a careful study of the whole will reveal its essential nature and purpose to be such as I have indicated.

G. WILSON KNIGHT.

CURIOSITIES OF A MEDIAEVAL EPISCOPAL REGISTER

THE register of John de Grandisson, the famous Bishop of Exeter, who held the see from 1327 to 1369, contains historical information of much interest. Appointed by papal provision at the early age of thirty-five, a man of undaunted courage and the highest principles, aghast at the vice, indiscipline, and disorder prevalent in his vast diocese, Grandisson found himself in conflict with the Archbishop, the Earl of Devon, the Cathedral authorities, the monasteries, the Archdeacons, the Consistory Court, and the Collegiate Churches.

The story of his brave and determined efforts is a long one. It is sufficient to say now that the Bishop's dominant will and high character bore him to a victory as great as could be achieved under such adverse conditions.

The most cursory examination of the register reveals the fact that between Grandisson's days and our own there is a great gulf fixed. The whole outlook of the moral and religious world has changed, and, when we read of the violence, superstition, and immorality of that time, we cannot doubt that it has changed for the better. There still, however, remains that challenge to the divine ordering of the world which was often made in mediaeval times, and has defied in all ages every demonstration of reason and philosophy. Witches, magicians, necromancers, were found among the Egyptians, the Jews, the Babylonians. Soothsaying, divination, and magic flourished in classical days; they were encountered in full swing by St. Paul at Ephesus; they still thrive in astrology, palmistry, crystal-gazing, and pyramidical interpretations. These superstitions take various forms, but all of them are founded on the weakness and credulity of human nature. In the Middle Ages every

variety of such extravagances obtained a ready acceptance. Thus Shakespeare writes:

> They say this town is full of cozenage
> As nimble jugglers that deceive the eye,
> Some killing witches that deform the body
> And many such libertines of sin.

In 1848, Grandisson wrote to the Official of the Archdeacon of Totnes and two Vicars about Margery Ryvel, styled by him 'an accursed woman.' He had previously charged her with the seduction of many residents in his diocese by her 'sorceries, superstitions, and delusions.' He had felt compelled, so he declared, utterly to extirpate the black art. He had cited Margery to appear before him; she had treated his mandate with contempt, and he had then issued a sentence of excommunication. He now desired the Archdeacon and the two Vicars publicly to denounce her as an excommunicate in their churches at High Mass. No one was to associate with such a sorceress, far less to consult her or ask her any questions.

The action of Grandisson may be usefully compared with that of Stafford, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, in a similar case. The latter's register not only shows that sorcery was still in full vigour nearly a hundred years later, but goes more into detail, and states the kind of nostrums which these so-called sorceresses supplied and the superstitious beliefs of ill-educated people which rendered their profession possible.

Agnes Hancock, of Montacute, was brought before the Bishop's Consistory Court on charges of sorcery and witchcraft, which she then declared to be unfounded. The Bishop's representative, evidently trying to do his best for the woman as well as for the complainants, fixed a day for her purgation. A jury of trustworthy matrons was chosen to try the case, and there is no reason to suppose that they acted unfairly. Agnes failed to obtain her purgation, and a penance was imposed by the Judge of the Court. The

simplicity of those who had regarded her as infallible, and tried her remedies, is indeed astonishing. They had believed that, by inspecting the skirt or girdle of any sufferer, she was able to say when an illness started and to give its cause, and that, by the same method, she could tell whether the patient would recover or die. She had declared her ability, by blessing girdles or other raiment, to restore the sick to health, perhaps only when she had not predicted their death. The evidence showed a current belief that boys could be hurt by spirits of the air, 'commonly called feyry,' and that under the more potent spells of Agnes these injuries could be cured, for with these spirits she held converse, and from them she sought advice. Convicted by the Court though she was, the prophetess pursued her old courses, and was summoned before the Bishop himself, who questioned her about her remedies. He was informed that they consisted of certain prayers. The Bishop then requested her to recite them, and, on listening closely, he noticed a jargon of foreign and unknown words which Agnes pronounced, untranslatable into the vulgar tongue. Desiring not to be 'untender' to one whom he probably regarded as somewhat deranged, the Bishop discharged Agnes and remitted the penance, after he had obtained from her an assurance that she would retire from her medical practice. He had probably heard many such stories before, and must have left the 'hall of judgement' with a humorous smile on his lips, a twinkle in his eye, and a sense of pity for human weakness in his heart. The calm and philosophical attitude of this Bishop shows an intellectual outlook much in advance of that of Grandisson, who supposed that the witches of his time were under Satanic influence.

Marriage, in mediaeval times, was under the control of the Church, which was able to inflict penances on unfaithful partners. Husbands and wives who had grievances against one another could apply to the Bishop for redress or a solution of their difficulties. It was, moreover, in his power to

rant what was then known as a divorce, but his sentence as equivalent only to what is now known as a judicial paration. To the Pope alone belonged the right of dis-lving a marriage, and thus enabling the divorced to re-arry, as Henry VIII found to his cost. As a rule, if there ere anything like a reasonable case, the Pontiff seems to ave been pleasantly compliant, but papal divorce was an pensive luxury, so that a person divorced may well have id, 'With a great sum obtained I this freedom.'

A most interesting case of the dissolution of a marriage by e Pope is mentioned in Grandisson's register. It resulted om one of the child marriages only too common in former mes. These were usually due to the mutual desire of the arents on both sides to be first in the field and prevent an igible partner from becoming the prize of others. Such a ild marriage as this was contracted in the reign of Edward I between Richard, Earl of Arundel, whose father was beheaded in the reign of Edward II, and Isabella, daughter Hugh le Despenser, children of proud and dominant milies. The bridegroom was seven years old at the time his marriage; the bride had reached the more mature age eight. When Richard was a few years older, and the day hen he was to begin married life drew nigh, he shrank from e prospect, and loudly protested. He had been driven, said, into the marriage before he understood what he was ing. He did not like his bride, and wished to have thing more to do with her. Parents and guardians in the iddle Ages were not to be trifled with. We read in the ston letters of a lady of birth and breeding 'breaking her ughter's head in several places,' and Lady Jane Grey was bjected to 'nips and bobs,' as well as to more severe rporal chastisement, by her august parents, the Duke and uchess of Suffolk. We can easily understand, therefore, w, at a much earlier period, Richard's resistance was likely be received. It was met with threats and blows, and, for e moment, his guardians were victorious. Though a son

was born to him, Richard, when he grew a little older, was now better able to defend himself, defied those who flouted his wishes and put him to shame, and resolu declined to live with Isabella any longer. He found lady equally willing to break up the partnership. couple only too plainly did not fulfil Horace's terse desc tion of happy wedlock:

> Felices ter et amplius,
> Quos irrupta tenet copula, nec malis
> Divulsus querimoniis
> Suprema citius solvet amor die.[1]

The ill-assorted pair determined, no doubt after anx consultation together, to make a joint appeal to the reig Pontiff for a dissolution of their brief and unhappy r riage. Clement VI, to whom their petition was addre was a Frenchman living in a profusion of luxury at Avig not in the least likely to reject a reasonable request w carried with it heavy fees to the papal exchequer. Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Chich were appointed by him as papal judges to decide the q tion. The decision at length arrived, and those w marriage had shown so little signs of 'linked sweetness drawn out' bade one another a long farewell, and Isa disappears from the horizon. Three months later, in presence of King Edward III and Queen Philippa, a r riage was celebrated in the royal chapel, and by the r wish, between Richard, Earl of Arundel, and Eleanor, w of Lord Beaumont, and daughter of the Earl of Lanca great-grandson of Henry III.

Richard's wave-tossed ship was not, however, in har even now, for a new difficulty presented itself and a f

---

[1] Blest are those,
Thrice and again, in union close,
Whom bond unbroken doth continue,
Nor, riv'n by jealousies malign,
Shall love their spirits disenthral
Before the final day of all.
—Hor., *Car.* i 13. Trans. by Sewell.

knot had to be untied. The bride and bridegroom found they had not been married lawfully on account of a fictitious consanguinity which formed part of the Canon law. On the one hand, all a husband's wife's relations were reckoned as his relations in the same degree; on the other, even distant cousins were not permitted to marry. Now the Earl's former wife was the first cousin of Eleanor, his new bride, on her mother's side, and a more distant cousin on her father's side. It followed, from the law of consanguinity, that, in marrying Eleanor, Richard was espousing his cousin, and that he had committed an illegal and uncanonical act. The trouble was serious, but happily there was the usual *Deus ex machina* to appeal to, with every chance of success. Clement VI was again approached, and asked, 'out of the apostolic goodness of his heart,' 'pitifully' to grant a dispensation and to declare any offspring legitimate. The Pope apparently showed no reluctance whatever to sanction the breach of Canon law which had been committed, and the actual words which fell from his lips are recorded in the register. 'Fiat,' said the Pope; but while thus granting the petition, and ordering that the Diocesan should declare the dispensation, he commanded a temporary separation, a 'good penance,' and the 'founding and endowing by the Earl of three chapels in the parish church of his principal seat.'

The reader may remember that a child marriage similar to that described took place between the son of Edward IV, the Duke of York, the younger of the princes afterwards murdered in the Tower, and Anne, only child and heiress of John Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk.

The question of the provision of education in the later Middle Ages is a large and difficult one; but modern research has revealed the certainty that all classes were far better educated than was formerly supposed. The Universities, the Cathedral bodies, the Collegiate Churches, a few of the monasteries, and some among the parish priests, supplied a

good deal of the teaching power. But, in addition, there were numerous grammar schools, founded and endowed sometimes by gilds, sometimes by private individuals, which performed a useful work, and were often a means of lifting boys of ability to a higher social position at little or no cost to themselves. Like similar schools of the present day, these ancient grammar schools must have varied very much in the quality of the teaching and in the results produced. Then, doubtless, as now, there were schools which performed that mission admirably; then, as now, there must have been schools that were grossly inefficient.

Grandisson seems to have been a stern critic of the Cornish grammar schools, and expressed his opinion of them with considerable vigour. He addressed a letter, in 1862, to his four Archdeacons and their officials, commanding them to issue, each in his Archdeaconry, his complaints and instructions to the masters and instructors of these schools. The Bishop maintained that these pedagogues were following a 'heathenish and preposterous method of teaching' in their schools. It was true that the boys were taught the Lord's Prayer, the Angelical Salutation, the Creed, Matins, the Hours of the Blessed Virgin, and other essentials of the faith, in the Latin tongue. They had, however, been learning, as we should say, like parrots. The Bishop had discovered, to his regret, that they could not construe a single sentence, nor decline a noun, nor name the tenses of a verb. In this benighted state, when they had scarcely a scrap of the preliminary knowledge required to make such study of the slightest value, they were most absurdly packed off to con school books of Latin verse. Grandisson concluded his attack with the expression of his determination to admit no candidates to lesser orders for the future who had not been properly taught, and who were not able to translate intelligently and to answer grammatical questions.

It would seem that monastic statutes, or the interpretation of them, often required that 'scholars' attending

outside schools should be provided with meals; this was probably a far more usual practice than any attempt at education by the monks themselves, except in the song schools existing in the principal monasteries. In 1342, Grandisson had many and grievous charges to make against Launceston Priory. The books were wrecks, the vestments torn and dirty, drinking prevailed, hounds were kept, and many enormities disgraced the institution. All the charities regularly distributed in former years had ceased and been embezzled. The Bishop ordered a complete and radical reform, demanding that the prior and monks should entertain daily at table in their 'hall,' not only destitute old people, but poor 'scholars' engaged in the study of grammar.

Grandisson severely rebuked the scandalous conduct of the officiants at the services in Exeter Cathedral, maintaining that many of the large and unwieldy staff of Canons were 'mercenaries, if not actual robbers.' They fleeced the Church of the payments in money and kind for services which were not rendered. They were for ever rushing off from the city on some pretext or other; sometimes they were bawling after dogs, sometimes flying hawks. It is true that they were so good as now and then to condescend to put in an appearance in their stalls. But what was their conduct when they were there? They chattered and mumbled together, and rattled through the Canonical Hours, getting in their tags of gossip in the midst of them and often scampering out before the conclusion of the service, as if the less they had of it the better. They neglected the duty of hospitality; they were constant in nothing but drawing their pay and allowances. Such, said the Bishop, was the conduct of Canons Residentiary, whose residence consisted in spending their nights away from the city and the Cathedral. Grandisson had a word to say about the Vicars Choral. They would do well to keep out of inns, and to avoid other unseemly conduct, if they wished to 'escape divine and canonical vengeance.'

Having found so much that was disgraceful in his primary visitation of the Cathedral, the Bishop proceeded to give directions for the future. Such Canons as were priests were ordered to minister devoutly, in due order, at Mass and the Canonical Hours. Those Canons who were not as yet priests were to obtain that office within a year. Adequate service books must be provided, corresponding with one another both in notation and text. The beauty of the Psalter must no longer be marred by the jumbling of one verse with another; but the clergy must keep together, and make the proper pauses in the middle, and at the end of each verse. The non-residence of Canons was a gross abuse, and they were exhorted to remember that 'the daily and quarterly distributions' received by them were due only when they performed their duties as Canons, were present at the common dinner, and exercised hospitality.

Two years later the Bishop had occasion again to denounce the conduct of the Vicars Choral, which he said offended God, spoilt the services, and tended to the damnation of the officiants. Their bursts of coarse and unseemly laughter, and their utterly irreverent conduct, shocked those who were present at the Cathedral services. Their contempt of all that was holy was manifest in every form; he would proceed to specify one or two of the outrages daily committed. Vicars Choral present in the choir at Matins, and holding candles, deliberately threw the grease and snuff on the heads of others standing beneath them, to raise a laugh at their expense, with the probable effect of provoking the enmity of their victims. Others mimicked and ridiculed the unrefined pronunciation or indifferent singing of those who were less cultivated than themselves. They did not hesitate to call aloud in English to the officiating priest to get on faster and not waste their time. Some began one office, some another; one sang a different antiphon from his neighbour; and all the time they were wrangling and disputing. The services became a bundle of incoherencies; every one did

what was right in his own eyes. What else could be expected? Their bodies were indeed in the choir, but their hearts were in the market, the street, their beds—anywhere except at church. The Bishop held the threat of dismissal over these Hophnis and Phinehases of his time, unless such conduct immediately ceased, and unless they performed their duties properly.

In 1360, Grandisson had to complain of the celebration of the mummery of the Boy-Bishop, at the feast of the Holy Innocents, not only in Exeter Cathedral, but in three of the Collegiate Churches of his diocese. On such occasions, as Warton tells us in his *History of English Poetry*, one of the children of the choir, completely apparelled in the episcopal vestments, with a mitre and crozier, bore the title and state of a Bishop and exacted canonical obedience from his fellows, who were dressed like priests. The Bishop denounced these parodies as 'idle and insulting entertainments,' and as a mockery of religion, as indeed they were. The vestments used, he said, were carelessly handled, stained, and spoilt. The *profanum vulgus* often broke out into fits of noisy laughter, and gave themselves over to jest and frolic. How disgraceful it was, the Bishop reflected, that religion should thus be made a laughing-stock, and something not far removed from blasphemy committed! And how deplorable that such performances should take place at a season always regarded by religious people as invested with a special solemnity, and in the midst of the Canonical Offices, and even during Mass!

There seems, indeed, to have been little excuse for such performances in Exeter Cathedral, when, even in those days, the ancient city possessed a theatre, which Grandisson calls 'the theatre of our city.' The vast jurisdictional powers in his possession extended to this theatre, and, as in other matters, so here, he acted vigorously, when he thought it his duty to put forth his strength. In August 1352 he wrote to the Archdeacon of Exeter to the effect that he had heard

that a play was to be performed in the theatre on the very next Sunday, in ridicule and caricature of the Gild of Cordwainers, or Shoemakers. The Bishop declared that, if this farce were brought on the stage, the shoemakers would inevitably retaliate, and serious breaches of the 'King's peace' would occur. For these reasons he instructed the Archdeacon to circulate his prohibition of the performance.

At the same time, Grandisson was quite alive to the fact that results do not occur without causes, and that the shoemakers must have done something to provoke such a feeling against them as was designed to find expression in this play. He discovered it in the current price of boots, which was quite a topic in the city. The shoemakers 'had been imperilling their souls' by trying to wrest the very last farthing for their footwear out of an indignant and long-suffering public.

It was not to be wondered at that when people were so cheated they should seek such means of showing their displeasure, and try to annoy the men who raided their pockets. Had Shakespeare lived in his time, the Bishop might have added that the shoemakers of Exeter

> like soldiers, armed in their stings,
> Made boot upon the summer's velvet buds.

Believing that the shoemakers were 'out for loot,' he bade the Archdeacon to urge them, and to impress on all the Vicars of the Exeter churches also to urge them, to adhere strictly to the prices fixed by the King and his Council. Such prices of goods, as is well known, were ordered by royal authority after the enormous rise in the cost of labour which followed the Black Death. Ralph, Bishop of Bath and Wells, and doubtless many other Bishops, issued similar injunctions to artizans, but without appreciable result.

This was not the only occasion on which trouble arose in

connexion with the Exeter theatre. Four years before, the inhabitants had been startled and frightened by the appearance of an extraordinary fraternity, styling itself the Fraternity of Brothelyngham, consisting, in the opinion of the Bishop, of men who made 'a mockery of religion.' The fraternity posed as a religious order, and placed at its head 'a lunatic and dotard' who claimed to be the Abbot. The theatre was hired, and there the forms of the institution of the Abbot took place. He was vested in monkish dress, enthroned, and treated as a 'kind of idol.'

A few days afterwards, the citizens of Exeter were astonished to hear the blasts of a horn echoing through the city and proceeding from the neighbourhood of the theatre. They were dumbfounded at what followed. The blare of the horn was but the signal for an orgy of disorder and terrorism by the fraternity and its allies. The 'monks,' reinforced by a host of followers, some mounted, others on foot, made their way quickly through the streets of Exeter. Though the inhabitants doubtless made their way into places of security as quickly as possible, many of them were seized and taken prisoners. Others were dragged from their homes, and not one of those taken was allowed to depart until he had propitiated his captors with a specified sum of money. The fraternity apologized for their violence by saying that no harm was intended. Nothing had been done, they said, to which any one with a sense of humour could take exception. Those, however, who went home without their money were of an utterly different opinion. To them the fraternity was like 'the madman casting fire-brands, arrows, and death, and saying, "Am I not in sport?"' The Bishop prohibited all meetings of the 'dangerous sect' or its adherents. On the heads of the disobedient would fall the terrors of the greater excommunication. If spiritual censures were found insufficient, the Bishop was determined himself to write to the King in order that 'the severity of the temporal power might visit with swift chastisement those whom the

discipline of the Church could not keep within bounds.' The threat was in all probability efficacious, as we find nothing more concerning the Fraternity of Brothelyngham in the register.

The clergy were sheltered from punishment for criminal offences by the civil power by their 'Privilege of Clergy,' which passed them over to the Consistory Courts. A letter addressed by Grandisson to the Bishop of Norwich is interesting as proving that this privilege did not secure them from imprisonment in the Crown prisons for debt, and that in the Middle Ages, just as in the days of Mr. Pickwick, such prisoners languished there until payment was made. Grandisson informed his brother Bishop that John de Nelonde, Vicar of Michaelstowe, in his diocese, had been held fast in jail, first at Newgate, and then in the Marshalsea—prisons abolished only in quite recent days—for a debt and its interest due to Simon Damet, a lodger at Lynn, in Norwich diocese. It was not denied that de Nelonde really owed Damet money; the Bishop, however, believed that the amount of interest had been fraudulently increased by the latter when he secured the conviction of the debtor. The implacable Simon, who was probably a professional moneylender, seemed determined that his victim should not be free. He would have 'every drop of blood'; nor, once in prison, should the captive depart thence till he had paid the uttermost farthing. In the meantime, de Nelonde was wasting away in confinement; he was a physical wreck, and soul and body scarce held together. He seemed likely very soon to be among those prisoners who 'rest together and hear not the voice of the oppressor.' The Bishop added that the bearer of the letter, who had posted with it all the way from Exeter to Norwich, undoubtedly at considerable expense to the Bishop, would explain the wickedness of the whole transaction. Grandisson implored his brother Bishop to have an interview with Damet, and to entreat him to ask

for nothing more than the amount of debt that had actually been incurred.

We glean from the Bishop's register that de Nelonde was a young priest in the confidence of his Diocesan, and employed by him to inquire into the dilapidations of one of the Cornish livings. We know also that, two years before making his application to the Bishop of Norwich, he had allowed de Nelonde a year of non-residence for study, when in all probability the latter was forced into the moneylender's hands by diminished income and University expenses.

It is therefore delightful to find that Grandisson's intervention was crowned with success, and that in 1341 de Nelonde was still in his old living, which, in that year, he exchanged for another in the diocese of Bath and Wells. To that diocese he must have carried the most affectionate remembrances of his old spiritual chief as one who in fact, though not in person, had indeed 'come to him when he was in prison.'

It seems fitting to conclude with something relating to Exeter Cathedral. It appears from a document of the time of Bishop Quivil, which is inserted in Grandisson's register, that several of the Cathedral bells were cast shortly before the year 1284, and that the firm of bell-founders employed—all members of one family—were granted an estate by the Dean and Chapter for which they paid a nominal rent of one penny per annum. The original clock and 'organs' were even older than these bells.

H. P. PALMER.

SOME PROBLEMS OF JUGO-SLAVIA

THE Balkan States have been termed the 'storm-centre of Europe.' This is almost equally true to-day as it was in pre-war times: and not the least dangerous spot is the new Jugo-Slavia. This is one of the largest Balkan States. It consists of the greater part of pre-war Bosnia and Herzegovina (then under Austrian rule), with the former independent kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro. In this new Jugo-Slavia, the dominant partner in politics is Serbia —hence much of the present trouble.

The inhabitants of this kingdom are varied. The Croats, the Serbians, and the Montenegrins are essentially of Slav origin, all having migrated from the East to the Balkans, and coming from the same racial stock. The Croats settled eventually in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Serbs in Serbia, whence a branch settled ultimately in Montenegro. This latter branch was strengthened by a further influx from Serbia proper after the defeat of the Serbs by the Turks at Kossova (1389). Unfortunately for modern Jugo-Slavia, the subsequent history of these two branches of the Slav race (i.e. Croat and Serb) has differed greatly. Dalmatia (i.e. the Adriatic coastline) is inhabited partly by Croats and partly by Serbs, with a strong admixture of Italians. In addition to all this, Turkish settlements are to be found everywhere, continuing their own religious and political customs, and living usually in their own quarters in town and village. There are also one or two little settlements of Spaniards, driven from Spain by the Inquisition of the sixteenth century, and which have not been thoroughly absorbed even yet by the people amongst whom they settled. The past fifteen years, moreover, have seen a great influx of Russian refugees, many of whom have undoubtedly come to stay. These varieties of people naturally presume a variety of religions and customs: and the Greek Orthodox,

the Catholic, and Mohammedan religions are equally important. Communications are difficult at all times; for good roads are few, and railway facilities, for the greater part of the country, are entirely non-existent. It will be seen, therefore, that absorption and unification of the New Jugo-Slavia would, in any case, be a difficult task, and slow of accomplishment. But there are at the moment certain factors threatening a disruption, which might have results far beyond the limits of Jugo-Slavia itself.

The first of these is the Croatian question. The Croats were not really too pleased to be incorporated in this new kingdom. They had the tradition and history of independence behind them, and had in some degree forced even their old Austrian masters to recognize their claims. They were hoping that the post-war settlement would accept this principle of national independence. The Allies were unable to do this, and incorporated the Croats with their fellow-slavs, the Serbs, in the new kingdom of Jugo-Slavia. Though disappointed, the Croats, remembering the services Serbia had rendered them in pre-war days, accepted the situation loyally. To-day they are thoroughly alienated, and only the fear of Italian domination has prevented revolt against the Government. Many causes have contributed to this end.

The Croats constitute a large proportion of the inhabitants of Jugo-Slavia. They are at least as numerous as, if not more so than, the Serbs. Their representation in the National Assembly is altogether inadequate; and is less, proportionate to their numbers, than either the Montenegrins or Serbians. Attention has been repeatedly drawn to this —but in vain. The Government seems afraid of creating a Croatian majority. It is humiliating to their national pride, also, to note that no Croat holds any high political or civilian office in the State. Taxation also provides a legitimate grievance. When the post-war national taxation was fixed, it was generally recognized that Serbia proper, harried by war and retreat alike, was unable to contribute its legitimate

share. The Croats at this time willingly bore the extra burden—but complain that now, ten years after the war, the assessments are unaltered, and rightly demand a revision. Thus, what was originally an act of national necessity due to war, has now become an invidious distinction against the Croats. Another factor, also, has been quite unintentionally operating against them. In early post-war years, Jugo-Slavia set out on a sound enlightened agricultural policy, with the intention of developing the land. Large landholders who were not developing their own land were forced to sell, and small farms and holdings were created. Unfortunately, owing to lack of money, and the urgency of other affairs, the initial steps were not followed up, with the result that the agricultural population was rather worse off than before. As the Croats are largely engaged in agriculture, this failure has affected them greatly. They have, therefore, legitimate grievances against the State, none of which should be beyond redress to an intelligent and sympathetic Government. The Croats have tried to draw the attention to their case by protest, by an obstructionist attitude in the National Assembly, and, after Radic's death, by withdrawing their members from Belgrade and holding their Croatian deliberations at Zagreb. This is not to be interpreted as an act of national independence, but as a protest against the Serbian majority, who still persist in ignoring the claims of Croatia in the government of Jugo-Slavia. The situation has altered somewhat since the death of Radic. In the early phases of the struggle, the Croats only demanded a recognition of their claim to a fair share in the government of the State. When this was ignored, then began the demand for autonomy—and since Radic's death there has also been heard the cry for complete national independence. At present this is made by a small, though vociferous, minority. It is generally recognized that the question of complete independence involves much larger issues, in which both Italy and Hungary would be directly

implicated; and, indirectly, the rest of Europe. The main body of Croats is not anxious to push this issue, fearing the interference of Italy. The withdrawal of the Croatian members from the General Assembly seems to have wakened the Government to a sense of its danger. It still remains to be seen whether it will deal generously and sympathetically with the Croatian demand for recognition.

The whole question is much complicated by the attitude of Italy, who in pre-war days was the dominant factor in the Adriatic, and desired to control the Balkan, as well as the Italian, coastline. There are a number of Italian settlements along the coast, some of them dating from the time of the Venetian Republic, and there is, of course, the tradition of the old Roman province of Dalmatia. Italy, therefore, has a historic and political interest in this coast. The original post-war settlement did not please her. She desired a much stronger hold on the Dalmatian coast. Much political agitation ensued, and by a series of treaties, ending with the Italy-Jugo-Slav treaty of 1924, her position was revised. She now holds Istria, Fiume (after the war, constituted a free State), and Zara. All this has created much bitterness of feeling between Italy and Jugo-Slavia. It is symptomatic of much that, quite lately, Slav names have been substituted for the old Italian ones—e.g. Spalato, Gravosa, Ragusa, and Ragusa Vecchia have now become Split, Gruz, Dubrovnic, and Cavtat. Jugo-Slavia, too, has now acquired a fleet of five cruisers to patrol and protect its coast. The gem of the eastern Adriatic, from the political point of view, is the Bokka, with Kortot at its head. This is the old harbour of Cattaro, which is the most magnificent roadstead in the eastern Mediterranean. It affords wonderful natural anchorage, is marvellously spacious, and could easily be converted into the controlling station of the Adriatic. Most of the Powers of Europe directly interested in the Near East have at one time or another had their eyes on Cattaro. There are, even to-day, traces of old Italian

settlements on the harbour, dating back to the old Venetian Republic. The whole question of Italian and Jugo-Slav interests in the Adriatic is one of extreme delicacy. There is no doubt that Italian aspirations are still unsatisfied, and that Jugo-Slavia is determined to resist any further encroachment. Feeling runs high on the subject: it complicates internal questions, as well as external relationships, and might have an influence far beyond the borders of Jugo-Slavia.

There is also another interesting factor emerging, which may yet have great influence on the Balkans, particularly Jugo-Slavia. The post-war settlement created in Central Europe a German republic of German-speaking people: i.e. the old German Empire in Europe bereft of its French and Polish elements. Thus out of the old Germany has arisen a large, compact, unified republic, which is rapidly making good its old economic and political position in Europe. On the other hand, the old ramshackle, heterogeneous empire of Austria-Hungary has completely lost its old character. The large Slav elements have been incorporated in the new Slav States: Austria of to-day is practically limited to the German-speaking people of its old régime, while Hungary is composed mainly of Magyars. Neither of the countries has recovered its pre-war position; nor are they in the least likely to do so as at present composed. Both countries, too, are troubled by monarchist claims. Austria has already seen a way out, by inclusion in the Union of German Republics. Economically, racially, and politically their interests are allied. The big Powers of Europe would certainly prevent this at present. It remains to be seen, however, how long they can resist the growing pressure of national feeling, and maintain the present artificial barriers. The possibility of this German-speaking Union in Central Europe necessarily opens out a new question for Hungary. The League of Nations has not yet destroyed the policy of 'Balance of Power' in

Europe; it has only limited and emphasized its character. On the principle of 'Balance of Power,' the natural reaction to a strong German group in Central Europe would be a Hungarian-Balkan group. It would not be by any means the first time that Hungary has been interested in Balkan politics. This has shown itself in the past by acute hostility to the old Serbia. The post-war redistribution of land has made a port on the Adriatic essential for the economic development of land-locked Hungary. The changing situation in Central Europe to-day may lead to the satisfaction of this need by co-operation, rather than by conflict. Whatever happens, however, Jugo-Slavia is bound to be the crux of the situation in any relation between Hungary and the Balkans.

It is, therefore, quite clear that the new Jugo-Slavia is in the midst of a most difficult task. Hampered by lack of means, with internal political and economic difficulties, and threatening external complications, she not only needs to act herself with sympathy and discretion, but requires the generous consideration of the European community of nations. In this way only can she stabilize and develop herself, and avoid disturbances which may involve Europe.

A. M. Evans.

THE PRINCE OF PULPIT ORATORS

'GEORGE WHITEFIELD was the first man who treated Great Britain and America as if they both belonged to him. He passed from the one to the other as though they were a pair of rural villages, and he was minister in charge of the parish. George Whitefield took a couple of continents under his wing; and the wing proved capacious enough for the task.' So writes the brilliant Australian essayist, Frank W. Boreham, and the tribute is well justified, and the reminder timely for our generation. The two great English-speaking nations have in common the most remarkable evangelist of Christian history, whose influence upon the past and present life of both peoples is quite indelible and still progressing. Whether we regard the history of evangelical Christianity in its narrower individualistic development and mark the progress of the evangelical Churches since Whitefield's day, or whether we take into our survey, as we should do, the wide diffusion of the spirit of Christianity in the social life of our age, both developments take their initial impetus from the fiery eloquence and indefatigable toil of this glowing herald of the Christian salvation.

It is common to couple Wesley's name with Whitefield's in this mighty achievement, and certainly in the Providence of God their careers were most curiously intertwined. We may describe Whitefield as the pioneer evangelist of their great joint movement, and Wesley as the constructive evangelist. Many years ago a writer in the *North British Review* emphasized this distinction thus: 'Whitefield was like a powder-blast in the quarry, and would by one explosive sermon shake a district and detach materials for other men's long work. Wesley loved to split and trim each fragment into uniform and polished stones. Whitefield

had no patience for ecclesiastical policy—Wesley was always constructing societies.'

But, after all, it is to the pioneer that we owe the launching of the grand effort. Whilst it was through Charles Wesley that George Whitefield found conversion, and by John Wesley that he was drawn into the Holy Club at Oxford, it is nevertheless doubtful if there would have been any Evangelical Revival at all if Whitefield had been other than he was—the master-evangelist of all time—and if he had not discovered the grace and the audacity *to initiate out-of-church preaching*. It was the bringing of the gospel into the open-air that gave to it the contagion, as it were, of the very atmosphere itself—that freed it from the artificialities and intolerable stuffiness of a dull and dead ecclesiasticism and made it again part of the vital experience of mankind. For this task, from which Wesley shrank at first, George Whitefield was peculiarly fitted. He was powerfully built physically and possessed a voice of peculiar resonance. Benjamin Franklin has left on record the story of his attempt to compute the range of Whitefield's voice while the latter was preaching in Philadelphia. He says, 'Whitefield preached one evening from the top of the Court-House steps, which are in the middle of Market Street and on the west side of Second Street, which crosses it at right-angles. Both streets were filled with hearers to a considerable distance, and, being among the hindmost in Market Street, I had the curiosity to learn how far he could be heard, by retiring backward down the street toward the river, and I found his voice distinct till I came near Front Street. . . . I computed that he might well be heard by more than 30,000 people. This reconciled me to the newspaper accounts of his having preached to 25,000 in the fields.'

The influence of Whitefield as a preacher upon contemporaries of such outstanding and varied calibre as the polite Chesterfield, the sceptical Hume, the aristocratic Bolingbroke, the cool, philosophic Franklin, is outstanding

proof of his genius. It has been well said that 'they were not only enthusiastic amateurs like Garrick, who used to weep and tremble at his bursts of passion, but even the colder critics of the Walpole School were surprised into sympathy and reluctant wonder.' He was as much at home with polite, select audiences as with scores of thousands of humble folk on the streets or in the fields. He possessed great versatility of style, was always natural, and displayed a creative genius of great beauty and charm. He was a definite and careful student of the art of oratory, rebuked the preachers of his time for their neglect of its study, and provided for its teaching in such organizations as he could influence, like his orphan asylum. The number of really great lives kindled at his torch is proof that history has not falsely idealized this man. Hervey, Toplady, Doddridge, Robert Robinson, Rankin, Venn, and Joss in England, and, in America, Benjamin Franklin (inspired though not converted), Samuel Hopkins, Gilbert Tennent, David Brainerd, and Samuel Davies, the father of the Presbyterian Church in Virginia, are but a few of the notable personalities he captured for Christ, every one of them becoming in his turn 'a fisher of men.'

It has often been claimed that Whitefield's power did not extend to the written page and that his sermons in print are cold and dull. It is true that his work was peculiarly dependent upon his amazingly expressive features and his organ-like voice, but there are some impressive testimonies to a peculiar unction that attended his sermons in printed form. For example, Samuel Morris, a resident of Virginia, invited his neighbours to his house to hear a volume of Whitefield's sermons read. The result was extraordinary—melting scenes occurred and a fire of conversion was kindled. Multitudes thronged to hear these sermons read, until at last a meeting-house was built for mere reading, and thus the Presbyterian Church in Virginia was founded.

No preacher of any generation commanded greater crowds

or had a more extensive hearing than George Whitefield. He was, above all preachers in history, the Apostle of the Common People. He addressed twenty-five thousand at a time at Bristol and other places in the old land, sixty thousand at one time in Moorfields, thirty thousand on Boston Common, twenty thousand at Philadelphia !—whilst audiences of ten thousand were commonplace to him. And he sustained a ministry of this magnitude unabated for thirty-four years ! Like Wesley, he often preached three and five times a day, day after day. Thirteen times he crossed the Atlantic in days when one crossing was a considerable adventure ! Such preaching, peculiar both in quality and frequency, could not be achieved except at a great physical cost. We read that ' often after leaving the pulpit he vomited blood, and those who knew him intimately tell us that " after a preaching paroxysm he lay panting on his couch, spent, breathless, and deathlike." ' No wonder he wielded power !

His facing of great crowds in the open air was not without physical danger too, especially because he so often chose crowds on pleasure bent, and so aroused the bitter opposition of vested interests. On one occasion, while preaching in Ireland, he was so seriously stoned as barely to escape with his life, and he bore the scars of his wounds for the rest of his days. Yet the fruitage of that particular occasion was notable enough in the winning for Christ of one John Edwards, who afterwards preached at the Tabernacle in London and became itinerant evangelist in England, Scotland, and Ireland.

It was this tremendous hearing for the gospel gained by Whitefield among the masses of his time that rendered the popular feeling for religion mobile once more, and so gave to John Wesley the opportunity for his more constructive movement. In happy reciprocity of influence it was Wesley's missionary interest in Georgia that in turn kindled Whitefield's concern for the wider world, and led him at last

to carry his marvellous gift for preaching into the New World.

It is, of course, hopelessly impossible to trace out and to measure the personal consequences of such a ministry as Whitefield's. We can only think with wondering awe of what it must have meant for men and women by the thousand to begin to live new lives by the grace of God. Whitefield set hundreds of thousands thinking for themselves again, under the guidance of the New Testament, on matters of the soul and the right conduct of life. Narrow and intolerant as was his theology in many particulars, nevertheless his passion for the exaltation of Christ as the source of new life brought a host of men and women to the vital centre of the Christian faith. To a very real degree, and in spite of his keen defence of Calvinism, Whitefield's ministry was above and beyond denominationalism. Preaching on one occasion in the Market Street, Philadelphia, from the balcony of the Court House, he cried, 'Father Abraham, whom have you in heaven? Any Episcopalians? No. Any Presbyterians? No. Have you any Independents or Seceders? No. Have you any Methodists? No, no, no! Whom have you there? We don't know those names here! All who are here are Christians—believers in Christ—men who have overcome by the blood of the Lamb and the word of His testimony. Oh, is this the case!' said Whitefield, 'then God help me, God help us all, to forget party names, and to become Christians in deed and in truth.' As a direct result, therefore, of Whitefield's work all the Churches were revived in both Britain and America, and great new communities of converts sprang into being as—to take a supreme instance—the Methodists of England.

It is possible, of course, to claim with reason that, had these great evangelists, Whitefield and Wesley, and the schools of evangelical thought and life they created, been more alive to the social implications of the gospel a far greater work would have been achieved of a socially redemptive character. As it was, however, we can claim that,

in spite of much social blindness on Whitefield's part—fortunately Wesley was more socially sensitive in conscience—nevertheless so powerful was the new spiritual impulse that it broke out spontaneously in social redemption. The Christian gospel is incorrigibly social in its impulse and outlook, and, though the crass individualism of all English life in the eighteenth century was a distinct and serious hindrance, the essential passion of the gospel could not be entirely defeated. These social effects can be traced best through two great series of personalities—one series in Britain, the other in America.

No name stands higher among the English-speaking peoples in the annals of social reform than that of Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury. His epic struggle for the workers of England—and especially for the suffering, exploited children—sprang directly from his new life in Christ. Lord Shaftesbury's actual spiritual father was John Wesley, but the fountain of his sublime energy in human service was that new evangelicalism let loose like a flood upon England in the torrential eloquence of George Whitefield. 'I am an evangelical of the evangelicals,' declared Lord Shaftesbury, adding, 'Christianity as applied is absolutely and essentially practical.' In his brilliant *Life of Lord Shaftesbury* the Rev. J. Wesley Bready, M.A.,B.D., has the following passage: 'To Shaftesbury, as to all ardent evangelicals, faith is illumination, dynamic; it is desire and restless energy for human betterment, a yearning to see the will of God "done in earth as in Heaven." Thus Shaftesbury was evangelical . . . because it represented an ardent endeavour to appreciate the Spirit of Jesus, and to apply that Spirit to all the complicated problems of human relationship.'

Outside Westminster Abbey, on the day of Earl Shaftesbury's funeral, one of the thousands of working men who stood bareheaded in the rain cried out: 'Our Earl's gone! God A'mighty know'd how he loved us and we loved him. We shan't look upon his like again.' Such was the devotion

of millions, but the love so wondrously kindled and kindling was really that love of Christ for souls, which George Whitefield revealed afresh to his generation.

But if George Whitefield's influence, allied with that of John Wesley, blessed England through the labours of the People's Earl, it was to bless a still wider area yet through another great social emancipator—William Wilberforce. It must always be a matter for profound regret that Whitefield, like so many other eminent Christians of his period, was unenlightened in conscience regarding the sin of slavery—as still so many are regarding the sin of war. He himself held slaves for the working of his orphan establishments. He was fierce and courageous in defence of fair and good treatment of the slave, and dared the wrath of slave-owners again and again on their behalf, but he was blind to the iniquity of the institution.

All the more gratifying is it, therefore, to find that, through his distinctive work of leading souls to individual salvation, he set in train forces that ended eventually in the abolition of slavery. The story is interesting indeed. It seems that in 1769, just before Whitefield left England for the first time, in one of his audiences there was a boy, ten years of age, whose tender heart was touched by the vivid eloquence of the preacher. In after-years the impression faded somewhat, but the vital seed remained. One day that boy, William Wilberforce, just a gay young spark on pleasure bent, was travelling in Italy, and picked up from the table of a hotel a religious book written by one Thomas Scott. From that moment Wilberforce forsook his frivolity and devoted himself to the cause of humanity for Christ's sake. Thomas Scott was a convert of John Newton, who was, in turn, one of John Wesley's greatest trophies of grace; and thus William Wilberforce's grand passion for human freedom is seen to take its impetus from the flood of evangelical fervour let loose first by Whitefield and again by Wesley.

But we cannot stay at Wilberforce. He marks but the second chapter, as Shaftesbury the first, in a great sequence of liberating events. Beyond Wilberforce, drawing inspiration from him, but also closely allied to the great evangelical tradition through the revival of free religion in America, looms the majestic figure of Abraham Lincoln. It is no mere coincidence that the ground in and around Boston and through New England is holy ground of Freedom's history. That area was the scene over and over again of mighty triumphs of gospel appeal on the part of George Whitefield. It was ground on which souls were born again by thousands and brought from darkness to light, from bondage to the glorious liberty of the children of God. Abraham Lincoln's great speech at Gettysburg contains sentences that might be said fairly to sum up the age-long influence of the Evangelical Revival: 'This nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.'

It is a mistake to think of Whitefield as an oratorical evangelist merely. He had a keen sense of the need for knowledge, and was therefore an ardent apostle of education. He was from a humble home, it is true, but the pot-boy of Gloucester became the student of Oxford University and a remorseless logician. It is not surprising, therefore, to find educational institutions springing up in the wake of his chief missions. Thus, after his great work among the colliers at Kingswood, Bristol, they were inspired to found a school for their children, the foundation-stone of which they insisted upon Whitefield laying.

When he landed in Georgia, Whitefield began at once to take an interest in the waifs and strays whose parents had died and whose plight was a pitiful one. Thus he founded his famous orphanage, for the upkeep of which he constantly plunged himself into financial embarrassment. George Whitefield certainly 'lived dangerously' so far as financial

resources were concerned—giving such money as he obtained freely and fully to the welfare of his sacred charges; but he found that Providence never failed him. On one memorable occasion, such was his sublime honesty, he actually refused the gift of a large estate in Scotland, valued at many thousands of pounds, because he thought the owner was acting under stress of undue emotion.

It has been well noted by Edward S. Ninde that 'at a time when philanthropies were few and most men indifferent to their brothers' needs, Whitefield went everywhere pouring out his appeals for the distressed. In both England and America he started a new tide of benevolence.'

It was always Whitefield's ambition to see his orphanage at Savannah—called by him Bethesda—become the 'fountain-head of Christian instruction for all the South Land.' He carried on a constant correspondence with his beloved charges, and numbers of the boys brought thus under his care entered the Christian ministry. After his death the orphanage fell upon evil days, but it is gratifying to know that to-day it flourishes again, still on the same spot and under the old name of Bethesda.

Whitefield took a warm interest in Harvard and Yale, but perhaps the most impressive instance of his influence in American education is in the great University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia. The finest statue to George Whitefield in the world is the one, sculptured by Tait Mackenzie, which stands in the campus of the University, and it bears an inscription of eloquent tribute to the evangelist acknowledging the origin of that great educational institution in Whitefield's original charity school of 1740! Princeton and Dartmouth also owed their origin either to Whitefield or to followers of the great evangelist. He was instrumental in securing the foundation gift from Earl Dartmouth that allowed of the establishment of that institution. We may be sure that nothing would have delighted Whitefield's heart more than to have seen these

mighty educational forces emerging from his humble but sincere efforts.

Every now and again the great historic triumphs of the Church's history are revived in her memory in order that history may repeat itself, not perhaps in the form of previous victories, but in their scope and spirit. Evangelism in this modern world can no longer be wholly effective on the merely individualistic type of appeal that Whitefield and Wesley made. We are too conscious of the way in which the ancient sins of the race entrench themselves in great social institutions. These must be transformed if the mass of souls are to be set free to follow Christ. If, as the story of Whitefield's influence proves, the genuinely changed heart yearns towards the changed city, it is equally true that the changed city releases the incipient and repressed impulses of the divine nature in the individual soul, especially when the changing of the city is the result of the sacrificial labours of regenerated souls. There dawns upon the mind of our time therefore a dazzling prospect. The evangelism of individuals by Whitefield and Wesley succeeded, in spite of a dulled social conscience and blurred social vision, in achieving vast transformations of society. What might not be achieved by a Church just as divinely impassioned and even more psychologically sound in her attack upon individual souls, but equipped also with a clear vision and a passionate determination regarding that right organization of social life which Jesus called the Kingdom of God! If the success of the former evangelism has been the cleansing of many reproaches from Christian civilization, will not the uniting of the individual and the social gospels in the same fire of the Holy Ghost be the bringing in of the world-wide Kingdom—the actual building of the City of God upon the earth?

ALBERT D. BELDEN.

NESTORIUS THE HERETIC

OUR judgement of old heresies is rendered difficult by the fact that we only meet them in the writings of the orthodox who have succeeded in suppressing them. In fact, heterodoxy is correctly defined as 'the opinion of the other fellow,' and when 'the other fellow' has been condemned as a heretic, he has seldom been given the opportunity of restating his position. The works of the excommunicated have been suppressed. Nestorius, a fifth-century heretic whose followers have survived in a separate organization until the present day, managed to commit his *Apologia pro vita sua* to posterity by writing it in Syriac rather than in Greek, and by remaining anonymous, giving to it the strange title of *The Bazaar of Heraclides*. It lay hidden for centuries, until it was discovered in some Eastern monastery in 1897. It was Professor Bethune-Baker who gave the substance of this defence to us in English in his book *Nestorius and his Teaching*, which appeared in 1908. He did not hesitate to argue that Nestorius had completely cleared himself from the taint of heresy, and in this contention he received a large measure of support from Professor Loofs in Germany. The whole of his book was translated from the Syriac into French by F. Nau in 1910, and then, in 1925, Mr. G. R. Driver gave it to us in an English translation, with an introduction and appendices. It seems clear, from these careful and restrained notes, that neither Mr. Driver nor the colleague who collaborated with him found Nestorius a completely satisfactory interpreter of the mystery of the Person of Christ. Still, it is a great achievement for a heretic who has been under the ban of the Church for a millennium and a half to rise from his grave in self-defence, and to succeed in converting learned theologians of the twentieth century to the admission that he had been

wrongfully condemned. Our instincts of fair play demand that we should give him a hearing.

From the time men first began to attempt an explanation of the Person of Christ there have been signs of two opposite tendencies. The Docetic tendency was to exaggerate the Godhead so much that the manhood was lost. The body of our Lord was but a shadow, and all the discipline of suffering was but seeming. On the other hand, the tendency, which for the sake of convenience may be termed Ebionite, so exaggerated the human at the expense of the divine that Jesus came to be regarded as a mere man. The consciousness of the Early Church was so much dominated by the majesty of Christ's personality that it was far more generally Docetic in its extremes than Ebionite. Paul of Samosata, the Court preacher of Queen Zenobia, was the first prominent teacher in the Church to take up a frankly humanitarian position. He held that the divine Logos dwelt in Christ as in any other, but at some point in His career Christ was adopted as the only Son of the Father. Paul was excommunicated accordingly. The great controversies of the fourth century raged round the dignity of the Second Person of the Trinity. The rise of Arianism demonstrated how large was that party within the Church which would regard Christ as a creature of like substance with the Father, but still a creature simply. One can imagine how the wrath of the orthodox would be excited by such statements as these. The Trinitarian controversy was hardly closed before a Christological controversy began. Apollinaris of Laodicea, a strong supporter of the Nicene symbol, endeavoured to explain how the divine Word dwelt in the man Jesus. He was most anxious to guard the doctrine of the impeccability of Christ; the faculty of will inevitably implied sin. The νοῦς in man was the seat of all wrong instincts, and, if Christ possessed a human νοῦς, His sinlessness could no longer be guaranteed. Therefore in Him the human mind was replaced by the divine Word, and God, the Word, became the seat

of personality in a human body. Thus the divine was manifested in a maimed or incomplete humanity. How could our manhood be saved in its integrity if the Saviour were not completely man? The Church rightly repudiated so grave an error, and the school of Antioch in particular guarded against such expressions as 'God suffered,' 'God was born,' 'God died,' by emphasizing the human side of the life of Jesus.

The Antiochene theologians are in many respects nearer the modern point of view than any of the teachers of the Early Church. In biblical interpretation and exegesis they were literal and exact, in opposition to the allegorical exegesis of Alexandria. In method, the Antiochenes were Aristotelians; the Alexandrians Platonists. In doctrine, Antioch was governed by practical and anthropological considerations; Alexandria by those which were mystical and theological. Diodore, Bishop of Tarsus, was the real founder of this school of thought. He, and still more his successor, Theodore of Mopsuestia, were most strongly repelled by the heresy of Apollinaris. In consequence, they emphasized too much the distinctness of the two natures in their determination to preserve a perfected human experience for Christ. To them it seemed incredible that the Logos in His very essence should limit Himself in the fashion of a man; an essential (κατ' οὐσίαν) indwelling of the deity in man was incredible. On the other hand, it was not sufficient to say that God dwelt in Jesus by an effectual (κατ' ἐνέργειαν) indwelling; that would be true of His operation everywhere. Another phrase was necessary. God dwells in Jesus by a divine complacency (κατ' εὐδοκίαν). This indwelling was the same in kind as that by which God dwells in all men (John i. 9), but infinitely higher in degree. The basis of the union between God and man in Jesus was therefore a moral basis. Other men might be more or less well-pleasing to God; Jesus alone was absolutely well-pleasing to the Father. This presence of the Logos in the humanity of

Christ was not to be spoken of as a henosis (ἕνωσις), or union; it was rather a conjunction (συνάφεια), like that between husband and wife. Such a metaphor as that, or that which represented the body of Christ as the temple in which the Logos dwelt, explains the charge which was constantly being brought against Nestorius that he taught the doctrine of two Christs, or two sons, one the Son of God by nature and the other the man who became Son of God by grace. That was the charge against Nestorius, we say. This brings us face to face with the great heresiarch who established a community separate from the organized Eastern Church, which stood as its great rival until the Middle Ages; which also, from Cyprus to China, was the greatest Christian missionary organization until the dawn of the nineteenth century.

Nestorius was the lineal descendant of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. He merely carried their teaching to its logical issue. He was a comparatively little known monk of Euprepius, near Antioch, eloquent and of a good presence, when he was suddenly called to the great honour of the See of Constantinople in 428. His contemporary in that city—Socrates, the ecclesiastical historian—gives us an unfavourable account of his intellectual powers, but allows that he was gifted with great verbosity. In his inaugural sermon he was guilty of a somewhat grandiose and tactless utterance. 'Give me,' he said, 'the world free from heretics, and I will give thee heaven in return.' He immediately proceeded to endeavour to extirpate Arianism in the city, but only secured the nickname of 'firebrand' as a result. The peculiar tenets of the Antiochenes on the subject of the Person of Christ were brought prominently forward in a sermon by his chaplain, Anastasius. He said, 'Let no one call Mary "θεοτόκος" [Mother of God], for she was a human being and of a human being it is impossible that God should be born.' Nestorius was not slow to accept full responsibility for this utterance. Immediately the

floodgates of theological controversy were opened. The ugly terms so much in vogue during the Arian discussions were technical expressions, but θεοτόκος was in popular use, and honoured by the imprimatur of many Fathers of the Church. It was said that Nestorius was a second and more dangerous Arius. His heresy was that of Paul of Samosata over again; nay, he made Jesus a mere man, if you consider the logical outcome of such an utterance. Such writers as Bright and Ottley have taken the same view of the theology of Nestorius. 'It is distinguished,' says Ottley, 'from the error of Paul the Samosatene only by its more clear affirmation of the personality of the indwelling Logos'; whereas Socrates, writing during the life of the heretic with a bias against him, says, 'To me it appears that Nestorius did not follow the lead of Paul the Samosatene and Photinus; nor did he assert at all that Christ was a mere man; but he shrinks only from the phrase (θεοτόκος) as if it were a hobgoblin (μορμολύκειον).' In later days Luther endeavoured to rehabilitate the heretic, and he has had many successors. We are fortunate in the fact that the Syriac version of the defence which Nestorius makes of his own position has now been discovered and translated. Its title, *The Bazaar (or Merchandise) of Heraclides*, artfully conceals the subject-matter of a book which might not otherwise have evaded the malice of the orthodox.

The great champion of the faith was Cyril of Alexandria, a proud, ambitious, and passionate cleric. By some he was hailed as the successor of Athanasius, but others, with true insight, discerned in him the nephew of Theophilus. The events which followed in rapid succession were largely controlled by political and personal influences. Alexandria had a long-standing quarrel with Constantinople, and was bitterly jealous of her younger sister. The great Chrysostom had been driven into exile by the acrimonious persecution of Theophilus. Nestorius suffered at the hands of Cyril, and twenty years later Flavian was brutally done to

leath at the instigation of Dioscorus, the successor of St. Cyril on the episcopal throne of Alexandria. The verse Latin pathetically describes the death of this later patriarch of Constantinople: '*dolore plagarum migravit ad Dominum.*'

The criticisms of Cyril were along the lines which led later to the Monophysite position; he seemed with difficulty to avoid the charge of confusing the natures of the divine-human Person. He contended strongly for the unity of the Person, the one Person who became flesh (μια φύσις τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου σεσαρκωμένη). Before the Incarnation there were two φύσεις present, but afterwards they became one. Nestorius would hold that the two φύσεις were renamed, glued together. In later years, when endeavouring to compromise with the orthodox Antiochenes, Cyril asserted that Nestorius differed from them in that he asserted a separation of removal in the two natures of Christ: the orthodox merely held a 'mental' distinction of the nature. *That* Cyril himself was willing to admit, saying, 'There are two natures —one of God the Word and one of the manhood'; but there is only one Person of the Son. Such is the utterance of Cyril endeavouring to undo the effects of his rash and unbridled conduct. Nestorius, however, would say exactly the same. It is true he did use the expressions 'the God' and 'the man' somewhat unadvisedly of the two natures, yet Athanasius had spoken even more unambiguously of 'the union of God the Word with the man from Mary.' In the *Bazaar* we find that Nestorius would go all the way with Cyril in this particular. 'God became incarnate in a man in His own person; and He made his person His own person.' This involves much speculation as to the meaning of 'person.' But it seems to meet the requirements of the orthodox creed-makers. He says again, 'Here was shown one purpose, one mind, one will—not to be distinguished or divided.' God the Word, and the man in whom He came, are not numerically two. For the person of both was one in dignity

and honour, worshipped by all creation, in no way and at no time divided by difference of purpose and will.'

The next point of difference between the teaching of Cyril and that of Nestorius is that the former teaches a real condescension of God, while the latter seems to think of the exaltation of a man into Godhead. Cyril would not hesitate to apply all the human actions of the life of Jesus to the Infinite. He would say that Mary was the Mother of God; that God was born, God was weary, God suffered, God died. There is undoubtedly a Docetic element in his teaching. Economically, Christ assumed ignorance or weariness; in His real person He could not be touched by human frailty. We seem again in danger of losing the humanity. All this seemed blasphemy to Nestorius. 'The birth of the flesh is the Word's birth,' he makes Cyril teach, exaggerating the view of his opponent. Does the Word suffer all human passions by physical sensations? It is impossible. Christ Himself as man is new, but as God He exists before the ages. To avoid the slightest misapprehension on this subject, we had better use the term χριστοτόκος than θεοτόκος.

Nestorius is criticized because he would deify one individual man; humanity as a whole is not influenced by such an Incarnation. He would answer that manhood could not exist in any other form than in an individual man; or, if it could, the manner of such existence would be inconceivable to us. This man is therefore θεοφόρος, i.e. either God-bearing or God-borne. We must remember that this phrase was not coined by Nestorius, nor used by him in this controversy. Remembering also that the Church had not yet spoken decisively on the impersonality of the human nature of Christ, it is difficult to see how Nestorius is to be excommunicated for this putting of the doctrine. Modern Christological thought would certainly be nearer Nestorius than Cyril in this particular.

Then, again, it is a physical Christology primarily with which Cyril presents us. In one divine act of power God

appears in the flesh. The Antiochenes generally emphasized the moral union of the human and divine in the ethical processes of Christ's human manhood. 'A union which came about by love and cohesion!' says Cyril sarcastically. Both opponents are hampered by their metaphysical conception of God. The New Testament has taught us to recognize more clearly that God in essence is ethical, is Love itself. Recognizing this fact, we discover once again that Nestorius is nearer to us than Cyril is. In His process of moral education it was necessary for Christ, as the great High Priest, to make an offering for Himself as well as for sinful man—so said Nestorius. Cyril's tenth anathema is the reply to that: 'The very Word of God Himself became our High Priest; nor had He need to offer sacrifice for Himself, but for us alone.'

These and other differences were submitted to the judgement of Caelestine, Bishop of Rome. The choice was unfortunate for Nestorius. It is true that Caelestine held practically the same views as Nestorius on the subject, as also St. Ambrose, the great Bishop of Milan, had done. But Nestorius had shown a measure of lukewarmness in oppressing Pelagians whom Caelestine had driven into the territory of his rival. Moreover, here was a golden opportunity for humiliating Constantinople. There was a traditional alliance between Rome and Alexandria against the new capital of the East. Yet Caelestine hesitated. Finally he put aside his own Christology, and made everything depend on the term θεοτόκος, which was the very point on which Nestorius was willing to compromise. He wrote a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople of which Harnack, says, 'In its unfairness and barefaced audacity it is one of the vilest compositions we have of the fourth and fifth centuries.' Unless Nestorius recanted within ten days of receiving this letter, he was to consider himself excommunicated. Such was the judgement of the Roman Council.

The party of Cyril in Constantinople was meanwhile

growing. The Emperor Theodosius had been a supporter of Nestorius, but his sister, the all-powerful Pulcheria, stood by Cyril. The Bishop of Alexandria impoverished his Church by his lavish bribery. At length the Emperor consented to summon a General Council to meet at Ephesus. The explanation of the fact that Theodosius was transformed into a bitter enemy of Nestorius is not yet forthcoming. The machinations of Cyril and the powerful influence of his sister may account for this change of front. Nestorius found himself at Ephesus, confronted by a Synod packed by the supporters of Cyril. Fifty Egyptian bishops had found leisure to cross the seas for this all-important occasion; ten only accompanied the patriarch of Constantinople. Memnon, the local Bishop of Ephesus, was the most violent of the anti-Nestorians. Nestorius complains that his life was in danger from a 'mob of acrobatic club-bearers and ruffians' hired by Memnon and Cyril. His supporters from Antioch had not yet arrived. Easter festivities and ceremonies, together with bad roads, had thrown them late. A fortnight passed away, and brought only a note to say that they were on the way. Cyril determined to open the proceedings of the Council. Nestorius was summoned, but declined to appear. He gives his reasons in *The Bazaar of Heraclides:* 'So I was summoned by Cyril, who assembled the Synod, and by Cyril, who was its head. Who is judge? Cyril. And who is the accuser? Cyril. Who is the Bishop of Rome? Cyril. Cyril was everything.' Naturally enough, the Council—or Synod, as Nestorius insists on calling it—decided that the letters of Cyril were in full agreement with the Nicene symbol, and Nestorius must be deposed. At the end of the week, John of Antioch arrived with fourteen bishops. They heard with indignation that the so-called General Council was over. They proceeded to hold a Council of their own, and, in retaliation, deposed Memnon and Cyril. It is unnecessary to enter into all the complicated proceedings which followed. The 'orthodox' party found it very hard

to get news through to Constantinople, but a beggar managed to convey to the bishops and monks there a letter from Cyril, concealed in a cane with which he walked. The news of his own deposition and that of Memnon was announced: 'The hot and unhealthy air kills us; scarce a day passes without a funeral; the servants are sent away sick.' This letter produced an immense sensation; it even brought forth the celebrated monk Dalmatius from his monastery after a burial of forty-eight years. The old man headed a long procession of monks and abbots carrying tapers and chanting psalms. Through the streets they went to Theodosius himself, to make their appeal, not without success. Dalmatius was carried back saying, 'God the Word died.'

By the decree of the Emperor, Nestorius went back to his monastery at Euprepius, while Cyril and Memnon were restored to their episcopates. One by one the prominent supporters and friends of Nestorius made their peace with the orthodox, and the threatened secession of the whole Antiochene school was averted by their compromise with the subtle Cyril. 'The herald of the heresy of the Man-worshipper,' as Nestorius was termed by the Council of Ephesus, was, five years later, driven into the desert to the south of Egypt, and for nearly twenty years dragged out a miserable existence. The attitude of the neighbouring monks towards him may be best expressed by a reported utterance of Scbenute, the abbot of the Pachomian monasteries. 'Nestorius,' he said, 'whose tongue swelled and filled his mouth, said the Blessed Virgin Mary bore a good man like Moses, David, and others.' Persecuted by such Christian companions on the one hand, and harassed by marauding companies of nomads on the other, Nestorius lived to see his cause vindicated at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. In Dioscorus, the successor of Cyril, who presided at the 'Robber Council' of 449, he saw his old enemy alive again; in Flavian, himself. When the statement was read

in the Council that Basil of Seleucia had said that Christ was in two natures after the Incarnation, there was a storm of wrath. 'Let no one call the Lord "two" after the Incarnation! Do not divide the undivided! This is Nestorianism!' 'Be quiet a little,' said Dioscorus; 'let us hear some more blasphemies. Why do we blame Nestorius only? There are many Nestoriuses.' Two years later, the disgraceful proceedings of the Latrocinium were repealed, Dioscorus himself was driven into exile, and the Chalcedonian formula, based on the famous letter of Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, was adopted. A candid opinion will probably grant that Nestorius was right when he claimed that the view of Leo was identical with his own; or, at least, that Nestorius approximates more closely in doctrine to the formula of Chalcedon than does Cyril. Anathematized, yet at peace, the heresiarch 'migrated to the Lord.' 'Would to God,' he said, 'that all men, by anathematizing me, might attain to a reconciliation with God; for to me, there is nothing greater or more precious than this.' He concludes his *Apologia pro vita sua* with this moving passage:

'As for me, I have borne the sufferings of my life, and all that has befallen one in this world, as the suffering of a single day. And now, lo! I am already on the point to depart, and daily I pray to God to dismiss me—me whose eyes have seen thy salvation. Rejoice with me, O Desert, thou my friend and mine upbringer, and my place of sojourning; and thou, my Exile, my mother, who after my death shalt keep my body until the resurrection cometh in the time of God's good pleasure. Amen.'

A. W. Harrison.

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN: ANOTHER STUDY IN DISAPPOINTMENT

IT is always a melancholy sight to see great and outstanding abilities devoted to the maintenance of unworthy causes. Cicero laying down his life in the effort to uphold the corrupt and moribund Roman republic, Claverhouse dying on the field of battle for a foolish and tyrannical monarch, are tragic episodes that excite regret as if they had but just happened. One of the most striking instances of the waste of rare abilities is afforded by one of the greatest statesmen in the history of the United States. In John Caldwell Calhoun there is seen the spectacle of outstanding gifts of intellect and character expended on the defence and maintenance of slavery, and a genius that might have done great things for the country wasted on a cause that was wholly unworthy. The life of Calhoun was a tragedy as truly as any in Shakespeare.

The question of the rightfulness or wrongfulness of slavery began to be canvassed in America early in the nineteenth century. By the end of the twenties it had come definitely into politics. The feeling against it grew and grew in the Northern States until every politician had to recognize its importance. It disrupted parties and broke and ruined the careers of eminent statesmen. From the beginning of the thirties Calhoun became the chief defender and protagonist of slavery. He devoted his outstanding gifts to the maintenance of servitude in the Southern States. He became an idea personified. He looked at every political question and manœuvre from the point of view of the defender of slavery. His cause obsessed him. In the later years of his life he could talk of nothing else. Harriet Martineau speaks of him—the 'cast iron man,' as she calls him—as no longer capable of mental relaxation, and as incessantly haranguing men by the fireside as in the Senate.

In the end, when Calhoun was in his grave, the problem was solved by the terrible and disastrous war between the Northern and Southern States. The ghastly results of the great struggle were reflected back on the memory and reputation of Calhoun. Men regarded him as equally responsible with the soldiers and politicians who, in the defence of slavery, had brought about the contest. Walt Whitman tells a story that illustrates what the men of the North thought about Calhoun. In his *Specimen Days in America* he relates that he overheard a conversation during the war between two soldiers, in which one of them spoke of Calhoun's monument, which he had seen.

'I have seen Calhoun's monument,' replied the other. 'That you saw is not the real monument. But I have seen it. It is the desolated, ruined South; nearly the whole generation of young men between seventeen and thirty destroyed or maim'd; all the old families used up—the rich impoverish'd, the plantations cover'd with weeds, the slaves unloos'd and become the masters, and the name of Southerner blacken'd with every shame—all that is Calhoun's real monument.'

Calhoun, who was born in March 1782, in the State of South Carolina, was the son of Patrick Calhoun and Martha Caldwell, who were both the children of emigrants from Ireland. His father, who was a surveyor, was a member of the legislature of South Carolina and a man of strong character. Calhoun was educated at Yale University, where his abilities attracted notice from the first, and Dwight, the president of the University, prophesied that he would do great things. He became a lawyer, but never put his heart into his profession, and in his thirtieth year found a more congenial sphere of work by becoming a Member of Congress. There was a wave of hostility to Great Britain at that time owing to the damage done to American commerce by the British Orders in Council and by the visitation of American vessels, and Calhoun became one of the most active supporters of the demand for war. Filled as he was with patriotic passion, he voiced his feelings in speeches

that, even at that early age, gave evidence of remarkable powers, and which have been described as 'classics of argumentation.'

In 1817 he became Secretary of War in the administration of President Monroe. The War Department was in a state of really astounding confusion, but Calhoun brought order and organization into the Augean stable. A former officer of the great Napoleon, General Bernard, who had been Chief of Staff of the engineers, was impressed by the resemblance between Calhoun's plan of army organization and that of the French Emperor. So great was the impression created by the ability of the Secretary of War that he began to be talked of as a candidate for the Presidency, although he had not yet attained his fortieth year. He himself was full of ambitious hopes, and was eager to promote the movement for his political advancement.

One result of the talk about Calhoun was to arouse the jealousy of the older men who were in the running for the Presidency. Adams, Crawford, and Clay, who were all hankering after the supreme office, looked askance at their younger rival. It is amusing to observe how Adams—who, as Secretary of State, was Calhoun's colleague in the Cabinet of President Monroe, and began by praising Calhoun—changed his tone as time went on. In October 1821 he wrote, 'Mr. Calhoun is a man of fair and candid mind, of honourable principles, of clear and quick understanding, of cool self-possession, of enlarged philosophical views, and of ardent patriotism. He is above all sectional and factious prejudices more than any other statesman of this Union with whom I have ever acted.' In April 1824, however, his views had changed, and he wrote, 'Precedent and popularity—this is the bent of his mind. The primary principles involved in any public question are the last to occur to him.' By September 1831, Adams had come to regard Calhoun as wholly bad. 'I have been deeply disappointed in him,' he said, 'and now expect nothing from

him but evil. His personal relations with me have been marked, on his part, with selfish and cold-blooded heartlessness.'

The people showed no approval or enthusiasm for Calhoun as a possible President, but that did not prevent the desire for the great prize getting a firm grip on him, and colouring his whole outlook and conduct. 'The presidential fever,' says his biographer, Von Holst, 'that tyrannical desire which has proved fatal to the true glory of so many statesmen of the United States, permeated the very marrow of his bones.' Like so many other American candidates for the office, he developed the habit of considering always what effect his conduct with regard to public questions would have upon his chances for the Presidency. He would have indignantly denied that he was indifferent to the common weal, but the presidential virus worked its harmful effect on him, as it did on so many other great men. As Von Holst says, 'The lofty independence of mind and truly chivalric spirit which were his real nature appear blunted.' The words applied to him by Adams—'selfish and cold-blooded heartlessness'—were perhaps exaggerated, but he did break with old and highly respected associates merely because others, whose services he wished to secure, did not like these connexions.

In other words, Calhoun was blighted by the shadow of the Presidency, as so many have been before and after him. Even Lincoln became ashamed of underhand means by which he had tried to clear rivals from his path. Robert Burns compared the career of some man that he knew to a Roman road that ended in a mire. How many of the greatest men in the United States recall that simile. How many of them had their characters corroded and debased by the presidential fever, and passed away with broken hearts. The position of Prime Minister of Great Britain has been sought, and eagerly sought, by British statesmen, but one does not find aspirant after aspirant creeping away, like a wounded animal, to die in misery and despair. It is

the peculiar characteristic of the supreme office in the United States to have this baleful effect.

In 1824, Adams was elected President, and Calhoun was elected Vice-President. From the very beginning he set to work to undermine the administration of his chief. In his eager desire for the Presidency at this time, he summoned his friends to assist in the establishment of a paper which was to further his ambitions. He refused to listen to objections as to cost, and succeeded in establishing the *National Telegraph*, which became the most powerful party organ that existed in the United States up to that time.

In 1828, Andrew Jackson, to whom Calhoun had given his political influence, was elected President. Calhoun was again elected Vice-President, and several of his friends and partisans received Cabinet posts from the grateful Jackson. Calhoun, however, soon ceased to pull loyally with Jackson. The characters of the two men were as antipathetic as those of Pitt and Fox. Eaton, the Secretary of War, had married a woman whose past was regarded with disapproval by the ladies of Washington, and President Jackson had endeavoured to force her into Washington society. Mrs. Calhoun, who was imbued with the aristocratic traditions of the South, and the wives of Calhoun's partisans in the Cabinet were the most active in resisting Jackson's ill-advised attempt. This greatly annoyed Jackson, who, not unnaturally, regarded Calhoun as partly responsible for the trouble.

In 1828, Congress passed a law imposing a heavy protective tariff, by which the Southern States, which were agricultural, were adversely affected, and to which they strongly objected. The opposition of the South to what was called 'The Bill of Abominations' was voiced by Calhoun. He protested against the tariff legislation in various addresses and expostulations, in which he maintained the right of any State which was opposed to that legislation to 'nullify' it. He held that the union of the United States was not a union

of the people, but a league, or compact, between sovereign States, any one of which was entitled to judge when the compact was broken, and to pronounce a law which violated the conditions of the compact null and void. He held that in the last resort a State might defeat obnoxious legislation by seceding from the union. This political doctrine excited intense opposition, and was loudly denounced in Congress and outside, but Calhoun maintained it with extraordinary force and ability. It was this doctrine that was ultimately put forward to justify the secession of the Southern States in 1861 and the formation of a separate Republic under Jefferson Davis.

In 1830 the antipathy of Jackson to Calhoun became violent hostility. Some enemies of Calhoun told the President that, after the war with the Indians, in which Jackson had indulged in certain high-handed actions and acted contrary to instructions, Calhoun had urged the propriety of arresting and trying him. Jackson was furious at the revelation, and from that time onwards regarded Calhoun with rancorous and unappeasable hatred. The feeling between them eventually became so bitter that, at the end of 1832, Calhoun resigned his position as Vice-President, and ceased to have any official connexion with Jackson. He became a member of the Senate, and, in his position as a senator, waged a bitter and unrelenting warfare against the equally malignant President. The two men, who were both Irish in blood and descent, revived in American politics the fierce passions and violent enmities that had characterized the Parliament of Ireland in the preceding century.

The break with Jackson had a sinister effect on Calhoun's career. The immense popularity and influence of Jackson made his enmity a very serious matter for Calhoun. Among other very important results, it rendered his attainment of the Presidency hopeless. This result changed the whole outlook of Calhoun. It broke his life into two parts, in which he changed characters as completely as did Pitt, the

Reformer who became a Tory, and Gladstone, the Tory who became a Reformer. Realizing that his chances of the Presidency were gone, he lost interest in the pursuit of it. He ceased to be a national statesman and became a sectional one. In the beginning of his career he had been praised as being absolutely free from sectional interests, and as judging everything from a national point of view. After the breach he definitely came out as the advocate and spokesman of the South as against the North. He became the chief upholder of the sovereignty of the States and the right of each State to veto a federal law which it deemed unconstitutional, and to secede if it so wished.

In 1832 there was further legislation, and Calhoun's State, South Carolina, passed in Convention an ordinance purporting to nullify the tariff laws of 1828 and 1832. Calhoun resigned the Vice-Presidency, as has been already stated, and was elected to the Senate, where he boldly maintained the doctrine of nullification and supported the action of his State. Although his principles were regarded with wide and intense hostility, he was so far successful that in 1833 Clay introduced a 'compromise tariff' with a view to conciliating the South. It was accepted by Calhoun and passed.

What really stamped the second half of Calhoun's career, and gave him the reputation which he holds in history, was his defence of slavery. During the administration of Jackson the question acquired an importance that made it impossible to ignore it. From the first, Calhoun was an ardent defender of slavery. He shut his eyes to the innumerable facts which showed that slavery was doomed. The splendid example of Great Britain was ignored and disregarded. Calhoun maintained that slavery was 'a good, a positive good,' and that it was 'the most solid foundation of liberty.' In a great and progressive republic, in an age of steam and electricity, he became more and more fixed and resolute in his championship of an institution that had

been condemned by the finest minds two thousand years before. In his defence of slavery he more than ever insisted on the doctrine of State sovereignty and nullification. He realized that it was the strongest pillar of the slave system, and, whenever slavery was in question, he preached it with passionate emphasis, and held it as a menace over the anti-slavery States of the North.

When Calhoun reached the age of sixty his mind harked back, strangely enough, to his old ambition, and he began to hanker after the supreme office. At the end of 1842 he resigned his seat in the Senate, and the legislature of South Carolina unanimously nominated him as a candidate for the Presidency. But his candidature was never taken seriously, and was not supported even by the South, and he withdrew. When the question of the future of Texas, which had revolted from Mexico, became urgent, he supported the proposal to annex it. He thought that the annexation would strengthen the slave power so much that it would have nothing more to apprehend. In 1844 he was invited by President Tyler, who had an intense admiration for him, to become Secretary of State, and accepted the invitation. In that capacity he used all his powers for the strengthening of slavery. When Polk became President, he offered Calhoun the legation at the Court of St. James's, but Calhoun declined the office and returned to the Senate.

In the disputes with Great Britain over Oregon and with Mexico over Texas he opposed war, and advocated peaceable adjustment. In 1847, when he was sixty-five, it was alleged that he was prompted by his presidential aspirations to obstruct the passage of Bills necessary for the successful prosecution of the war with Mexico. He indignantly denied that he was an aspirant for the Presidency. 'At my time of life,' he said, 'the Presidency is nothing.' But the history of the last canvass, and not his age, was the real explanation of his refusal to indulge such aspirations any longer. Towards the end of his life his health began to fail seriously.

When he made his last speech he was unable to support himself. Two friends had to lead him out of the Senate Chamber. On March 31, 1850, he died of an acute pulmonary affection, aggravated by heart disease. At the end he murmured with trembling lips, 'The South! The poor South! God knows what will become of her.' In the last years of his life he prepared *A Disquisition on Government* and *A Disquisition on the Constitutional Government of the United States*, which were his political legacy to the nation and which place him in a high position among original thinkers upon political philosophy.

Although Calhoun was, during his later life, the great protagonist of slavery, and carried on for years in the Senate the struggle that passed, eleven years after his death, into the field of battle, there is no indication that he ever had the slightest qualms of conscience about his support of slavery. He firmly believed that he had done his duty faithfully throughout his career. In February 1847 he said in the Senate, 'If I know myself, if my head was at stake, I would do my duty, be the consequences what they might.' A year or two before his death he said, 'For many a long year, Mr. President, I have aspired to an object far higher than the Presidency; that is, doing my duty under all circumstances, in every trial, irrespective of parties, and without regard to friendships or enmities, but simply in reference to the prosperity of the country.' There is no reason to believe that if Calhoun could have foreseen the great war he would have shrunk from it. If he had been alive in 1861 there can be no reasonable doubt that he would have ranged with Jefferson Davis and Lee under the flag of the South.

Calhoun was a man of transcendent mental power. From his first entry into Congress his great ability was recognized. He assumed right away an equality with the oldest and most experienced members that recalls the younger Pitt. He disclosed a high order of executive as well as legislative ability. He was a worker as well as a talker and a reasoner.

He was tactful and diplomatic, and skilful in creating and consolidating political groups and in formulating policies. He was fertile in suggestion, full of resource, and laborious in research. His mind had extraordinary analytic force and acute insight, and was expressed with remorseless logic and vigorous and trenchant rhetoric. Nicholas Murray Butler, who speaks with the greatest authority, describes him as being, with the single exception of Alexander Hamilton, the most searching and profound expounder of principles of government that America has produced. Butler, in this assertion, merely echoes a similar statement by John Stuart Mill.

It is inevitable that Calhoun should be compared with the other two giants of his time, Henry Clay and Daniel Webster. The three formed a contemporary group of intellects rare and wonderful in the history of any country. Clay was the greatest leader, Webster the greatest orator, Calhoun the greatest thinker. Yet all three were leaders, orators, and thinkers. Bowers, whose opinion carries much weight, states that, of the group, Calhoun was 'admittedly the strongest intellectually, and the one most unmistakably touched with genius.' Each one of the three passionately desired the Presidency, and each one of the three failed to attain it. Meanwhile the citizens of the great republic sent to the Capitol such mediocrities as Harrison and Tyler and Taylor and Polk.

Calhoun had a striking appearance, in keeping with his remarkable qualities. While he was Vice-President, and in the full maturity of his powers, he is described as looking unlike any other man in history. The rugged carving, the low, broad brow, the thick, black hair brushed back defiantly, the spare frame almost amounting to attenuation, the penetrating gaze of the 'glorious pair of yellow-brown eyes,' the bushy brows, and the sunken sockets, all combine to make him an arresting figure. In private intercourse he had a wonderful charm and fascination. The witchery of

is manners and his exquisite urbanity recall such courtier atesmen of the Courts of Europe as Henry St. John and larvey and Chesterfield. 'To make St. John more polite,' as the phrase employed by a contemporary poet as a nonym for superfluous labour, and Calhoun was the same ind of man. Dyer writes of him that he was 'so thoroughly ristocratic in his exquisite urbanity, that a stranger, while armed with his genial and benignant greeting, yet felt at there was a barrier between him and the stately South arolinian which, though light as gossamer, was as impene-able as granite.' His conversational powers were said have been remarkably attractive. Like Disraeli, he made special practice of cultivating and fascinating young en. Yet, though refined and gentle and winning, there as no weakness in Calhoun. As Clarendon said of the uke of Buckingham, 'he had masked under this gentleness terrible courage, as could safely protect all his sweetnesses.' His personal character was above reproach. He had the ghest reputation for uprightness and sincerity. His tastes d habits were simple and even severe. In his thirtieth ar he had married his cousin, Floride Calhoun, and his mily life was one of mutual love and happiness. His eldest ughter possessed unusual intelligence, and Quincy speaks her ability in discussing and maintaining her father's ews and principles. Webster, who had so often opposed m in the Senate, said, after his death, 'He had the basis, e indispensable basis of all high character; and that was spotted integrity and unimpeached honour. If he had pirations, they were high, and honourable, and noble.' bject to what has been said about his efforts to attain the residency, this may be accepted as true.

Calhoun has not got 'a legend,' like some of the great mericans—Washington, Jefferson, Clay, and Webster. ittle is known of him as an individual. There are no traces his speeches of literary or historical interests. There are no otations, historical references, flowers of oratory, none of

those graces that make men return to speeches when their living interest is gone. Little is known of his everyday life and his personal relations. There are no picturesque stories, no mention of favourite authors or hours in his library. A lady who knew him well recorded after his death that he had no amusements. 'I never heard him utter a jest,' she said. 'He did not even indulge himself in a cigar.' Mussolini says in his autobiography, 'Detailed memoirs of intimate and personal character are attributes of old age and the chimney corner,' but it is when one tries to grasp the character of a man without them that one realizes their value.

The verdict of history on the career of Calhoun is one of condemnation. The greatest of his gifts but aggravate the severity of the verdict. Those who condemn him speak of his conduct as Lord Digby spoke in the House of Lords of the practices of the Earl of Strafford. He said that the malignity of those practices was highly aggravated by the rare qualities of Strafford, whereof God had given him the use, but the Devil the application. Dr. Von Holst, the best biographer of Calhoun, says, 'He has no claims upon the gratitude of his country.' The seeds which he sowed sprung forth in due course as armed men, who perished in hundreds of thousands on bloody fields of battle. Von Holst sums up his whole story in a sentence:

> A man endowed with an intellect far above the average, impelled by a high-soaring ambition, untainted by any petty or ignoble passion, and guided by a character of sterling firmness and more than common purity, yet, with fatal illusion, devoting all his mental powers, all his moral energy, and the whole force of his iron will to the service of a doomed and unholy cause, and at last sinking into the grave in the very moment when, under the weight of the top-stone, the towering pillars of the temple of his impure idol are rent to their very base.

J. A. Lovat-Fraser.

THE EMPRESS FREDERICK[1]

THE letters of the Empress Frederick are invested with a romance all their own. The editor, Sir Frederick Ponsonby, accompanied, as equerry and private secretary, King Edward, who was spending a week with his favourite sister at Friedrichshof, near Cronberg. The Empress was dying of cancer, and her brother took with him Sir Francis Laking, his physician-in-ordinary, thinking he might do something to mitigate her terrible sufferings by administering narcotics in larger doses than the German doctors were accustomed to give.

After they had been at Friedrichshof three days, Sir F. Ponsonby received a message that the Empress wished to see him that evening at six o'clock. He found her in her sitting-room, propped up with cushions and looking as though she had been on the rack. The nurse told him she had just been given an injection of morphia and would be better in a moment. Suddenly the Empress opened her eyes, and began to ask questions which showed she was very much alive and alert. After twenty minutes the nurse came in to remind the visitor that he must go. The patient, however, claimed 'A few minutes more,' and the nurse again retired. After a pause the Empress said, 'There is something I want you to do for me. I want you to take charge of my letters and take them back with you to England.' When Sir Frederick expressed his readiness to do this, she seemed pleased, and went on, 'I will send them to you at one o'clock to-night, and I know I can rely on your discretion. I don't want a soul to know that they have been taken away, and certainly Willie (the emperor) must not have them, nor must he ever know you have got them.'

---

[1] *The Letters of the Empress Frederick.* Edited by the Right Hon. Sir Frederick Ponsonby, G.C.B., G.C.V.O. (Macmillan & Co., 1928.)

That night, as the clock boomed one, there was a quiet knock at his door. He replied, 'Herein,' and four men, in blue serge breeches and long riding-boots, entered carrying two boxes, about the size of portmanteaux, covered with black cloth. New cords were round them, and on each was a plain white label with neither name nor address. They set the boxes down and retired without speaking a word. Sir Frederick had only expected packets of letters, and wondered how he should be able to get two large boxes away unobserved. He wrote on the label of one 'Books with care,' and on the other 'China with care,' adding his private address. Next morning his servant was astonished to see this weighty addition to his luggage, but he explained in an off-hand way that they were things he had bought and wished to be placed in the passage. This brought M. Fehr, the King's courier, on the scene, who complained that, though notice had been given that nothing was to be brought into the castle without permission from himself or the Emperor's Chief of Police, yet these two boxes from Homburg had reached Sir Frederick without any one knowing anything about them. Sir Frederick felt he was making a bad start, but replied that the Custom House officers were bad enough, but, if M. Fehr began to trouble before they started he should never get the goods into England. 'It is at the Custom House I want your help, not here,' I said, in an aggrieved voice. The idea that the boxes contained something contraband appealed to M. Fehr, who became very confidential and said that Sir Frederick might rely on his help.

On March 1, 1901, they left Friedrichshof to return to London. As Sir Frederick stood talking to the Emperor in the hall, he could see out of the corner of his eye the file of soldiers carrying out the luggage. The black boxes looked very different from the rest, but no one noticed them, and the Emperor went on talking. They were the last things placed on a wagon which stood in front of the

windows of the great hall, and the tarpaulin cover was not at once drawn over it. The two great boxes were painfully conspicuous, but every one was listening to the Kaiser, and no notice was taken of the luggage. It was a mighty relief when at last the boxes were safely locked up at Cell Farm, Old Windsor.

The Empress died on August 5, 1901. Sir Frederick was with the King at her funeral. After it Count Eulenberg, head of the Emperor's household, told him confidentially that no letters or papers of the Empress had been found, although a thorough search had been made. He added that the Emperor wished Sir Frederick to ascertain, without making too much of it, whether by chance these letters were in the archives at Windsor. Sir Frederick learned from Sir Arthur Davidson that the grounds had been surrounded by cavalry, and the castle by special police, while competent searchers ransacked every room. Sir Frederick promised to write Lord Esher, who was Keeper of the Archives, and in due course received a reply that there were no such papers. This was forwarded to Count Eulenberg, who wrote a short letter of thanks for the trouble Sir Frederick had taken. Some years later the Count asked him several questions about his visit to Friedrichshof, which Sir Frederick was able to answer with candour. He was conscious that more searching and precise inquiries were to follow, but fortunately they were interrupted, and he escaped further questions.

The Empress's letters to her mother had evidently been returned to her, with a view to the publication of extracts which might answer the harsh criticisms passed on her in Bismarck's *Reminiscences* and other memoirs. She had deleted passages, and, when unable to proceed further, sent them back to England by Sir Frederick, who was her godson and the son of one of her dearest friends. She was not able to give him any instructions, but, after twenty-seven years the bitter and unjust criticism to which the Empress is still exposed led Sir Frederick to decide to publish the

letters in the interest of historic truth and in vindication of the Empress's memory.

Her girlhood was almost ideal. In March 1856, Mr. Buchanan, the American Ambassador, dined with Queen Victoria and sat next to the Princess Royal. He thought her the most charming girl he had ever met. 'All life and spirit, full of frolic and fun, with an excellent head, and a heart as big as a mountain.' She was married to Prince Frederick of Prussia on January 25, 1858. She had been her father's adoring pupil and companion, and when he visited the young people in June he found the relation between them all that could be desired. It proved, indeed, a marriage of deep and enduring affection. The Prince Consort continued to the end of his life to cultivate his daughter's knowledge and grasp of public affairs, and thus perhaps made her position more difficult in Prussia, where *Küche, Kinderstube, Krankenstuhl, und Kirche*—kitchen, nursery, sick-room, and church—were regarded as the bounds of woman's kingdom. Her father's letters also had their influence on Prince Frederick, whose esteem and love of the Prince Consort lasted as long as he lived.

The Princess sent Queen Victoria an account of the death of Frederick William IV on January 2, 1861. 'I have seen death for the first time! It has made an impression upon me that I shall never forget as long as I live. . . . Fritz and I stood looking at him for some time. I could hardly bring myself to believe that this was really death, that which I had so often shuddered at and felt afraid of—there was nothing there dreadful or appalling—only a heavenly calm and peace. I felt it did me so much good and was such a comfort. "Death, where is thy sting; grave, where is thy victory." I am not afraid of death now, and when I feel inclined to be so, I shall think of that solemn and comforting sight, and that death is only a change for the better.'

The autocratic temper of the new King soon brought

him into conflict with the Prussian Parliament, and he summoned Count von Bismarck from the Embassy in Paris to extricate him from his difficulties. Neither the Crown Prince nor Princess 'could see eye to eye with this ruthless protagonist of Prussianism, and from the first there were clashes and skirmishes, covert and open hostility. Bismarck regarded the Princess, as he regarded all women, as a *quantité négligeable* in affairs of State, while to the Princess, who had views much in advance of her time, any form of autocratic government was anathema.'

The letters reflect the feeling of Prussia during the wars with Denmark, Austria, and with France. The Crown Princess did national service in organizing better hospital conditions at Homburg in 1870, and the Crown Prince gained much distinction as a commander and as a man of feeling.

When their eldest son was thirteen his father noted in his diary that the boy's relations to his parents were 'simple, natural, cordial.' Even now many hopes sat on his forehead. 'God grant we may guard him suitably against whatever is base, petty, trivial, and by good guidance train him for the difficult office he is to fulfil!' Unhappily for his parents, for the German Empire, and for the world, the young Prince was drawn into his grandfather's circle, and came under the influence of Bismarck and the Junker party, who estranged him from his father and mother and sowed the seeds of future disaster.

The letters bring back the tragedy of the Crown Prince's fatal illness with terrible reality. The quarrel among the doctors and the pathetic struggle against the disease make painful reading. No wife could have been more devoted; no sufferer more heroic. The Prince lived to be Kaiser for ninety-eight days. His Proclamation and his letter to Prince Bismarck indicated that a more liberal and enlightened policy was to be pursued in the future. But all such hopes were dispelled by the Emperor's death on June 15, 1888.

His widow 'lost for the time being all hope, all desire. Life, with her husband gone, was empty and bitter.' William II gave the impression that he held his father in small esteem. The Bismarcks openly disparaged him. Herbert Bismarck spoke of him as an 'incubus' and an 'ineffectual visionary,' and bluntly suggested to the Prince of Wales that 'an Emperor who could not talk was unfit to reign.' The Prince found it difficult to restrain his temper. 'Bismarck now became all-powerful again, and no humiliation or pain was spared the ex-Empress, either by the Chancellor or his new master.' A cordon of soldiers was drawn around the palace so that no documents might be removed without the knowledge of the new Emperor; even the doctors were not allowed to carry on any correspondence with the outside, or to leave the palace. The Empress Frederick appealed in vain to her son for an interview, and when she wished to see Bismarck, on the day after her husband's death, he replied that he had no time, as he was so fully occupied with his new master.

She had to eat the bread of bitter tears. She lived to see the Kaiser drop his pilot in March 1890. It meant the removal of an inveterate enemy, yet she thought the parting with Bismarck a dangerous experiment. She wisely abstained, however, from interfering in political matters, and busied herself with providing a new home at Cronberg. Her feeling towards her mother comes out in the greetings on Queen Victoria's birthday in 1899, 'Eighty years of grace and honours—of confidence and goodness—of trials and sorrows—with much happiness and many joys which are given to few, though mingled with troubles and anxieties inseparable from a unique position as a sovereign and mother. Truly a reason for us to praise and thank God for so many mercies, and to pray that bright and peaceful years may crown the rest!' She shared our national anxieties during the Boer war and was shocked by a tactless public speech made by the Kaiser. 'Dear William has made a new

speech with much fanfaronade. I wish the German Government would give up the policy of constant fireworks, sensational coups, &c., as the vanity and conceit of the public and their chauvinism are stimulated thereby to a perfectly ridiculous degree.' Her relations with her son became more cordial and life grew brighter, until she also fell a victim to cancer, of which she died on August 1, 1901.

Sir Frederick Ponsonby says that the main reason for her unpopularity was that, despite her pride in the German army and the German people, she remained in German eyes '*die Engländerin*,' a phrase that then bore as much scornful acerbity as the term 'Bolshevist' in the England of to-day. Her son says, 'She was always most German in England and most English in Germany.' That, thinks Sir Frederick, 'was the main cause of her unpopularity.' It must be acknowledged that she had not the tact needed for her trying position. Many sympathized with her in her difficulties, but those who dared to espouse her cause were so persecuted that their careers were ruined. Of her sterling ability and high character her letters give abundant proof. Sir Frederick's final estimate will certainly be endorsed by his readers: 'Calumniated, abandoned, distrusted, and even hated as she was by Germany in her lifetime, and, for a quarter of a century after, the time is surely coming when that great country will recognize that in the Empress Frederick it had a sovereign lady who, in spite of her faults, in spite of the defects of her qualities, always devoted her energies to secure for Germany the political and cultural leadership of continental Europe.'

JOHN TELFORD.

Notes and Discussions

THE THEOLOGY OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

No thinker ever stands entirely alone. The most original and independent minds are debtors to those who went before, and this is especially true of the Middle Ages. St. Thomas Aquinas is not eminent for his independence, but for his conservative fidelity, a quality for which he is still esteemed as a master in the Roman Communion. Progress is always by the interaction of settled convention and the fermentation of new thought. Aquinas stands in the orthodox succession, gathering up as his inheritance the elements of generally accepted truth set forth by Augustine, Anselm, and his own master, Albertus Magnus, among others. He thus becomes the epitome of the conservative aspect of mediaeval thought, while its audacious curiosity finds expression in Abelard, Duns Scotus, and William of Occam. Both aspects are characteristic of the period, but in so far as the triumph of free inquiry inevitably meant the end of scholasticism, the passing of the Middle Ages, it is to Aquinas that we look as the embodiment of the mediaeval *Zeitgeist*.

The theologian of this period is a metaphysician first. This accounts for a certain unreality about his exposition. Instead of beginning with the known facts of the divine revelation in Christ, and working back thence towards a satisfying metaphysic, he begins with the abstract philosophy of Plato or of Aristotle, and tries to build accepted Christian doctrine into the fabric raised on that foundation. Plato and neo-Platonism, by way of Philo, Plotinus, and St. Augustine, had already penetrated deeply into the Church, and Aristotle, long known and revered for his logical method, was now accessible in his metaphysical treatises. The fascination exerted by Aristotle is remarkable. He supplies the need for a transcendent God in whose hands the universe may be safely disposed. The mediaeval mind, as distinct from the mediaeval heart, does not demand a personal Saviour, so much as an ultimate Monarch. In fact, it is almost true to say that the Church as formally established at the time of Aquinas was not 'Christian' at all, in any deep and characteristic sense. Its faith is philosophical and ecclesiastical; it seems to hover on the border between theism and deism, however real may have been the personal religious experience of Augustine or of Aquinas himself. There is always a metaphysical presupposition as to the nature of God. Its problem is rather to find a place for Christ in its system than to evolve a system which satisfactorily honours Christ.

Yet the fact that Aquinas, and others before him, had turned to Aristotle for an adequate conception of God is significant. There was a motive for this quest. If the Christianity he knew had been

more richly self-consistent in expression and in theory, he need not have looked beyond it for satisfaction. Aquinas lived in the very middle of the thirteenth century, at the zenith of ecclesiastical greatness. Anselm, it is true, had been a Platonic realist in the days of Hildebrand. He could hold that Pope and Church were representatives of their eternal counterparts in the presence of God. The Hildebrandine Papacy was only beginning. Now, however, in the brilliant age of papal supremacy, when it seemed that alike the shadow and the substance of power were in the hands of the Church, a man might well hold that its reality was '*in re*,' that the ecclesiastical system was inherently true.

Such a view of the Church, moreover, fitted in well with the transcendent conception of God which both Aristotle and Augustine's neo-Platonism yielded. A remote God needed an agent in the world. With such an agent as the Church of this century, God could be considered as remote as might be, even an abstraction of ' pure energy,' a perpetual operation of transcendent thought inspiring the Church, which was the evident and tangible reality of men's lives.

The ground on which the orthodox thirteenth century theologian, then, bases his system is primarily not an arbitrary metaphysical assumption about the nature of God, but an unquestioning acceptance of the authority of Holy Church, which compels him to use any ideas at his disposal to express what God must be for so stupendous an instrument of His will to be possible, necessary, and right.

On the one hand, therefore, Aquinas is impelled by fidelity to the Church of his age to a transcendent view of God, expressed in Aristotelian terms ; and, on the other, he is assisted, by this very conception of God, to exalt the function of the Church at every point. These two factors are constantly present in Aquinas's theology.

He holds that, although the essential reality of things is inseparably resident in them, we cannot perceive it by unaided reason ; it must be revealed to us. It is Scripture, interpreted by the Church and finally by the Pope, which thus brings the truth of life's meaning and of the nature of God and of man within our understanding.

Aquinas combines the thought of God as pure intellectual activity with the orthodox conception of the Trinity, in whom all the Persons are distinct, yet substantially one. God is self-sufficient, so the act of Creation is viewed as a work of grace. Almost inevitably, God is regarded from a determinist angle, and man's freedom is correspondingly limited. God is the Final Cause of all things, and all that He does for men whom He has made is in order to bring them to Himself. But manifestly there is an unresolved difficulty in Aquinas's twofold notion of God as sheer ' Existence,' and as a Person capable of loving and of being loved.

The mystery of the Incarnation is not simplified by being regarded as the assumption of a human nature by the Logos. Anselm's view implies that there is a sublimated essential '*humanitas*' which the Logos could assume. Aquinas has to find room in a human being for all his ordinary qualities—except sin—together with the Divine

Logos. He is not clear as to how the union takes place, but he never forgets that it is the Logos in some form who has walked this earth, and the human Jesus is left almost out of account.

Aquinas's soteriology draws upon both Anselm and Abelard. The death of the Son of God is, on the one hand, God's own contribution to the satisfaction of justice ('There was no other good enough to pay the price of sin'); on the other hand, it is the surest means of attracting the love of men to Himself. But, because in fact it was a Divine Being who died, and not a mere man who alone truly deserved to die, the merit of the Death is freely available to the 'members' of that 'one mystical person' of which Christ is the 'Head.' It is indeed more than sufficient, for the infinite virtue of Christ outweighs the accumulated sinfulness of men.

This is the foundation of that doctrine of merit which developed so remarkably. All believers, being forgiven their debt, may by their acts of righteousness add to the 'Treasury of Merit,' which is available for all at need. Our forgiveness is of the unmerited grace of God, but thereafter we can help ourselves and others by meritorious conduct, remitting part of the temporal punishment which is our due here and in Purgatory. Out of this belief, to which Aquinas gave full sanction, grew the lucrative system of indulgences.

Closely associated is the ordinance of penance, which Aquinas regarded as a sacrament. Innocent III, in 1215, had decreed that at least annual confession to a priest must be made; and the confession was followed by the pronouncement of absolution and of the appropriate penance.

The primary sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper were regarded as efficacious practically *ex opere operato*, though the term was not yet used. Transubstantiation had already been accepted and confirmed as Church dogma in 1215, and here again Aquinas found a congenial contact with Aristotelian thought. The presence of Christ was literally enshrined under the forms of the bread and the wine. The sacraments were regarded as the ordained channels for the grace of God coming into men's lives.

It is singular that, while St. Thomas taught that the Virgin Mary was as human as others in respect of sin, his critic Scotus, who in other ways stands in the line of the Reformers, declared her to be sinless, a doctrine established by Pope Pius IX as the 'Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.'

It is also noteworthy that St. Thomas found 'no real disagreement between theology and philosophy.' Duns Scotus was at least aware of incongruities.

Aquinas is governed by three distinct considerations. He begins his inquiry at two opposite points, with the necessity of reaching a central ground of reconciliation. All these three points are fixed for him beforehand, from which it follows that the course of the inquiry cannot by any means be free. One master whom he will follow is Aristotle, prince of free-thinkers. At the same time he must serve another, the Church, to which, in his age, free-thought is abhorrent.

But, for his own soul's peace, he must come at last to the central Christ. So he does, for this is the truth he knows in his own experience, and here is the vital centre of his faith; he can live here when he has abandoned his dialectic and his rigid creed. But these are the familiar forms of his age, and the Church has far to go before she acknowledges that there is nothing that lives but life, and that the credal and logical forms must suffer change and be wrought anew again and again until the life may dwell therein unhindered and express itself through them. Meanwhile, we see the lines of faith and reason, of orthodox theology and speculative philosophy, warped in the attempt to display a unity and a continuity impossible for them. Nevertheless, St. Thomas Aquinas is a great son of a great age, and the Church owes to his definitive theology much of the stimulus which stirred men to a more eager search for the truth.

LESLIE H. BUNN.

WAS JESUS A CARPENTER?

THE effect of popular art and literature upon the mind can hardly be truly estimated. Men take for granted what they see constantly portrayed in pictures, and are for ever finding taken for granted in their general reading. We have all seen paintings and book illustrations of Jesus in the carpenter's shop. Nine out of every ten books we read of His life assume that He was a carpenter. This belief, however, rests upon a single text,[1] and even this verse has the reading 'The Son of the carpenter' in some MSS. Moreover, Origen distinctly says in his work against Celsus that nowhere in the Gospels is Jesus Himself called a carpenter.[2] On the other hand, it is only fair to say that Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho says that Jesus, 'when among men worked as a carpenter, making yokes and ploughs, thus teaching the marks of righteousness and commending an active life.'[3]

It is quite possible, however, for Justin to have deduced this from the three passages, 'Is not this the carpenter's Son?' 'Whosoever puts his hand to the plough,' and 'Take My yoke upon you.'

Before we go on to suggest another rôle for the Master, it may perhaps be of interest here to collect the material bearing on the carpenter tradition; and to this end let us first turn to Sirach xxxviii. 25–34. 'How can he get wisdom that holdeth the plough? . . . so every carpenter that laboureth night and day . . . they shall not sit high in the congregation . . . they shall not be found where parables are spoken.' The Rev. A. P. Sym suggests[4] that this reference explains why the people were especially offended at Jesus the carpenter for presuming to speak in the synagogue and in parables.

Dean Farrar[5] tells us of a curious anecdote to the effect that Libanius, a pagan philosopher and admirer of Julian the Apostate, inquired of a Christian, 'What is the Carpenter doing now?' 'He is

[1] Mark vi. 3. [2] Origen, *C. Cels.*, vi. 36. [3] *Dial. cum Trypho*, 88.
[4] Art. 'Carpenter,' *H. D. C. G.* [5] *Life of Christ*.

making a coffin,' was the sharp reply. Soon after came the news of Julian's death.

It is strange how few are the references to carpentry in the sayings of Jesus. There is the saying about the mote and the beam,[1] the green wood and the dry,[2] and the Oxyrhynchus saying, 'Cleave the wood and there I am.'[3] With this we may compare the words in the Infancy Gospel of Thomas, 'Cleave the wood and remember Me.'[4]

The manual labour of our Lord has always held a high place in devotional literature. Ephraem Syrus, for instance, in his sixth rhythm on the Nativity, has said, 'Owing to Joseph the workmen came to the Son of Joseph. Blessed be Thy nativity, Thou Head of workmen, the impress of which the ark bore, fashioned after which was the Tabernacle of the congregation, that was for a time only. Our craft praiseth Thee, who art our Glory. Mayest Thou make the yoke which is light, yea, devise and make measures by righteousness, that he that is vile may be accused thereby, and he that is perfect may be acquitted thereby. Weigh therewith both mercy and truth, O Just One, as a Judge.'

An interesting cross-light upon the trade of Jesus is discoverable in the researches conducted by Dr. Rendel Harris into the cult of the heavenly twins. In the Acts of Thomas, Jesus and Thomas appear as twins. In this case Jesus would appear to be the heavenly twin, and Thomas the earth-born one. Among well-marked Dioscuric features the legends concerning Christ reveal the following details: in Pseudo-Lentulus, Jesus is represented as having red hair (the thunder colour): Al Baizawi says that 'Isa is the same as the Hebrew Ishu, which, he says, is derived from *al'ayas* (white mingled with red), which reveals in the very Mohammedan name for Jesus the red of thunder and the white of lightning; Christ is represented in the Fourth Gospel driving the buyers and sellers from the Temple with a scourge of small cords, which *may* be an echo of the lightning whip of the Acvins of the Vedas: He shows in the marriage feast at Cana an interest in wedding festivities; as does Thomas, in the Acts, which seems significant, when it is known that the Dioscuri are the patron saints of weddings; in the Acts of Andrew and Matthias He ensures a safe voyage to the missionaries, thus revealing another Dioscuric trait—that of guardian of sailors; and, lastly, the Heavenly Twins are universally accepted as the patrons and founders of the arts of building and carpentry. Hence the question arises if we are not to put down the carpenter reading in Mark vi. 3 to mythical influences of a Dioscuric nature.[5]

The foregoing seems to cast not a little doubt upon the carpenter tradition, which makes it the more interesting that from the earliest times there has existed a rival tradition concerning our Lord's

[1] Matt. vii. 3–5. [2] Luke xxiii. 31. [3] Oxy. Pap., Part I.
[4] James's *New Test. Apoc.*, p. 52.
[5] Art. 'Jesus,' in Hughes's *Dict. of Islam*; Harris, *Dioscuri in Christian Legend*; *Cult of the Heavenly Twins*: 'Picus who is also Zeus': Boanerges'; *Expositor*, Ser. 7, Vol. II., p. 305; Vol. III., p. 146, 382; Ser. 8, Vol. IX., pp. 29, &c.

vocation during the silent years. It is believed in the East that the Carpenter's Son was a dyer. Traces of this are to be found in the Gospel of Thomas, and in the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy. That Christ practised the art of dyeing is also asserted in La Brosse's Persic Lexicon. Christ is the patron of the Persian dyers, and a dye-shop is called by them the shop of Christ.

We find traces of a similar tradition in the Mohammedan *Tales of the Prophets*. There the Apostles are called '*hawari*,' which is the Ethiopic for 'messenger.' The stories say, however, that it comes from a word meaning 'to whiten,' and this since they were fullers by trade. Jesus said to them, 'Just as you make clothes clean, so by faith in God cleanse your hearts from the dust of sin.' They then asked for a miracle, so Jesus took a jar and filled it with clothes. When at last He took them out they were all of one colour.

Let us at this point in our inquiry turn our eyes to the small village of el-Mejdel, some three miles north of Tiberias, and about sixteen miles from Nazareth as the crow flies; for it is here that Jesus may have spent some of the thirty odd years prior to His ministry. It seems most probable that this village rests on the site of the ancient and important town of Magdala. This view finds confirmation from Rabbi Schwarz, who asserts that the cave of Teliman, or Talmanutha (Cf. Mark viii. 18, Dalmanutha), was in the cliffs which overlook the sea behind the site of el-Mejdel. The rabbis say that Magdala was adjacent to the city of Tiberias; while in the time of Phuaresmius (seventeenth century) Mejdel is mentioned as identical with the Magdala of Scripture.[1]

Edersheim says that Magdala, which was a Sabbath day's journey from Tiberias, was celebrated for its dye-works and its manufacture of fine woollen textures, of which eighty are mentioned. Magdala had a synagogue. Its name was probably derived from a strong tower which defended its approaches, or served for outlook. Twenty minutes to the north of Magdala descended the so-called Valley of Doves (the Wady Hamam), through which passed the ancient caravan road that led over Nazareth to Damascus.[2]

We may believe, if we attach importance to both traditions, that in His early youth Jesus would help His father in the carpenter's shop at Nazareth, but when Joseph died, and the care of the family fell upon the Master's shoulders, He would fare forth in search of better employment—found at length in the dye-works of Magdala. Was it in her own home town, one wonders, that He first came into contact with Mary Magdalene? Was it during the silent years that He performed His gracious work upon her? We do not know. Our sources are silent. We can but surmise.

Be this as it may, both Jesus the Carpenter and Jesus the Dyer are cherished in the hearts of men. The Western world will ever find its proud arrogance checked by the recollection that the kingliest King who ever lived was once a carpenter in Nazareth; and the men

of darker skin, lacking a Saviour in their creed, may yet rejoice to find that the greatest miracle of the Master Dyer is the washing of their robes in the blood of the Lamb.

E. J. JENKINSON.

THE INFLUENCE OF SCHLEIERMACHER ON PROTESTANT THEOLOGY

SCHLEIERMACHER'S important contribution to Christian thought is his insistence that theology and religion cannot truly and finally be regarded as separate. Religion is essentially an assertion, theology an inquiry. That is not to say that the one is unresponsively static, the other irresponsively dynamic; it means that our *certainty* should be confined to the limited field of practical relationships, while 'on the Godward side' we are ever open to receive new impressions. Now religion is imperilled when it becomes too stereotyped, or too vague, and in the same way theology loses value when it becomes too abstractedly inquisitive, or too dogmatic. There is a mean value proper to each which is lost either by intrusion into the other's province or by exaggeration within its own. A real distinction exists between what a man does as religiously good and what he believes as theologically true. Perhaps, without unduly stressing the passage, we may read in this sense St. Paul's saying that we are not willing to give our life in defence of a man because he is righteous, though we will do so because he is good. His righteousness is a matter for dispute, in which we may not agree with him. It is an individual, debatable quantity. His goodness, if we recognize it, is an overflowing influence which makes a personal appeal to us. He may possibly claim to be righteous, and instinctively we proceed to analyse his claim; goodness is not claimed, it is conceded. Yet we know that finally a man's conduct is good relatively to himself according to what he believes to be right, and absolutely according as what he believes actually *is* right. Although, therefore, we can distinguish between what is religiously good and what is ultimately true, these things cannot really be separated, for they react on each other.

Religiously, faith and practice are vitally distorted by a basically wrong view of God; on the other hand, a theology is incomplete and dangerous which evolves a God whom the soul of man cannot worship, and who cannot or will not do for man all that man truly requires of a divine being. Religion should be the living basis, the sure ground, from which theology begins. Here we should have a sense of immediate contact with God so real that we are impelled to seek a fuller knowledge of Him. Theology, being a venture into the unknown, must base itself firmly upon the known, lest it lose itself in the great profound. But the theological inquiry will enrich our conception of the God whom religiously we adore, and will enhance our sense of what is truly real.

This relation has been discussed at some length because it was by no means clearly grasped in the post-Reformation centuries, and because we cannot rightly estimate the influence of a thinker unless we consider what current elements of thought and belief stirred him to give his own particular emphasis. The Reformation undoubtedly had strong practical results in a purer form of worship. This was natural, for in its course it was an eminently practical movement. It was not, of course, without its theoretic basis, for it was opposed to the fundamentally wrong thinking of Rome about God, which was the prime source of her grievous errors. But the Protestant Churches, when once established, did not leave room for that development which is inevitable in a living institution. Fearful of losing their dearly bought gains, the Reformers refused to provide for change, whether in practice or in belief. The system was regarded as closed at both ends—and was therefore open to those perils which always beset a closed system that has not the courage to be improved.

This was the position when the German *Aufklärung* began to express the revolt of thoughtful men against a fixed orthodoxy which sterilized progress. But, as was natural with men whose interest was on the purely inquisitive rather than on the experiential side, they went to the other extreme. If the orthodox Protestant had a religion which made no attempt to keep in touch with ultimate reality, the thinkers of the Enlightenment created a theology which had no necessary connexion with religious experience. Yet this was only the inevitable reply to those who had indeed a real and living religious life, but whose theology, embalmed in various historic Confessions and unrevised, was not in any true sense expressive of what God meant to them.

There was thus at the end of the eighteenth century a dual danger lest religion should be permanently impoverished by being out of touch with any living theological inquiry, and lest theology should be permanently discredited by being divorced from the confident assertions of personal religion. To Schleiermacher belongs the distinction of firmly basing the new fearless search towards God in the deep centre of religious testimony. His metaphysic is strongly moulded by his Moravian upbringing. He finds in the religious consciousness a sure basis, or, again, a congenial atmosphere, for the development of thought about God, and his thinking is always brought to the test less of intellectual than of religious satisfaction. We know, he would say, that Christ is a Redeemer because He has redeemed *us*. The issue within ourselves of our faith in Christ drives us to ask who it is that does such a work in us. He must be more than a man, or He could have no redemptive power. Schleiermacher is quite willing to say that Jesus is God-possessed, that it is God working through Him who achieves our redemption. But he does not go the whole length of declaring that it is God Himself projecting His personal life into the world in the person of Jesus. Indeed, for all his exaltation of Jesus as the central fact of our faith, Schleiermacher does not set it beyond doubt that He is not a man gloriously

endowed with the redeeming energies of a divine principle which comes short of personality. He seems to have a lingering thought of a transcendent God who is just too august for complete self-incarnation. But at least no uncertainty remains that for redemption we are in utter dependence upon Christ.

As is to be expected, Schleiermacher does not stand alone. He points out a new and better way, which subsequent theologians are not slow to tread. First there is the Mediating School, of which Neander and Dorner are the chief names. It is in two senses a transitional group. It occupies the position of Schleiermacher as between the rigid orthodox Protestants and the radical Tübingen writers, but it also represents the transition from the point at which Schleiermacher's standpoint was a novelty in theological study to when, through Ritschl, it had become the characteristic modern line of progress. Neander laid hold of Schleiermacher's thought of the personal influence of the divine in men, and worked it out in his *History*. Dorner is impressed by the reverse side of the same idea, the personal response of the individual to the working of the divine, and traces the testimony of experience through the primitive and later history of the Church.

It was Ritschl who gathered up and carried forward most effectively the truths indicated by Schleiermacher. He came under other influences also; but these two men stand together on the firm ground of experience. From this point Ritschl proceeds to a deep distrust of metaphysics, which to him has no apparent bearing upon practical religious life. At least, he would say that, if any transcendental attributes or characteristics are to be ascribed to the divine nature, let it not be *a priori*, but only as need arises for explaining our experience of His working. But neither he nor Schleiermacher seems to have realized that the ethical transcendence of God necessarily implies His metaphysical transcendence.

To Schleiermacher, moreover, Ritschl owes something of the ground on which he bases his *Werthurtheile* doctrine, that things are to be judged according to their value for us. But he shrinks from going the entire length of saying that Christ, who in our experience undoubtedly has the value of God for us, therefore and of necessity is God. Here he closely follows Schleiermacher. It is remarkable how even moderate German scholars have failed to see that there is no exaltation of the divine character which compares in grandeur with that deliberate self-abasement which they deny as unworthy of Him. It is the failure, already noted, to construe the nature of God in terms of personal or even of ethical excellence.

All present-day theology is indebted to Schleiermacher. He has given us the standpoint for an increasing vision of God. If it be said that his theology takes for its subject rather our religious consciousness of God than God Himself, this is to avoid the alternative of an abstract construction. As Dr. H. R. Mackintosh remarks, Schleiermacher has done memorable service by setting Christ once more at the centre of His religion. Subsequent inquiry may result in a clearer

expression of the significant relationships of Christ to God and to man, but the central ground is gained for Him for ever. Thanks to Schleiermacher, we shall not again try to honour one God with the mind and another with the heart.

THE CHARM OF OXFORD

OXFORD is the delight of all the world, and the Trust which watches over its beauties, and seeks to preserve them unimpaired despite the growth of the University and the city, has had 'an exciting, busy, and fruitful year.' The second annual report quotes an article which Sir Michael Sadler contributed on March 1928 to the *London Mercury*. The Trust has caught the tide, and Town and Gown are united in the determination to preserve the beauty of one of the treasures of the world. There is no desire to hamper its growth. It is a living thing. The poorer families need better and healthier homes, and every one is determined that they shall have them. Many other schemes are involved. Much has been done already. The Trust has bought a wide stretch of the eastern side of Boar's Hill, from which there is an incomparable view of the city. A hundred acres of meadowland along the banks of the Cherwell have also been secured. Twenty more acres on the summit of Boar's Hill have been bought to preserve the view dear to Matthew Arnold and enshrined in the *Scholar Gipsy* and *Thyrsis*, looking over the Vale of the White Horse and the Wessex Heights. The Trust needs to accumulate funds for the purchase of the Headington estate, which is the green background of Magdalen. The Wytham Woods have already been bequeathed by the present owner to the University, under certain conditions. Most of the work of the Trust is done voluntarily, so that expenses are reduced to a minimum. Mr. and Mrs. Masefield and others have given performances in aid of the Trust. It is in friendly co-operation with the Cambridge Preservation Society. Sir Charles Batho, Bt., when Lord Mayor of London, arranged a luncheon at the Mansion House to the Masters and Prime Wards of the great City Companies and the Chairmen of the five Joint Stock Banks, where speakers from Oxford and Cambridge were able to describe the aims of the Preservation Societies. The Trust at Oxford is in close touch with the City Council and other authorities, who welcome its suggestions for the suitable and harmonious treatment of sites and buildings in prominent positions. Some illustrations are given in the report which show how much valuable service the Trust is rendering, and establish a strong claim on the generous support of old Oxonians and of all lovers of the city. The sum of £22,268 has already been raised, but much more is needed if great opportunities are not to be lost. The Cambridge Preservation Society has secured 380 acres at Madingley, and has thus averted the danger which threatened a beloved part of the countryside west of Cambridge.

J. TELFORD.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

Synoptische Studien. I. *Zur Geschichtsquelle.* By Wilhelm Bussmann. [Die Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, Halle (Saale).]

THIS extremely able work, by a writer who has combined the labours of research with those of the pastorate, discusses the relation of the Synoptic Gospels to the historical source on which they rest. The Two Document Hypothesis is accepted, but it is claimed that Luke used a shorter form of Mark (G) than the canonical Gospel. Subsequently G was expanded by a Galilean redactor (B), whose work was used as a source by the author of Matthew, while a still further redaction was made by a Roman writer (E), who is also the Second Evangelist. The theory is worked out in very great detail, and finally a reconstruction of G is given in Greek. In Great Britain similar views have been presented by V. H. Stanton and W. W. Holdsworth, but the hypothesis is worked out independently and on a much larger scale by Bussmann, whose sole reference to the work of British scholars is to the *Horae Synopticae* of Sir John C. Hawkins. A first reading of *Synoptische Studien* awakens many doubts: little is left to the individuality of the Evangelists, the work of the successive redactors being described with a precision which extends even to E's supposed fondness for the preposition μετά. On the other hand—and this is perhaps Bussmann's main contribution—we are compelled to see how great a problem is created by Luke's relation to Mark, and especially by his omission of so much Marcan material. Bussmann's work is in many respects an alternative solution to many of the issues faced by the Proto-Luke theorists. His remorseless argument that the 'Marcan omissions' are not to be explained by Luke's 'fear of doublets' is very difficult to meet unless one dissents from the initial assumption that Luke uses Mark as his principal source. To deny the latter is, of course, to move towards the Proto-Luke hypothesis as a superior solution of the problem. A second part of *Synoptische Studien* will treat the sayings-source used by Matthew and Luke, and a third the special sources used by these Evangelists. Bussmann's work is of first rank, and will repay study both by those who accept and those who reject his particular views.

Recent Religious Psychology. By A. R. Uren, Ph.D. (T. & T. Clark. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

This new branch of inquiry came into being on American soil, and Dr. Uren shows the various methods it has pursued—the questionnaire,

biographical, historical, comparative and genetic, and experimental methods. An important feature of his volume is the exposition and criticism of the standard works on the subject, from Starbuck's *Psychology of Religion* down to Pratt's *Religious Consciousness*. That gives special value to the work. It is in itself a compact and comprehensive survey of the standard literature of the subject. The two last chapters, on 'Results' and 'Limitations,' show clearly what is the present position. The striking phenomena of the religious life have been reduced to law and shown to conform to the rest of our organized knowledge. The most firmly established results are pedagogical. The arrogant claims of the extreme negative wing of the American school cannot be allowed. 'The psychology of religion has no right to violate the frontiers of theology and metaphysics.' Its function is to describe the history of the facts, not to determine their truth. 'The religious consciousness defies the psychology of religion to disprove its claims that in its profounder moral and spiritual experience it is in touch with God, and challenges psychology to prove that natural science covers the whole of reality.' The religious man feels that in his deeper moral and spiritual experience he is in vital contact with reality, and no valid reason can be given why that should not be as it seems.

Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century. By A. Büchler. (Milford. 12*s.* 6*d.*)

The Chief Rabbi (Dr. Hertz) says, in a Prefatory Note, that the Principal of Jews' College, London, completed these Studies in 1927, the sixtieth year of his life, and the Council of the College decided to print them as No. 11 in their publications. The New Learning in Jewry is only a century and a half old, and it was widely believed, not so long ago, that the whole field had been mastered. During the last generation, however, new horizons have come to view, and it is felt that much of the work already done must be handled afresh, with greater depth and sympathy than mid-nineteenth century rationalism would admit. Anglo-Jewry has taken its share, through men like Solomon Schechter and Dr. Büchler, in this extensive and intensive cultivation of Jewish scholarship. The pertinent early materials dealing with sin and atonement are here gathered under five heads, with an interpretation and evaluation of each rabbinic statement and its bearing on the subject. These divisions are: Obedience to the Torah, its Source and Sanction; the Service of God for the Love or the Fear of Him, and the Right Attitude to Suffering; the Defiling Force of Sin in the Bible, in Post-Biblical, and the Rabbinic Literature; and Atonement of Sin by Sacrifice. The object of the analysis and reconstruction is not apologetic, but an endeavour 'to advance an unbiased appreciation of some Jewish-Palestinian concepts of sin and atonement in the first century.' The covenant at Sinai, God's Kingship, and His yoke, are shown to be the sources of Israel's obligation to worship Him and obey His

commandments. To submit to His dispensation, and to bear the greatest afflictions sent by God without a murmur and without questioning His justice, is evidence of man's love to God; he who serves only for fear of punishment or hope of reward 'kicks against chastisements in his opinion undeserved, and questions the justice of God and His providence.'

The two chapters on the defiling power of sin show that the Day of Atonement was a cleansing from sin against God. The teachers of the first and second centuries held that man cleansed himself from sin by repentance, whilst God's visitations of all kinds furthered submission and repentance. The sprinkling of blood was the chief part of the sacrificial atonement, and other atoning sacrifices in the last decades of the Temple bring out the individual stages of the atonement. It was not automatic. 'The atonement of sin effected was not identical with its pardon; that was the final grace granted by God, by which the peace between God and man, which had been broken by this deliberate offence of the sinner against Him, is now restored by the forgiveness bestowed by God.' Every position is supported by quotations from the Old Testament and the rabbinic literature in a way that gives peculiar interest and value to this masterly set of studies. It is the fourth of the Jews' College publication which we owe to Dr. Büchler; Dr. Marmonstein has contributed two; Dr. Hirschfield three; Dr. Daiches two.

Studies in Religion; Studies in Literature. By Henry Bett, M.A. (Epworth Press. 5*s.* each.)

Here are ten studies in religion which get to the heart of The Problem of Prayer, The Theory of Miracle, The Resurrection of the Body, and other subjects of the deepest interest to Christian thinkers. Difficulties are frankly faced, and faith comes out reinforced, conscious of itself and the future. The spirit of the book is seen in the conclusion that 'in the very nature of the case there cannot be any scientific or philosophical difficulties in the way of believing in prayer exactly as the simplest piety does, except such difficulties as arise out of an assumed determinism; and such an assumption makes not only prayer, but all moral and religious conceptions of life, absolutely impossible.' The *Studies in Literature* show what scant mercy evangelical religion has received from men of letters, while the Catholic type of religion has often been idealized in our fiction and our poetry. The very fact that the cause was a lost one has helped to glorify it. 'Some Elements of Style' is a school for young writers where they will learn much of real value. The studies of the Greek Anthology, of Wesley's *Journal*, Théophile Gautier, Jaufre Rudel, John Davidson, and Dora Greenwell, are of great interest, and 'What is Poetry?' finds it in the 'note of kindled fancy indissolubly blended with apt and noble language, that we call the lyrical spirit.' Both volumes of studies are rich in allusion and marked by strong sense and true critical insight.

The Incarnate Lord. By Lionel Spencer Thornton, M.A., of the Community of the Resurrection. (Longmans. 21*s.* net.)

The writer of this remarkably able book is a thinker of rare force and originality, who is convinced of the inadequacy of current interpretations of the Incarnation. They provide no satisfactory place for the essentially Christian conception of reality which sets the lordship of Christ over the universe and over history. He feels the difficulty of giving an intelligible meaning to the Incarnation from the view of Personalism, because personality is too sharply separated from every application of the theory of organic evolution to the universe. He has no faith in idealistic theories of reality. In these reality is subjective. The human mind creates its own objects. The incarnation of God in a human personality conflicts with the cosmical significance of Christ. Father Thornton has no use for the current antithesis between 'organism' and 'personality.' Conceptions of Incarnation that harmonize with idealism conflict with the religious idea that God is Creator of the world and that we are recipients of His revelation mediated through the works of His creation. He prefers to build his interpretation of Incarnation upon a thorough-going realism. God is the one absolute Reality. All knowledge is 'given' by Him. Reality is not our achievement through our creation of private worlds of experience; for 'all experience is primarily experience of God's self-revelation'; 'Experience is always occupied with "reality" other than itself'; it is 'given.' 'Revelations of reality from beyond determine the whole process of knowledge.' This realism affords a basis for a genuine reconciliation between science and religion in place of the artificial understanding of both parties to keep to separate compartments of reality. This reconciliation is achieved by regarding all reality as one perfect organic whole. This justifies a philosophy of nature which is equivalent to a philosophic realism. Such an organic conception of the universe and man has now won its way to the front. Hence *revelation* and *organism*, which are two dominating conceptions of Mr. Thornton's discussion, are intimately connected. They advance together. The universe is to be interpreted 'in terms of activity advancing through ascending concrete forms until concrete activity attains that degree of individuality which is manifested on the level of the spirit. Through this ascending series of activities a progression of revelation is given to the human mind, and is mediated by selective principles of unity in the concrete series of embodied activities. This mediation ascends in adequacy from less to more, from the instrumentality of objects to the self-determining individuality of agents on the level of spirits. . . . This advancing progression of the organic universe, of the revelation it conveys, and of the mediation through which that revelation is given, rises to a point where in all its aspects it is focused in and upon man. At that point the progression passes by transformation into an infinite order of which man has experience.' 'The Incarnation came as the climax of this ascending

curve of movement, whereby the creative activity of God has been incorporated into time and history.'

For the philosophical basis of the long and elaborate discussions through which Mr. Thornton expounds these positions with learning and insight, he frankly acknowledges his indebtedness to the writings of Professor A. N. Whitehead, whose thinking is exercising an increasing authority in theological circles. Indeed, the reader of Mr. Thornton's fine essay would be well advised first to read his summary of Dr. Whitehead's teaching, which is given in a very useful appendix. If the doctrine of the Incarnation can be finally and satisfactorily related to the organic conceptions of the universe which Dr. Whitehead builds up with scientific exactness upon his fascinating theory of 'events' and 'objects,' we are on the eve of most important changes in the interpretation of many other theological problems besides that of the Person of our Lord. Some of these issues, including Christian theism, the doctrines of the Holy Spirit and the Trinity, Mr. Thornton sets out in detail and with challenging intellectual consistency. It may be too soon yet to assume the permanent constraint of Dr. Whitehead's new realism upon theological thought. There is much in his abstruse system that does not yet shine in its own light; his terminology is strange and not always free from confusion. But his fundamental position that reality is one vast organic unity and its expression one ceaseless rhythm alike in matter, mind, and spirit has come to stay. Sooner or later, constructive theological thinkers may reckon it amongst the aids to faith. Then such fresh, honest, and reverent pioneers in new ways of supporting the Christian verities as Mr. Thornton will find grateful recognition.

The Cambridge Shorter Bible, issued by the University Press at 7*s.* 6*d.*, has been arranged by A. Nairne, T. R. Glover, and Sir A. Quiller-Couch. The text is generally that of the Authorized Version, but the Revised Version is used for Job, the Psalms (with one exception), and a few isolated passages like Isaiah ix. 8–5. In the New Testament the Revised Version is used more frequently for single words and sentences. Good judgement has been used in the omission of certain psalms, genealogies, and less edifying passages. There is nothing of *Chronicles*, but the Gospels (save for the genealogies) and the Acts are unabridged. Difficult passages in Romans are omitted, and Jude and 2 and 3 John disappear. The Minor Prophets gain by reduction, and the six pages of excerpts from the Apocrypha will be welcomed. Great care has been exercised by the skilled editors in the choice of passages, and the result is a volume that will be greatly prized for family use and for devotional reading.

The Authority of the Bible. By C. H. Dodd, M.A. (Nisbet & Co. 10*s.* 6*d.*) This work by the Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis at Mansfield College belongs to *The Library of Constructive Theology*. It brings out 'the specific religious value of the Bible in various aspects, laying emphasis everywhere less upon the word than upon the life behind the word, and upon that life as part of an historical context whose meaning is determined by "the fact of

Christ." ' It is divided into four parts: The Authority of Individual Inspiration; of Corporate Experience; of the Incarnation; of History. The idea of evolution holds sway in religion, and the progressive revelation in the Bible is clearly brought out. There is a continuous history in which as a whole, even more clearly than in the several parts, a divine process of revelation can be discerned. The religious authority of the Bible comes home to us primarily in inducing in us a religious attitude and outlook. Its use as a source of doctrine is secondary, but by no means unimportant. The Bible is not the 'last word' on all religious questions, but the 'seminal word' out of which new apprehension of truth springs in the mind of man. That is Professor Dodd's conclusion in this much-needed and clear-sighted study.

The Riddle of Life. By Neville S. Talbot, M.C., D.D. (Longmans & Co. 2*s.* 6*d.*) This Lenten study, prepared for the diocese of London, is dedicated to the memory of 'that mighty saint, Baron Friedrich von Hügel,' to whose writings it is deeply indebted. Dr. Talbot does not minimize the Riddle of Life. It is presented so powerfully that we begin to wonder how it can be solved. Various explanations are rejected, and light is sought in the Old Testament and found in Jesus Christ and His Cross. Our Lord lights up the great problem of His Cross and His Resurrection. The practical considerations are courage; other-worldliness, which links life here and now with eternity; the riddance of sin; the battle with evil; the fruits of suffering; bereavement; the ultimate victory. Every point is clearly put, and the whole treatment is lit up by faith and hope. It is a book that will comfort and guide many who are perplexed by the Riddle of Life.

Religion Without God. By Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., S.J.D. (Longmans & Co. 15*s.*) Dr. Sheen is a member of the Catholic University of America who holds that present-day religion is not in evolution, but in revolution. As he surveys the philosophy of religion he finds a clear tendency to dispense with God as the goal of religion and the end of life. As a substitute the majority of philosophers of religion offer a religion in terms of value or friendliness of the universe. His study of Luther leads to the conclusion that he put an abyss between nature and grace, making it impossible for the latter to perfect the former. It is interesting to see the Romanist view. 'Luther brought the individual into prominence by asserting his rights against a mystic corporation, and by putting into his hands the sacred Scriptures, which he might interpret as he saw fit. But his followers glorified the individual still more by making the individual a kind of Scripture inspired directly by Almighty God.' A survey of the philosophy of value leads to the conclusion that it is 'hastening the advent of a new paganism and a new panic, for the day that God passes out of civilization, that day gladiators step in.' To eliminate God 'will be the extinction of daylight; then we shall be marching to the music of ghosts and not the voice of reason.' Dr. Sheen is devoted to Aquinas, whose sacramental philosophy 'answers the

best ideals of modern thought by bringing man into prominence and making him the King of Creation, but it does not suffer from the defect of doing so at the expense of God Himself. Man is still the king of the universe, and God is King of man.'

The Synoptic Problem and a New Solution. By R. H. Crompton. (T. & T. Clark. 8*s*.) This is an attempt to arrange the Gospel of St. Luke in pre-Synoptic order. It is re-arranged in twenty-two narrative parallels, sixteen of which are classed as symbolical and six as symbolical and didactic. Mr. Crompton thinks he can deduce a sevenfold parallelism teaching from the various passages and sayings of St. Luke's Gospel, and gives elaborate tables setting forth his conclusions. His idea is that the pre-Synoptic Gospel originated in Alexandria, and that proto-Luke is the result of conflict and was intended to show that the Palestinian section of the Church was tending to a retrogression which aimed to include Judaism, whereas Christianity was a new covenant entirely free from Judaism. It is a very elaborate study, but we cannot think that the new solution will find much support.

Essays Catholic and Missionary. Edited by E. R Morgan. (S.P.C.K. 8*s*. 6*d*.) Evelyn Underhill writes the first of the sixteen essays, on 'Christianity and the Claims of Other Religions.' It is as a living body capable of dealing with the world and with life that Christianity faces the claims of other beliefs. Here philosophy, experience, and ethics each explicate the other, and together fulfil all the needs of the mind, the heart, and the will of man. Other essays deal with the presentation of the gospel to the greater religions, to non-civilized peoples and non-Christian society. The Bishop of Masasi shows how to approach non-Christian customs in a very interesting essay, and the problems of the native Church and the spiritual life of the missionary are well brought out in this important and practical set of essays.

The Excellence of Revealed Religion. By C. G. Challenger, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 5*s*.) The Hulsean Prize Essay for 1927 is 'an Inquiry into the Meaning of Revelation.' The gradual subjugation of philosophy by theology forms an interesting study. When the great doctrinal controversies were over, all that was granted to philosophy was the subordinate function of criticism. At the Renaissance the union of Scripture and tradition achieved in the Patristic Age was broken, and Scripture became established as the sole content of revelation. The Methodist Revival 'leavened both the Church and Nonconformity. The Bible was interpreted anew in the light of the experience of conversion, and was found to contain a "scheme of salvation."' To follow the guidance of religious experience is to choose the better part. The prophet is the most excellent instrument of revelation—the true revealer of God—and in Christ 'the nature of God seems to be so fully revealed that He has for us the religious value of God.' The discriminating survey of thought in this essay is of real value.

Sacraments. By A. L. Lilley, M.A. (Student Christian Movement.

4s.) Canon Lilley's lectures, delivered in Canterbury and Hereford Cathedrals, deal with the sacraments from the historical point of view, beginning with St. Augustine and coming down to Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, St. Thomas Aquinas, and later Scholastic discussion. He seeks to correct 'the tendency to magical conceptions from which sacramental practice is never wholly free,' and to show how 'sacraments, as things of the material order, may be associated with a spiritual effect.' The lecture on Sacraments and the Modern Mind shows that 'For certain natures, and among them some of the most deeply religious, the sacraments have already superseded the preaching of the Word as the means of access to the religious life. Reality breaks through as it were unfettered, not tied to and hampered by the halting interpretations of a human teacher.' Canon Lilley points out the danger in this unlicensed symbolism. The book is of special importance in view of modern tendencies, and the closing essay on Transubstantiation will repay close attention.

Silcoates Sunday Evenings. By Sydney H. Moore, M.A. (Independent Press. 4s. 6d.) These are a lay head-master's talks to his senior boys about religion. Mr. J. L. Paton, in his Foreword, describes Sunday as the most difficult day of the week in a boarding school, and says that neither Arnold at Rugby nor Sanderson at Oundle overcame the difficulty. These sermons do not a little to meet that need. They make a boy think; they bring him in touch with heroic religion; they are illustrated in a way that makes a hearer enter into the spirit of the message. The subjects are arresting, and they are always made impressive.—*Criticism of the Philosophy of Bergson.* By John MacWilliam, B.D., B.Litt. (T. & T. Clark, 9s.) Bergson is here singled out as the best and most eloquent representative of a vast mass of current opinion. His philosophy is that of common sense. Mr. MacWilliam's aim is to 'scrutinize the presumptions of the natural sciences, to show their perversity, and to prove that they are the unconscious results of these same philosophic abstractions which are so much abhorred of ordinary people.' He divides his study into ten chapters, which begin with Quality and Quantity and lead up to three sections on the Validity of Natural Sciences, Mind and Body, the Theory of Evolution. It is an acute and vigorous criticism which students of philosophy will highly value.—*The Psalms. Book I.* A Revised Translation. By F. H. Wales, B.D. (H. Milford. 1s.) A plain and rhythmical expression of the sense of the original, even at the expense of the letter, is aimed at in this translation. Mr. Wales has sought 'to bring to light the various words and varied meanings now misrepresented or unrepresented.' The translation does not wander unduly from the Revised Version, but it has often a homely note which arrests attention, and the division into sections is clearly marked and really helpful.—*The Quest Eternal.* By E. A. Wanderer (W. A. Elliott). (Allenson. 5s.) This is the story of a quest for religion, told largely in dialogue, but so full of simple trust and joy that it will help others to find their way into the sunshine which Mr. Elliott has found.—

The Acts of the Apostles, Part II., xiii.-xxviii., and Supplement. By Stanley Wood, M.A. (George Gill & Sons. 1*s.* 6*d.* and 9*d.*) These questions and notes are intended for candidates preparing for Oxford and Cambridge and other examinations, and are admirably adapted for their use. The information is clearly given and seems to cover the whole ground.—Mr. Allenson sends us *The Idealism of Jesus*, by John E. McIntyre, M.A. (6*s.*), a set of studies in practical religion which are full of ripe thought and never stray far from great practical issues.

The Bible in Graded Story, by Clara and Edna Baker (Abingdon Press, $2), is the fourth volume of this graded series. The stories include Three Patriarchs, Three Leaders, Three Kings, Five Prophets, The Great Prophet (Jesus), and Three Apostles. They are told for children from four to twelve years of age, and some attractive pictures add to the interest of a book which teachers and parents will welcome.—*Social Pioneering*, by W. M. Gilbert (Abingdon Press, 40 cents), is intended for young Christians. Subjects such as Government, Modern Industry, Alcohol, and Health are opened up, so that study circles may gain real knowledge of the world in which they live.—*Adventures in Service*, by Ralph A. Felton (Abingdon Press, 35 cents), is a text-book on rural and small towns. The need of working together, homes, child welfare, a new patriotism, are some of the subjects discussed with a practical purpose. The series is a happy one, and much needed.—*Prayers for the Day's Work*, by Christian P. Reisner (Abingdon Press, 50 cents), are arranged into seventeen groups, with four to eight little prayers in each division. Dr. Reisner long ago began to buy books of prayers, and this third volume of prayers has been written largely whilst laid up in hospital by an accident. It is a choice little book, and seems to have apt petitions for every walk in life.

Child Life and Religious Growth, by Edna M. Bonser (Abingdon Press, $1.50), aims to help those who teach primary classes, in developing ideals and habits that would encourage religious faith and character. Instructions to teachers are followed by twenty-five outline lessons, and many Bible stories, construction and observation stories. It will be invaluable for those who have charge of the primary department both in day and Sunday schools.—*Comrades of the Way* and *The Comradeship Hour* (40 cents each) are little manuals from the Methodist Book Concern which will be real aids to devotion. The first describes the New Testament writers and their message for to-day; the second gives brief daily meditations for a month, on St. Luke's portrait of Jesus, with an appropriate prayer. They both come from skilled writers, and are instructive and practical throughout.

In the School of Christ. By G. H. Lunn, M.A. (Morgan & Scott. 3*s.* 6*d.*) The vital truths of religion are here explained in a series of letters intended to help young disciples. They are intensely spiritual, and practical also.—*Is Our Christianity a Failure?* By J. R. Clark Hall. (Marshall Brothers. 3*s.* 6*d.*) Mr. Hall is an

evangelical member of the Church of England who dwells on the failure of Romanism and of Anglo-Catholicism, despite their outward success. He suggests that evangelical clergy should more often keep their churches open, during the week, for private prayer and meditation, and deals with such subjects as Divine Healing, War, the Holy Communion, and the Deposited Prayer-Book, and maintains that, wherever basic Christianity is found in action, there is, in the long run, no question of failure.

True Religion. By W. Page-Roberts, D.D. (John Murray. 8*s.* 6*d.*) The Dean of Canterbury selected and revised these thirteen sermons to represent his twenty-nine years at St. Peter's, Vere Street. It was a congregation of medical men and their families, and one cannot turn these pages without feeling grateful to the man who made such thoughts pass through their minds. There is a fine Catholicity about his teaching and the evangelical note is never silent. He pleads for 'periodic intentional meditation' and suggests themes which might help some to recover that elevation of spirit they once possessed. His Harvest sermon shows that each period of life stands to succeeding periods in the relation of a sowing time. 'Every day we are sowing and everyday we are reaping.' It is beautiful teaching, clearly and persuasively expressed, and with true simplicity and sincerity. It would have been a real loss if the dean had not left us such a legacy.

Cardinal Ideas of Jeremiah. By Charles E. Jefferson. (Macmillan & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.*) Dr. Jefferson preached these ten sermons in his Broadway Tabernacle, New York, and offers them as a companion volume to the *Cardinal Ideas of Isaiah* published three years ago. He first depicts the man; then the thinker. Then we see how he regarded religion as an affair of the heart; saw the place and power of the individual as the key of the world problem. His picture of the potter is one of the most famous illustrations in the entire literature of religion. It teaches that the infinite may be temporarily thwarted, but cannot be permanently defeated. His prophecy reaches its highest peak when he describes the law in the heart as the sole basis of permanent reformation. A sick heart is the source of the world's woe. For Jeremiah prayer was conversation with God. 'He blurted out things to God which shock us. He sometimes chided God, scolded Him, reprimanded Him, told Him He was not giving him a fair deal.' That chapter is very suggestive and so indeed is the whole book.

Child Nature and Nurture, by Henry H. Meyer (Abingdon Press, $2.50), is a study of the religious-educational theory and practice of Zinzendorf. It gives a clear account of his published and unpublished educational writings and an estimate of his contribution to the theory and practice of religious education. His theory was worked out in actual experience with children and young people, and his early recognition of the purity and innocence of the little child brought him into conflict with the Lutheran doctrine of baptismal regeneration and the Pietistic formula of conversion. It is a careful study,

with a valuable appendix of the source of quotations from hymns and other writings.—*The Stringing of the Bow* (Abingdon Press, $1.75), by Oswald W. S. McCall, grew out of suggestions made by young members of his congregation as to youth and the conduct of life. They are arresting discussions of subjects such as friendship, marriage, the physical instincts, and religion. It is a book such as young people need and will welcome—a wise and gracious handling of matters of vital concern.—*Character Building in Colleges* (Abingdon Press, $1.50), by W. A. Harper, embodies the impressions of a quarter of a century of college life. Dr. Harper lays stress on four problems: Who is God? Who is man? What is the world? What destiny awaits man? These mighty dynamics in the formation of character are explained and enforced in an impressive way in this important book.—*The Coming of the Church.* By J. R. Coates, M.A. (Student Christian Movement. 3*s.*) The substance of this book was given in addresses to missionaries in China, where it proved its value and interest. It begins with 'The Coming of the Church' in the Old Testament; then it describes 'The Church in Being' as shown by the Synoptic Gospels; Paul's 'Adventures in Churchmanship,' 'Church Principles,' and 'The Church Triumphant' are great themes for the concluding chapters of a lucid and very helpful survey.—*The Handmaid of the Lord*, by Alice Isabel Cook (Epworth Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*), is the story of our Lord's mother told with insight and tenderness. It is a book which was needed, and it could be used with great profit in Mothers' Meetings, as well as in devotional hours at home.

More Boys and Girls of History. By Rhoda and Eileen Power. (Cambridge University Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*) *The Boys and Girls of History* had such a welcome that the writers have given their young friends another set of historical stories. England overseas is here, with adventurers, settlers, and mutineers. The Boston Tea-Party is thrilling, and so is the meeting of Stanley and Livingstone. The Bristol apprentice who sees John Cabot return from two voyages of discovery, the beautiful account of the girlhood of Mary, Queen of Scots, the little maid who watches Raleigh's execution, stand out vividly, and every sketch bears evidence of real knowledge of the country and the times which it depicts. The illustrations are worthy of a book that young and old will find it hard to lay down.

The Lure of Sussex. By R. Thurston Hopkins. (Cecil Palmer. 3*s.* 6*d.*) The Sussex Library is a big one, but this little book is so intimate and so enthusiastic that it will take a special place among lovers of the county. Author and publisher have tramped its 'whapple-ways' together, and found never-failing welcome in its inns. The author's Preface and the publisher's Introduction whet one's appetite, and the book is full of delights both in its bypaths, its descriptions of places and persons, of windmills and sheep-bells. Sussex has hosts of lovers, and this book will add to them.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

uther and the Reformation. By James Mackinnon, Ph.D., D.D. Vol. III. Progress of the Movement (1521–9). (Longmans, Green & Co. 16*s*. net.)

his volume covers the second act of the Reformation drama. It ens with Luther's entrance of the Wartburg, whence he is to direct e movement by his correspondence and issue controversial writings Auricular Confession, the Mass, Religious Vows, and Monasticism. he Bible was his real Wartburg. 'The conviction that he stands r God and His Word is the real source of the marvellous spiritual source and power that radiated' all over Germany. In his months physical and mental suffering the Devil was an ever-present ality. He hears him rattling the hazel-nuts which had been ought him. 'It did not occur to him that the rats might be aying hide-and-seek in the roof.' During his retirement the battle r reform was raging at Wittenberg, and resulted in a deadlock which ought him on the scene. His moderating influence marked a ctory for 'the policy of gradual change in virtue of expediency.' ter a while, however, he found the time ripe for more incisive easures, and himself took in hand the reform of worship, usages, and ganization at Wittenberg and elsewhere. The first Diet of Nürnrg (1522–3) refused to suppress the Reformation movement, and manded a General Council to consider the question of reform. is refusal to do the Pope's bidding was very gratifying to Luther, d, although the second Diet was less recalcitrant, it only undertook execute the Edict of Worms 'as far as possible,' and repeated the mand for a General Council. The breach with Erasmus became mplete in 1536. Theology had taken the place of humanism and d a driving force which humanism lacked. 'God preserve me from ther and all his works' was now the tone of Erasmus, and to Luther was 'a viper,' an open and reprobate enemy of the truth. Still re important was Luther's relation to the Revolutionary move-nt. When the peasants ignored him in their preference for the achers of the right of rebellion, Luther waxed furious. Hence his plorable effusion '*Against the Robber and Murdering Bands of the asants*. 'In this wild outburst he outdoes even Münzer as the ostle of irresponsible violence.' Nothing can excuse 'the furious irit of this incitement of the brutal instincts of the feudal class ainst the mass. Luther has clearly lost his head, if not his courage, the face of a situation which was indeed terrible enough, but which wild effusion, by giving scope to the spirit of vengeance, could ly make still more terrible.' Dr. Mackinnon makes the great ama unroll vividly before our eyes. The final act, closing with ther's death in 1546, is reserved for the fourth and last volume.

The Early Life of Thomas Hardy, 1840–1891. By Florence Emily Hardy. (Macmillan. 18*s*. net.)

Mrs. Hardy has performed a difficult task with skill and wisdom She has told the story of Thomas Hardy's early life in a most revealing way. We can now understand more truly Thomas Hardy struggle for recognition. We see the shy and sensitive boy and wate him grow into manhood—slowly, but surely, gaining mastery ov his craft. Mrs. Hardy has allowed Thomas Hardy himself to te —where it was possible—the story of his early days. We can no see Hardy in his workshop, and watch him as he gains control ov his tools. This book dispels the story that Hardy scorned the worl and that he had eyes only for Wessex. He felt the glamour London, and we have been surprised to find how much time he spe there, and how its interests absorbed him. Nevertheless, we see th Wessex was his true love. In Hardy's story the child is indeed fath of the man. We see him in this story as a solitary, learning th language of nature—giving his loyalty to the sights and sounds his lovely countryside. He brought his mind to his seeing, and h writings are a commentary on the words written in his diary—'Th poetry of a scene varies with the minds of the perceivers. Inde it does not lie in the scene at all.'

We have been impressed by the fact of Hardy's deep devotion poetry—during the two years of 1866 and 1867 'he did not read word of prose except such as came under his eye in the daily new papers and weekly reviews.' His deepest passion was for poetr and we now realize how it is that running through all his prose wo there is something which is closely akin to poetry. We have be greatly struck by Hardy's gift of writing the pithy and epigrammat sentence. Here are a few scattered about the book—'To find beau in ugliness is the promise of the poet'; 'Experience *un*teaches 'The business of the poet and the novelist is to show the sorrin underlying the grandest things, and the grandeur underlying t sorriest things.' We like his hint for reviewers—'Observe what true, not what is false; what is to be loved and held fast, and earnest laid to heart; not what is to be contemned, and derided, and spu fully cast out of doors.' Here is one more of his dicta—'There a two sorts of church people: those who go, and those who don't g there is only one sort of chapel people: those who go.'

We are glad to find that Hardy thought that his best novel w *The Woodlanders*; we certainly agree. We have found Mrs. Hardy book truly illuminating. It does not dispel all the mystery of Hardy for he kept his secret to himself. But it reveals his *eyes*—so watchf so penetrating; it shows to us his heart—so tender and compa sionate; it makes plain to us that to him life's tragedy was alwa peeping through life's pleasures. The parabolic story in the bo is for us that which tells of Hardy's visit to the music-hall—Mou Rouge, in Paris—and his watching the young women dancin

hrough a chink in the wall, he could see behind these dancing girls he cemetery of Montmartre. That is Hardy!

We have found the diary of the first Mrs. Hardy most interesting. t closes with these words, written in 1911, a year before her death: As one watches *happenings* (and even if it should occur unhappy appenings) outward circumstances are of less importance if Christ our highest ideal. A strange, unearthly brilliance shines around our ath, penetrating and dispersing difficulties with its warmth and glow.' There is in this book both a reticence of judgement and a candour f utterance. To those interested in Hardy it is indispensable, and all readers it will bring much of interest and illumination.

ules Michelet. By Daniel Halévy. (Librairie Hachette. 2*s*.)

his is an important addition to *Les Romantiques* Series. M. Halévy ts forth each stage in Michelet's course, from his early years as a ruggling printer's son to his death in 1874. His literary life falls to five stages: L'Historien Conservateur; Crise; Les Trois Anaptistes du Collège de France; Terza Vita; Ultima. It is very early and sympathetically outlined, and leaves the impression of a reless worker who was at his desk by five o'clock every morning d battled bravely with his early poverty. His lectures at the cole Normale were very popular. He was completely at his ease, d spoke with great abandon. Students who afterwards became mous never forgot those marvellous hours. After writing two lumes of Roman history, he turned his attention to Gaul, where infant nation was stirring. As other works appeared, every one lt that France had found another Guizot, a profound guardian of e traditions of his country, philosophic, learned, both narrator and et. Then he became a new man. Gabriel Monod was so much sturbed by Michelet's journal, which came into his hands, that he d it sealed up for fifty years. When it appears, light will be thrown some enigmas of his life. Absorbed in his work, he had neglected s wife, and, to console herself, she had taken to drink. After her ath, one of his pupils brought his mother to Michelet's lectures, d she and her son came to live under his roof. She had many ends, and transformed his home, but died of cancer. He had now come a militant republican. In 1849 he married a brilliant girl twenty who had evidently set her heart on that union, and now ok possession of him and his work in a masterful fashion. His story of France in twenty-four volumes is his chief work, but his ture poems and other writings gave him front rank in the literature the Radical Republic.

s Théories d'Anatole France sur l'Organisation Social de son Temps. Par Maurice Gaffiot. (Paris: Marcel Rivière. 30 francs.)

has been thought impossible to discover any social system in the rk of Anatole France, but M. Gaffiot, who is a professor of political

economy and sociology, has enterprised with success the task of drawing out the position taken by one of the acknowledged masters of French literature. He was the son of a Parisian bookseller, François Thibault, and in Anjou, from which the family came, France is in current use for François. The sketch of his early life is very interesting, and his social views are grouped under such sections as: The Social Classes, Government, Law, Justice, Nationalism and War, and Religion. There were three periods in his thought. Up to 1879 he was dominated by evolutionary pantheism; from 1879 to 1892 by scepticism; after 1892 his pessimistic and socialistic critical attitude was aggravated by the Dreyfus affair. In spite of superficial variations, his thought might be summed up in three words: pessimism, sensualism, scepticism. Sensualism was its basis, but its limits were determined by pessimism, which often went beyond his sensualism and scepticism. M. Gaffiot has done his work with real ability and remarkable patience.

The Sumerians. By G. Leonard Woolley. (Clarendon Press. 6*s*.)

This book was called for, and Mr. Woolley was certainly the man to write it. The Ur excavations have excited such interest, both in this country and America, that a history of the people is sure of a welcome. It is illustrated by the royal head-dress and helmet, the ornaments, seals, standards, maps, and buildings recently discovered. In the second millennium before Christ the Mesopotamian princes styled themselves Kings of Sumer and Akkad, to show that their power extended over the whole Land of the Two Rivers—the Tigris and Euphrates. The human slaughter at the graves of the King and Queen may have been due to the deification of the early kings, though in the historic period even the greater gods demanded no such rite. That is an argument for the high antiquity of the Ur graves. In 3500 B.C., Sumerian art stood at a level seldom reached in the ancient world, and must have had behind it centuries of growth and experience. Some princes stand out from the obscurity, such as Queen Ku-Bau, a famous character in early legend, and Gudea, who was noted as a cultivator of commerce and a temple builder. The account of the laws and customs throws much light on Sumerian society. The religion had gods innumerable, recognized throughout the whole land. Every city had also its special deity. The book is one of extraordinary interest, for Sumerian civilization lighted up a world still plunged in primitive barbarism and the people became in some respects 'our spiritual forbears.'

The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III. By L. B. Namier. Two volumes. (Macmillan & Co. 30*s*. net.)

Mr. Namier describes, in his Preface, how he was led to concentrate his research on this subject. It has involved extraordinary research,

towards which the Rhodes trustees gave considerable financial help, but it has permanent value as a reliable investigation into the composition of Parliament at the accession of George III and into the use of the Secret Service money. 'Why men went into Parliament' helps us to see the inevitable members, the country gentlemen, the politicians, social climbers, and members of the Services and the Law, whose chosen goal was Westminster. Thomas Pitt held Old Sarum in 1761 that he might enjoy a few months' immunity till he could settle with his creditors. England elected almost 88 per cent. of the House of Commons, English boroughs almost 78 per cent. Drink and a few guineas were given to secure votes, and at Gloucester in 1761 two voters were decoyed by the agents of one candidate into a public house, made drunk with brandy, and packed into a chaise, from which they were taken out dead through suffocation. The knights of the shires responded more freely to public opinion than the members for rotten boroughs and close corporations; but even the members for the worst of the rotten boroughs did not remain impervious to the currents of popular feeling, as Mr. Namier shows by an analysis of the voting on three critical questions. The average price for a seat in 1761 is set down at £2,000. An Appendix gives the Secret Service accounts of the Duke of Newcastle during his two terms of office—1754–6 and 1757–62. The total was £291,000, of which £55,500 was spent on elections and constituencies; £68,500 on pensions to M.P.'s; £50,000 was doled out to the aristocracy, £56,000 went in additional salaries and to secret agents, £40,000 to friends of friends of the Government, £21,000 to Germans. This amount Mr. Namier regards as 'surprisingly small in size, a mere supplement to places and other open favours; and on further inquiry it is found that there was more jobbery, stupidity, and human charity about it than bribery.' The second volume concentrates attention on Shropshire constituencies, Cornish boroughs, the Treasury Boroughs of Harwich and Oxford, and gives an amusing account of four Parliamentary beggars. It is a mirror in which one sees the political life of the times in its true light.

An Outline History of the Great War. By G. V. Carey and H. S. Scott. (Cambridge University Press. 6*s*.)

By the preparation of this volume Major Carey and Captain Scott, two University men who took part in the great events of which they write, have rendered a very real service to the rising generation, and not to that generation alone. Their purpose in writing cannot be better expressed than in their own words to the effect that 'To those on whom the events of 1914 to 1918 are branded as a living experience it is sometimes a shock to find that the youth of to-day is often ignorant of the very names of the chief battles of the war. . . . It is in the belief that some knowledge of the war is of importance to the men and women of to-morrow, and of special interest to a generation whose parents helped to make the history of these critical

years, that we have compiled this book. To realize what the war *felt like* is even more important than to know the events in outline, and the false glamour which is apt to be shed on war, when viewed from a distance, finds no place in this narrative.' The author's aim is thus seen to be a high and worthy one, and we do not hesitate to say that it has been achieved with astonishing success. This is not a lengthy book, and much of the detail which lends picturesqueness to a narrative has of necessity been ruthlessly excluded. But it is picturesque in spite of compression; from first to last it conveys an intensely vivid picture of the main course of events, and creates an atmosphere which the reader, willy-nilly, must breathe as he follows the story. Confusion and din, terror and tumult, squalor and filth, automatism and exhaustion, hunger and wounds, valour and sacrifice, undying optimism and the thrill of success, are among the features of this great epic which simply thrust themselves upon the reader's attention. For all its conciseness this history is intensely alive, and, in our deliberate opinion, is beyond comparison the best short history of the war which has appeared up to the present. One fault only we have to find, and that with the maps. These do not please the eye, and, worse still, more often than not, are extremely difficult to read without the aid of a magnifying glass. This is a drawback, though perhaps one which may be less felt by the younger folk, for whom the volume is primarily intended, than it has been by the writer of this notice. Otherwise the *format* of the book leaves little to be desired; it is well printed and attractively bound; the illustrations are of the highest class, and some of them serve to bring home the reality of war more vividly than many words would do. For the work as a whole no praise could be too high.

The Letters of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Selected, with an Introduction, by R. Brimley Johnson. (John Lane. 6*s.*)

Mr. Johnson considers the letters of Shelley to be among the finest in our language. They reflect 'every side of an arresting personality; the man himself, eagerly pondering over many mighty and trivial matters, infinitely curious about all knowledge, burning with love for his fellow men, reasoning and logical in the analysis of thought, tender and sympathetic towards his chosen friends, indignant with all that is cruel, obstinate, or mean.' Mr. Johnson has aimed to make this selection represent every side of his life and character. The letters to Love Peacock, with their sketches of travel in Italy, are of special interest. We see also his friendship for Byron and Leigh Hunt, and watch his great lament for Keats growing. He tells John Gisborne, in June 1821, that he has just sent his elegy to the printer in Pisa: 'I have dipped my pen in consuming fire for his destroyers, otherwise the style is calm and solemn.' He has begun a letter to Keats on the same sheet, but that had to be cancelled, though we still read: 'My dear Keats, I hear this moment

that you are at Naples and that . . .' Mr. Johnson shows that in the last five years of his life he was gaining mental and moral strength after his restless and tragic youth.

The Lord's Horseman. A Study about John Wesley. By Umphrey Lee. (New York: The Century Company. $2.50.)

This is a worthy addition to the Lives of Wesley. It is admirably laid out, written in fine taste, and marked by a true judicial temper. It is not encumbered with references, but it is based on careful study of the eighteenth century and of Wesley's own writings. The treatment of his attitude towards the struggle with the American colonies shows both impartiality and discernment. The relation of Wesley to medicine and science furnishes some suggestive pages. We are rather puzzled by the statement that in 'the Methodist Church to-day there is no greater ecclesiastical offence than that of disregarding another minister's parish rights.' That does not apply to England, at any rate. To read Wesley's *Journal* is 'to pass in review the eighteenth century in the two kingdoms.' His intense mental vigour is well brought out in the chapter headed 'An Itinerant Mind,' and that on 'Fifty Years of England' is really instructive. 'His significance for English philanthropy in this period lies largely in the fact that he made such work an integral part of the programme of his Societies.' We think Mr. Lee disparages Wesley's sermons, and lays too much stress on his autocracy, but his book is one of sustained interest and literary ability. On p. 154, Charles Wesley's marriage should be dated four *months* before that of Grace Murray, and on p. 214, Leytonstone was Miss Bosanquet's institution, not Wesley's.

Archbishop Davidson and the English Church. By Sidney Dark. (P. Allan & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.*)

The editor of *The Church Times* views the work of Dr. Davidson from the stand-point of a High Churchman. He pays tribute to the character of the Archbishop and to his freedom from petty personal ambition, but thinks he has always lacked audacity, and regards the revision of the Prayer Book which was to check and crib Anglo-Catholicism, and to which he devoted the amazing vigour and courage of an undaunted old age, as a failure. 'Discipline' has 'still to be secured. Obedience has still to be obtained. The problems incidental to a comprehensive Church have still to be solved.' Each step in Dr. Davidson's life is clearly sketched; his intimate relations with Dr. Tait, his close friendship with Dr. Benson, his favour with Queen Victoria. His addresses and charges are laid under contribution and criticized. The knitting together of the Anglican communion throughout the world, with the vast extension of the episcopacy and its activities, is regarded as his greatest achievement. He has not developed in the Anglo-Catholic direction, and

we can see clearly from this volume what it has cost him to hold the balance amid contending parties. Mr. Dark's criticisms are indeed the highest tribute to the wisdom, the tact, and the reasonableness of one whose purity of character, steadiness of purpose and achievement make his biographer regard him as perhaps the greatest of his contemporaries in Church and State.

A Dickens Dictionary. By Alex. J. Philip. 2nd Edition. Revised and greatly enlarged. By Alex. J. Philip, M.B.E., F.L.A., and Lieut.-Col. W. Laurence Gadd, V.D. (Gravesend : The Librarian. 21*s.* net.)

The first edition of this Dictionary was published by Messrs. Routledge in 1908. It has now been carefully revised in the light of later research, and the ' Originals ' of the first edition have been grouped into a second part which Col. Gadd has greatly enlarged and brought up to date. Opinion is divided as to the originals of some of the characters, but twenty years of research on these questions is embodied in these valuable notes. The synopsis of the various novels in chronological order is a valuable feature of the Dictionary, and the full-page illustrations are very effective. Perhaps a later edition might state the various theories as to the Mystery of Edwin Drood. ' Kent ' should also be added to the notes on Cobham. Twenty numbered copies on hand-made paper and bound in vellum have been issued at ten guineas. Nine of these are still available. The Dictionary is one that every lover of Dickens will covet. It is no mean monument to a much-loved memory.

John Bunyan in Relation to His Times. By E. A. Knox, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 8*s.* 6*d.*) The special purpose of Bishop Knox in this valuable book is to describe the spiritual and political problems that environed Bunyan. Common folk in his day loved and talked theology, and Church fellowship was an absorbing and glorious reality. Bunyan was the Amos of his time, the peasant prophet and preacher who contributed his share to currents of thought that still pulse in the veins of his countrymen's spiritual life. Dr. Knox brings out Calvin's influence on the Elizabethan age by his doctrines of man and of the Church. Other chapters describe the work of Hooker and of George Herbert, Hooker's heir and great exponent in verse. Baxter and Bunyan are made to interpret each other, and chapters are devoted to Bunyan's persecutions, his attitude to the Bible and the Church. His vitality and popularity entitle him to high literary rank, and to *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *The Holy War* a principal share must be attributed ' in the continuance of vital religion among the peasantry and *bourgeoisie* of England.'

Elizabeth Baxter, by Nathaniel Wiseman (*Christian Herald* Office, 2*s.*), is a second and abridged edition of Mrs. Baxter's life. Her devotion to Christ was an inspiration to all who knew her, though her views on faith healing are unacceptable to many.

GENERAL

Cheltenham Spa; or Georgians in a Georgian Town. By Edith Humphris and the late Captain E. C. Willoughby. (Knopf. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

CAPTAIN WILLOUGHBY belonged to an old Cheltenham family, and had not quite completed his part of this history when he was killed in the Great War. Miss Humphris, who had worked with him, and herself belongs to an old-established Cheltenham family, has now completed the work. The material has been very rich, and excellent use has been made of it. In the first chapter the history of the town is traced through the British, Roman, and Saxon periods down to 1714. A year or two later the land was bought on which was the saline spring, and the spa soon became famous. Mrs. Delany was there in 1733, and wrote to her brother, 'I begin with one glass to-morrow morning.' John Wesley's visits are duly recorded; Dr. Johnson was there in 1749, and Shenstone got lost on the Cotswold Hills in 1748 on his way to the town, where he fell romantically in love. There is much about the Kembles, Mrs. Siddons, Mrs. Jordan, and Harriet Mellon, who there won the heart of Mr. Coutts, the banker. Byron was at Cheltenham with his mother in 1801, just before he went to Harrow, and in later years seems to have proposed to Miss Milbanke when staying at Cheltenham. Jenner had some lively experiences there when he opened his surgery to vaccinate those who came in numbers from the whole neighbourhood. 'The small-pox was at their heels, and he was literally mobbed. One village, that had been greatly opposed to his system, began to pour in. He found that the Guardians had stopped all outdoor relief until the people were vaccinated, as the cost of coffins was so great!' Some pleasant pages describe the visits of the Duke of Wellington and of George III and members of the Royal Family. The outstanding religious influence was that of Francis Close, whose ban on the races brought the age of dissipation to a close, and who made the town a great educational centre. The story of the town is brightly told and the illustrations are of special interest. We wish a page or two could have been given to the colleges, and we miss an index. The book is sure to be in demand, and the next edition may give us these welcome additions.

The Background of the Social Gospel in America. By Dr. W. A. Visser 'T. Hooft. (H. Milford. 5*s.*)

The interest of this work is augmented by the fact that it is printed in Haarlem, and seeks to promote a true mutual understanding between various sections of the Christian Church. Dr. Hooft thinks there is a great deal of mutual interest, but 'amazingly little mutual understanding.' Cultural and religious contacts are growing, but European literature about American religious life is 'permeated

with a spirit that is definitely unsympathetic.' America emphasizes the social aspects of the gospel to an uncommon degree. That presupposes the reconsideration of the relation of religion to public life. The choice is felt to lie between a courageous attempt to christianize the whole of the social order or a fatalistic acceptance of threatening ruin. The Puritan background of the social gospel appears in the ideal of a thoroughly christianized society. What Dr. Hooft calls the Enlightenment sought to emancipate human reason from the bonds of Church and dogmatism inaugurated by Luther and Calvin. It insists on the inherent worth and goodness of man, whereas the Reformation emphasized total depravity. The social gospel 'fights for a better society for the sake of the individual and not for the sake of society itself.' That leads to a chapter on 'The Contribution of Revivalism,' from Jonathan Edwards to Whitefield and Methodism. Methodism pays its homage to the spirit of the age, which is the discovery of the central place of man in the universe. In its doctrine God's love for man is made a guiding principle. Its great positive contribution is that it saved 'The American Church from spiritual death.' In Moody's message and in Sankey's hymns 'this conception of God's love even for the greatest of sinners became the key-note of Christianity.' The revivalistic trend of thought is towards a more rational view of the relations between God and man and a practical religion applicable in daily life. 'No other single factor contributed to such an extent to the growth of missionary interest as this type of religion.' The important contribution of science to the social gospel is brought out in a suggestive chapter, followed by a survey of the underlying theology of that social gospel. It dares to regard the Kingdom of God and the world as finally united because of His infinite grace and love. Dr. Hooft thinks that, humanly speaking, no nation is more important in the future of Christianity than America, and the social gospel is 'in a sense the first expression of American religious life which is truly born in America itself'. The study is one of great value and one that will promote sympathy and good understanding between the Churches on both sides of the Atlantic.

The Philosophy of Plotinus. By William Ralph Inge, C.V.O., D.D. In two volumes. Third Edition. (Longmans, Green & Co. 21*s*.

Dean Inge delivered these Giffard Lectures at St Andrews in 1917–1918. This third edition is no mere reprint. The dean has read through the whole of the *Enneads* again, and made some hundreds of small corrections and alterations in his book. He has also availed himself of the work done upon the subject in the last ten years. 'Professors Dodds and Sleeman have published a large number of textual emendations, some of which are important as clearing up obscurities caused by errors in the manuscripts. Yet in spite of all that has been done to remove such errors, the text of *Plotinus* is still faulty in many places.' Fritz Heinemann in a work published at Leipzig in 1921 claims to have restored the chronological order

in which the different parts of the *Enneads* were written, and to have discovered considerable interpolations, which he ascribes to friends and disciples of Plotinus. He also asserts that the philosopher's doctrine changed materially between the earliest and the latest part of his book. Dean Inge does not agree with him. He finds nothing more than a slight change of emphasis. Mr. Stephen Mackenna has now translated the whole of the *Enneads* except the sixth book, and Dr. Inge earnestly hopes that he will complete his labour of love. Some of the errors against which the dean protested ten years ago are seldom any longer repeated. His own last reading has confirmed his conviction that the value of Plotinus as a religious philosopher can hardly be overestimated. He knows 'no more powerful defence of the *religious* view of life, which bids us pass through things temporal "in the spirit of a worshipper" to use a phrase of Bishop Gore's. . . . He names the rungs in Jacob's ladder, but, as I have said, his view of reality is much rather a picture of a continuous spectrum, in which the colours merge into each other, unseparated by any hard lines. Most of the waverings and apparent contradictions which schematists have found in the *Enneads* are thus to be accounted for.' The dean says 'Plotinus will teach us that there can be no evolution except in relation to a timeless background which does not itself evolve. That is, of course, the Christian view, and I believe it will vindicate itself against the rival views of a Deity who is vitally involved in the fortunes of His creations.'

La Littérature à la Lumière du Matérialisme. Par Marc Ickowicz. (Paris: Marcel Rivière. 30 francs.)

This is the first time that the method of historic materialism has been applied to literature. It is here studied from the point of view of Marxism. The four conceptions of art—idealistic, sociological, Freudian, and Marxist—are surveyed in the first part. The second applies the method of historical materialism to romance as embodied in *Robinson Crusoe*, and in the works of Balzac, Flaubert, and Zola. Then we pass to the theatre as represented by Shakespeare; the French theatre before the Revolution; Alexander Dumas fils, and Ibsen. Poetry is studied under four sections: Social Poetry in Whitman and Verhaeren, Arthur Rimbaud, L'Unanimisme, Le Futurisme. A final chapter is given to the Mechanism of Literary Creation. There is a double appeal in this stimulating study to both students of Socialism and of literature. M. Ichowicz thinks that humanity is entering on a new phase which means the reunion of art and life, the complete fusion of the ideal and the material.

The Koran, translated by E. H. Palmer, with an Introduction by R. A. Nicholson (H. Milford, 2*s*.), has just been added to *The World's Classics*. Mr. Nicholson describes the circumstances under which it was spoken and then committed to writing. The preposterous arrangement of the surahs by their length and the fact that the

Koran is a collection of manifestoes, diatribes, harangues, edicts, discourses, sermons, and such-like occasional pieces is clearly brought out. Its style was fashioned out of rude jingling oracles and its abruptness and incoherence are characteristic of Arabian eloquence.

The Complete Novels of Jane Austen. With an Introduction by J. C. Squire. (Heinemann. 8*s.* 6*d.*) It is a great feat to have put Jane Austen's six novels into a single volume which, though it runs to 1,440 pages, is comfortable to handle and printed in good type. It is a companion volume to the three given to *The Short Stories, Short Novels* and *Short Biographies of the World.* Mr. Squire points out that nearly all that we can know of Miss Austen lies between the covers of her novels. A few biographical facts and dates are given, which help us to understand her work and to feel that she writes of what she really knows in a style that approaches perfection. Her characters become familiar friends. We see them in all the relations of daily life; we listen to their conversation; we enter into their minds and hearts. It is miniature-painting of the deftest and most realistic. Her books have a high moral tone, and, whilst we laugh at many a foible and oddity, we pay homage to some noble men and women. Nobody who likes Jane Austen, as Mr. Squire says, can be wholly bad or wholly wicked. This volume will bring rare and life-long pleasure to a host of readers.

The Best Short Stories of 1928. No. 1, English (with Irish and Colonial Stories). No. 2, American. Edited by Edward J. O'Brien. (Jonathan Cape. 7*s.* 6*d.* each volume.) There is wealth here for lovers of short stories. The English collection opens with an old man's hallucination, and one finds with a sigh of relief that 'Old Beetle's Crime' was only one of his imagination. Arnold Bennett's 'Cornet Player' is charming, and Sheila Kaye-Smith draws a picture of a strange 'Wedding Morn.' 'Dick's Hatband,' which does duty at four funerals, including his own, is unique, and many other thrills may be had by turning these pages. America has its own thrills, though none can quite match the opening tragedy of 'The Guardian Angel.' It has its lover's throes in 'Seven Blocks Apart,' but its long strain of disappointments ends with the two mothers, who have kept their children single, shut up together in one flat, whilst the young folk set up housekeeping in the other. 'The Cat that lived at the Ritz' is a grim story, and American life at home and abroad is here in all its bewildering reality. This seventh annual selection of short stories has romance and adventure enough to beguile many a leisure hour.

Portrait in a Mirror. By Charles Morgan. (Macmillan & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.* This is a painter's romance written with an insight into art and artists that makes it a fascinating study. Nigel Frew's love for Clare is absorbing, and its last stage is far from elevating, but the character-painting is powerful and the painter's meditations and

impressions are often illuminating. It is a fine story, but we wish its climax had been more worthy of the lovers. The invalid Agatha, the old Miss Fullaton, Nigel's brother Richard, are really vivid portraits. —*From Dusk till Dawn*. By William Garrett. (John Lane. 7*s*. 6*d*.) This is the story of one crowded day and night. Every moment leaves a thrill. Detectives are busy; night-clubs are raided; there is murder and suicide; a love-affair happily started, and all manner of excitements and adventures which keep a reader wondering from the departure of the express from a wayside junction till the boat-train steams out from Waterloo Station. It is a very clever and well constructed plot, and the whole story is exhilarating.—*Shoddy*. By Dan Brummitt. (Sampson Low & Co. 7*s*. 6*d*.) This powerful story takes its name from the cloth made in a Yorkshire town whence the Bonnafedes emigrate to America. There the boy, who has missed a supper because of an unpaid bill, lives to become a Methodist bishop, and his son serves England in the war and wins the daughter of his father's old creditor. The story centres round the Methodist General Conference and the work in colleges and stations. It is written from the inside, and the writer does not spare the ambitions and intrigues of some of the ministers. He shows also the finer side in Peter Middleton and his noble daughter, in the bishop's son, and others. It is a vivid story, and the war scenes and the Yorkshire courtship are really powerful. The bishop and his wife are an ambitious pair, but they come to a better mind before the curtain drops.—*The Gulf of Years*. By Watson Griffin. (Sampson Low. 7*s*. 6*d*.) Dr. Luther believes in mental healing, and does some wonderful things by linking his own skill to the patient's faith. His love for Nancy makes a good story, and there are some exciting scenes, but it is not easy to accept the Christian Science cures, especially that of the doctor's own little boy.—*About Fairies and other Important People*. By Daisy Sewell. (Allenson. 3*s*. 6*d*.) The stories will set young folk wondering, and will teach them many a lesson of love and unselfishness. Miss MacConnell's coloured plates are very attractive.—*Sparrows in the Organ*. By Archibald Alexander, D.D. (Allenson. 3*s*. 6*d*.) Fifteen sparrows' nests in an old organ—that is itself a romance. Here are thirty-eight talks to girls and boys which are quite short but get one good idea lodged in the mind. Who can forget the tram conductor's sermon on 'Joy —Jesus, Others, Yourself?' It was worth bringing from Glasgow.—*Sex and Youth*. By Dr. Sherwood Eddy. (Student Christian Movement. 3*s*.) This is a popular edition of a wise and timely book on a delicate and most important subject.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Edinburgh Review (January).—'A Survey of China in 1928,' by the editors of *The North China Daily News*, trusts that the Powers will not be hoodwinked into throwing away all their legitimate rights and safeguards and thus destroy the one incentive to make the promised Nationalist reforms a reality. Sir F. Maurice reviews 'Lord Oxford's Conduct of the War'; M. Carew Hunt writes on 'John of Leyden'; Lord Olivier on 'Progress of a Negro Peasantry' in Jamaica. Dean Hutton, in 'The Later Years of Warren Hastings,' holds that, though England has had many distinguished servants in India, she has had no greater man to occupy his place. Before he died he reaped at least some reward in the affection of his friends and the admiration of his countrymen.

The Hibbert Journal (January).—Miss Rathbone asks, 'Has Katherine Mayo slandered "Mother India"?' Her facts are generally acknowledged to be true, but her critics think that she has ignored the good and thrown a fierce light on all that is worst in Indian life. We owe to this American stranger 'our first coherent knowledge of the terrible facts' about motherhood which are given in the book and abundantly confirmed by official statistics. 'Which is the more important—the hurt feelings of the race-conscious, educated, articulate Hindu, or the millions of tortured bodies and wasted lives upon whose secrets Miss Mayo's book has shed its ray?' In 'A Religion for the Educated Indian,' Dr. Graham describes his experience in lecturing to Indian universities and educated audiences on religion. He asks whether the teaching of Dr. Stanley Jones about Jesus as He lived and died in Palestine could be combined with his own. He was sent out by the Society of Friends, and offers three elements for missionary teaching among the upper classes of India: the indwelling God, Jesus Christ on His human side, and strong application to conduct. Dr. Kullman's 'An Orthodox Russian in the Presence of God' and Dr. Jacks's 'The Ethics of Leisure' are among the outstanding features of a fine number.

The Expository Times (December).—The sketch of Wilfred Monod shows what a power he is in the religious life of France. He is pastor at the Oratory of the Louvre, Professor in the Free Faculty of Protestant Theology in Paris, has published fifteen volumes of sermons, seven of short meditations, four of lectures, two large volumes of systematic theology, three on Christian education, four on other subjects. He began his ministry at a small town in Normandy, and then passed to Rouen, where he came into contact with poverty, alcoholism, and the struggle of the classes. In 1907 he began his

work in Paris, and through the World Alliance has become a leader in the circles of international Christianity and the cause of union. Dr. Franks in a very effective way discusses Ritschl's *Justification and Regeneration* as a book that has influenced our epoch. He thinks the study of that work would give coherence to our loose and nebulous thinking, and supply the necessary intellectual background for the appeal to educated men.—(January.)—Dr. Mozley's estimate of Bishop Gore dwells on his union of elements conservative and liberal. If all Anglo-Catholics were like him, or took him as their leader, 'there would be a very different story to tell of the recent history of religion in England.' Any tendency towards Roman Catholicism without the Pope can look for no support from him, and any contrast between institutional religion and the religion of the Spirit is to him unthinkable, though he is the last man to feel satisfied with the institution. He seems sometimes, indeed, to overlook the brighter side of things. He is not attracted by the more speculative elements in theology, but theology is alive in his teaching, and, more than any other man of his generation, he has made it live for others.

The Journal of Theological Studies (October) has special interest in its group of notes and studies and its scholarly reviews. Karl Budde of Marburg discusses the origin and nature of the Sabbath and the week. He endorses Professor Erdman's view that the Sabbath as the rest day of the smith tribe of the Kenites goes back to prehistoric times, was borrowed from them by Israel in the time of Moses, and made free from all professional work, first and foremost that of the farmer. The custom has 'become a blessing to the whole civilized world,' and will, Dr. Budde hopes, 'be renewed in far higher form than can, unfortunately, be claimed in the present.'

Church Quarterly (January).—'Our Redemption,' by the Professor of Theology in the University of Warsaw, is a fine evangelical article on 'the life-giving mystery of the Cross.' Our redemption is the manifestation of the 'immense love' of God. Dr. Claude Jenkins describes Sudbury's Register for the diocese of London, 1362–72, which is being printed by the Oxford University Press, though slowly through lack of funds. This important article ought to win many new supporters for the Canterbury and York Society. 'Pilgrims' Progress' compares the quest for truth and knowledge in *Robert Elsmere*, *John Inglesant*, and four other religious novels. Dr. Hitchcock argues that 'St. Paul's Malady' was scurvy. 'Coverdale and the Psalter' brings out the exquisite delicacy of his version. Dr. Osterley in 'Old Testament Criticism' says frankly that he thinks Professor Kennett's explanation of the altar fire at Carmel 'unworthy of a place' in his volume of *Old Testament Essays*.

The Congregational Quarterly (January).—Dr. Garvie's 'Fifty Years' Retrospect' is impressive. He rejoices in the movements towards unity, and says, 'My own thought and life have led me to give an increasing value to the experience and the doctrine of the

Holy Spirit.' He is convinced that 'no conception of God is so significant for thought, and no experience of God so valuable for life, as that of God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' 'A Nonagenarian's Recollections,' by the Rev. Frederick Hastings, are a ministerial portrait gallery of great interest. Dr. Spinks of Chicago writes on 'The Molokane, the Russian "Spiritual Christians,"' and the editor's 'Notes' are stimulating.

Holborn Review (January).—P. J. Fisher writes on 'Bunyan as a Literary Artist.' His phrases and picturesque expressions 'frequently suggest the colour and habit of seventeenth-century England of the people, and give a rare savour of salt to his prose. In his more emotional moments his style refines to an exquisite adequacy of expression and perfect delicacy of finish.' Mr. Gunson deals with 'Palestinian Civilization in Patriarch Times'; Mr. Richards has a congenial subject in 'The Coolie Emigrant Ship'; and there are articles on 'The Jerusalem Meeting,' 'Socialism,' and 'The Divinity in Man.' Professor Peake's Editorial Notes on Bernhard Duhm and Theodor Zahn are of special interest.

Cornhill Magazine (February).—Mr. Mitton's serial 'On Solway Bridge' keeps one wondering how Bede Delaval is going to develop. His little niece Perdita is a delightful philosopher, and the Russian princess comes strangely on the scene. W. M. Parker describes a memorable visit to Thomas Hardy in 1920, when he 'met and conversed with the greatest literary giant of the modern world.' Mr. Locker-Lampson makes us share his wonder at the genius of Leonardo da Vinci. Mr. Metcalfe tells his thrilling experience when 'Washed Overboard at Night in a Gale.' *Cornhill* was never more variously interesting than it is under Mr. Leonard Huxley's editorship.

Science Progress (January).—The main articles are 'Soil Bacteria and Fertility' and 'the Work of the Fisheries Laboratory, Lowestoft.' The fish in relation to its environment is the main object of study, and a good fishery naturalist must be able to stand the rough conditions of work at sea, and not be deterred from making his observations by unpleasant conditions. He is apt to get out of touch with academic work, but there is a fascination in direct contact with the sea and sailors. 'News and Notes' gives many interesting facts about science and scientific workers.

British Journal of Inebriety (January).—Several important articles appear in this number. Dr. Hubert J. Norman writes on 'Alcohol and Drug Addiction in relation to Mental Disorder,' and Professor W. E. Dixon on 'Cocktails and their Effect.' A note by Sir Arthur Newsholme, President of the Society for the Study of Inebriety, describes the presentation of a testimonial and a cheque to Dr. Kelynack in recognition of his invaluable service for twenty-five years.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review.—In the October number, enlarged to 200 pages, three scholars give the results of their critical investigation of 'The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark.' Professors Kirsopp Lake, Robert P. Blake, and Silas New present 'an interim report' of their conclusions. They agree with Canon Streeter that Origen used in Caesarea a text of the MSS. known as 'family θ,' but suggest that he may have brought this text to Caesarea; they also hold, in opposition to Streeter, that the text was also used by Eusebius. The relation of the Caesarean text to the Georgian and other versions is fully discussed. An excursus deals with 'The Harelean Version,' for 'since the facts of the Armenian and Georgian versions of the Gospels seem to show that there was once a text of the Caesarean type, the apparatus of the Harelean version suggested itself as possibly preserving traces of such a text.' The term 'ecclesiastical' is substituted for 'the more familiar but possibly misleading Antiochian or Byzantine.' The whole article is a most valuable contribution towards the solution of outstanding textual problems of the New Testament.

Princeton Theological Review.—The October number, published late, contains Dr. Macartney's 'Stone Lecture,' delivered in November, entitled 'John Bunyan and his Tercentenary.' To critics who charge Bunyan with 'religious egoism' the reply is: 'The City of Destruction is not a locality, but a state of mind, and one which Wiseman does well to flee.' The second part of *Pilgrim's Progress*, so far from being, as Froude says, 'a feeble reverberation of the first,' is 'in a very real sense more than just a sequel; it is a true conclusion and climax.' Effective use is made of Hawthorne's 'tremendous satire,' *The Celestial Railroad*. Dr. Geerhardus Vos contributes a suggestive study of 'Jeremiah's Plaint and its Answer.' Professor Oswald T. Allis writes on 'The Alleged Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel'; Dr. Burney's work is examined in detail, the argument being pronounced 'unconvincing.'

The Journal of Religion (Chicago: January).—Dr. A. G. Baker, in 'Jesus Christ as Interpreted by the Missionary Enterprise,' discusses the pronouncement of the Jerusalem Conference: 'Our Message is Jesus Christ.' He holds that this Christocentric gospel of minimized supernaturalism cannot reach a growing number of the world's population who are caught up in the new social mind, which he calls naturalism.' His own view is, Christ is 'partly the originator and partly the product of what may be called a creative process of God, which the modern humanistic sciences are beginning to understand; a process which is as world-wide as the human family, but which, in this particular phase of it, has been confined until recently to the one cultural area which bears the name of Christendom.' Dr. Pauck writes on 'Luther and Butzer.' Butzer

never ceased to be a humanist, and that gave a moralistic colour to his Christian ideal. 'The difference between his and Luther's concept of the Kingdom of God is, therefore, largely due to the antagonism between humanism and Lutheranism, between Erasmus and Luther, between an anthropocentric, rationalistic, and moralistic use of his Bible, and a theocentric, inspirational biblicism.'

Methodist Review (January—February).—'John Wesley in Training' appears simultaneously here and in the *London Quarterly* as a study linked to the recent celebrations at Oxford. Marshall Claxton's painting of the Holy Club forms the frontispiece. Professor Van Pelt, of the Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, writes on 'A Better Church Hymnary.' Of the 'choice but neglected' hymns of Charles Wesley, he holds 'Shepherd divine, our wants relieve' to be almost indispensable, and regrets the omission from the American hymnal of 'Head of Thy Church triumphant' and 'All praise to Him who dwells in bliss.' Miss Everett writes on 'John's Vision,' Mr. Weimer on 'Wordsworth and the Preacher.' 'Methodism in Maryland' and Dr. Cadman's radio address on 'Providence' are of special interest.

Christian Union Quarterly (January).—Every side of this subject is discussed in this number, and the section 'What People and Papers are Saying about Unity' shows how widespread is the desire for closer fellowship among the Churches. Bishop McDowell says that the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Kansas City last May was 'more thorough-going and far-reaching than any previous action taken by that Church.' It appointed a commission of thirty-seven members, which met in Philadelphia in November and divided itself into sub-committees which are dealing with relations between Methodist and other Churches.

Canadian Journal of Religious Thought (November—December).—The Editorial Notes deal with the position of Protestantism; the influence of Sunday schools, which have a roll of over a million scholars in Canada; and the signal service of the retired Archbishop of Canterbury. There is an article on W. H. Hudson, who was 'sensitive to all forms of beauty, and gifted with the power of preserving for us in simple and melodious speech something of the brightness and splendour of his memorable experiences.'

FOREIGN

Calcutta Review (January).—Sir Michael Sadler, in 'Ten Years Later,' describes Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, with whom he was associated on the Calcutta University Commission, as one of the great men of his age whose life was consecrated to Bengal. He was 'a Nehemiah of his time.' There is a valuable paper on 'The East in English Literature.'