

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



*Buy me a coffee*

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



**PATREON**

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *London Quarterly Review* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_london-quarterly-and-holborn-review_01.php)

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

OCTOBER 1930

## RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE AND THE QUESTION OF ITS VALIDITY

**W**E are living in psychological days. Everywhere and in every realm the task of self-scrutiny is being pursued with an almost bewildering, and certainly bewildered, zeal. For the time being, a healthy objectivism in life and thought seems to have departed from us. If such be regarded as an ideal for living and for thinking, it is indeed *Ichabod* with us. Our own minds are upon the dissecting-table. Our own 'experiences' are being subjected to what is sometimes called the 'dispassionate' scientific gaze. Thought has turned inward, and seems in certain quarters to be bent upon the curious, if not impossible, task of explaining, or perhaps I should say explaining away, itself.

This scrutiny—this scepticism, if you will—is both historically inevitable and will be, as we may venture to hope and believe, eventually fruitful. The history of human thought is the story of the endeavours of the mind of man to understand the universe in which it finds itself. These endeavours may be, for convenience, divided into two categories : first, the endeavour to ascertain the facts and their sequential inter-connectedness ; and, second, the endeavour to find some final meaning for the whole concatenation of facts which will do justice to the mind by which alone this riddle can be read at all. The first may be called the *scientists* ; the second may be called the *philosophers*. The first seek to find the reason *for* things, the second seek to find the reason *behind* things. Until the nineteenth century, thought was, on the whole, more concerned with the second task than with the first. The last few generations, however, have seen the intensive application of the inductive method which the seventeenth century brought into prominence.

Thus we have had the great scientific impetus which is probably the chief characteristic of the nineteenth century. But this concern with the objective world could not be expected permanently to engross the mind of humanity. The inward look was bound to return, if only in response to the urgent question which the growth of scientific knowledge impels: What is the precise *validity* of this knowledge? Thus we are led back to a scrutiny of the mind of man without which this fabric of scientific knowledge could not itself have been reared. Hence the historical inevitability of psychological investigation.

This psychological examination has been directed, of recent years, to what is called by the vague but, as we hold, necessary phrase, 'religious experience.' Which serves to show that no realm of human experience is exempt from this scrutiny. No emotion, however sacred and immediate, no sacrificial conduct, however sublime, and however, as men spontaneously say, *divine*, can ward off the psychological investigator. No quest for truth, except, perhaps, the sceptical psychologist's own, so seemingly disinterested as to be taken at what we call 'its face value.' The holiest affections, the sublimest deeds, the most single-minded concentration upon truth—all such are summoned to the psychological dissecting-table.

This century had hardly opened when an epoch-making book appeared. It was called *The Varieties of Religious Experience*, and contained the Gifford Lectures, by William James, for 1901-2. Whatever may be the final fortunes of the specific theories maintained by James, this book will, I believe, remain one of the historical landmarks in the literature of religious thought. For here was an attempt—and made, not by one of those numerous minds which argue vehemently with themselves, but by one of the elect minds which are content to state what they see—to apply the principles of psychological investigation to the facts of religious experience. Here was seen, not only the scientific

interrogator applying his question to the sphere of religion—‘What are the facts?’—but revealing some sympathetic insight into the facts with which he was confronted.

The psychological scrutiny of the facts of religion received from this work of James an impetus which has been felt until to-day. It was soon seen that the deepest and most far-reaching questions were involved. Not all who followed in the footsteps of James had the sympathetic insight into the significance of religion that he had. Interest in the *facts* of religion does not presuppose acceptance of the *truth* of religion. The nature of the conclusion we derive from the facts is very frequently determined by the philosophic creed we bring to their examination. The term ‘religion’ not only covers a realm of human experience; it indicates some kind of ‘supernatural’ reality with which, it is claimed, this experience brings us into relation. And the whole question which has arisen for the psychological study of religion is whether there is, or is not, any justification for this latter claim. As Emile Durkheim, the late leader of the French sociological school put it: ‘From the fact that a “religious experience” . . . does exist, and that it has a certain foundation . . . it does not follow that the reality which is its foundation conforms objectively to the idea which believers have of it’ (*The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Eng. tr., p. 417). Thus we have our religious students of the psychology of religion, and our anti-religious students of the same subject matter. The real question, in other words, is the question of *validity*.

It is often declared that psychology, in so far as it is, or claims to be, a branch of scientific investigation, has only to do with the facts, and is not competent to give any final explanation of these facts. As a working principle this limitation of sphere is, I believe, right and true. It is, however, well to remember that there is no such thing as psychology in the abstract: there is only psychology where there are psychologists—just as there is only religion where

there are religious people. As a consequence, we never find psychology in isolation from philosophic conclusion. The psychologist is like the rest of us—he cannot think compartmentally. We therefore find the closing chapters of most treatises on the psychology of religion devoted to the psychologist's own religious, or anti-religious, creed. Religion cannot be discussed merely empirically: both the nature of the subject and the nature of our human minds compel the question: And now what about its *truth*? James, for example, in the volume already referred to, devoted his closing lectures to this question, which kept cropping up as he advanced. As he said, 'The plot thickens upon us; we cannot escape theoretical considerations' (op. cit., p. 817). So, also, with Leuba and with Durkheim.

As long, therefore, as psychology is content with amassing the experiences of religious men and women, its endeavours, so far from awakening antagonism in the unreflecting religious mind, generally elicit the nod of approval. No one likes to be solitary, not even the thinker in advance of his times, whose brooding thoughts confer upon him an isolation which he seeks to remove by the expression of these thoughts in spoken or written words. When, however, the psychologist passes to the next stage of his investigation and seeks to 'explain' his phenomena in terms of formulas, or 'laws,' a certain hesitating *malaise* begins to manifest itself; and when, or if, he goes one further step, and seeks to explain away the credal Reality to which the believer attributes his experiences, the real problem commands the stage.

The main conclusion of James in the lectures referred to was, I take it, the primacy of *feeling* in religion. 'Feeling,' he said, 'is the deeper source of religion, and . . . philosophic and theological formulas are secondary products, like translations of a text into another tongue' (op. cit. p. 481). This conclusion, which discovers the womb of religion in *feeling*, inspires varied and various reactions in modern religious minds. It causes discomfort to those who

have been accustomed to equate religion with the acceptance of a series of dogmatic formulas. It awakens, further, a certain antagonism in the minds of those sceptical souls who have themselves been strangers to anything in the nature of mystical feeling, and whose religious position has so often been reached along the painful road of hard mental travelling. Nor could it be expected that those who have spent their strength in thinking, often with desperate urgency, *about* religion should whole-heartedly welcome a conclusion which regards their task as a 'secondary product.' This humble womb, in which are begotten so many pathological sentiments, seems, further, to many to debase so noble a thing as religion—though, I confess, these seem to forget both the humble origin that belongs to all things human and that fruits should not be confused with roots.<sup>1</sup> Yet, again, it is a conclusion which is not welcomed by those strong *ethical* souls who know more of the challenges and tasks of religion than of its gifts of peace and spiritual insight. Howbeit, psychology is not concerned with these reactions to her conclusions, and merely interrogates friends and foes alike, latent and open: Do the facts warrant my conclusion or do they not?

In any case, this emphasis received a very remarkable welcome in the early part of this century, and is still very potent. This welcome indicated a healthy reaction from that eighteenth and nineteenth century apologetic which so often sought everywhere for 'evidences' for religion except in religion itself, and which gave the impression of disguising the absence of vital religion by a loud, blustering, and pugnacious reiteration of 'proofs.' There are to-day certain signs that this reaction, which tended to a more vital interest in religion itself, is now in its turn leading to an attempted swing back to a seemingly less subjective and more purely intellectualist emphasis. I do not myself

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. James, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

doubt that the immediate *occasion* of the reaction from the emphasis upon mystic experience is the scrutiny of such by a body of psychologists who are more familiar with psychology than with religion. The shafts of these go home and stick in theological minds of a similar temper.

All this reveals the unavoidable ambiguity involved in using the term 'religion.' It is rare to find two people agreeing as to what they mean by the word. Congenitally we seem to emphasize different aspects of that which is greater than all our experiences, whether these be taken individually or collectively. Religion is the most severely individualistic thing in the world. The consequence of this is that in successive ages, sometimes in the same age, there is the continual see-saw motion between an affective and an intellectual emphasis in religion, with the vital ethical interest standing, as it were, in the middle, seeking to keep each side from wholly over-weighing the other. The emphasis of one age brings a corresponding reaction from the next. The psychologist, it is true, seeks to escape this confusion, inasmuch as when he talks about religion he talks, not about his own religion—often he seems, either to himself or to his readers, to have none—but about the religion of other people. His orientation to the subject is, or, rather, claims to be, purely objective, or, shall I say, phenomenal. Nothing that is *his own* is at stake, and so he can juggle, in impartially-minded nimbleness, with the religious experiences of other people. By this method he may lay claim to a certain scientific objectivity—the objectivity, for example, with which one who is colour-blind may examine a series of Turner sunsets; or such a single-minded concentration as Sir William Crookes once manifested in the piano-playing of an accomplished pianist: when his intense interest was remarked upon to him by a friend of mine now deceased,<sup>1</sup> he replied that he was merely seeking to calculate

---

<sup>1</sup> From whom I derived the story.

the energy in feet-pounds being expended per minute. The psychologist deals with facts outside the sphere of his own consciousness, and, so, free from the obscurities and possible distortions which arise from such a connexion. But what he may so easily forget is that he is dealing with facts that are only facts to those who know them subjectively. By that I mean that the peculiar quality which makes them what they are is the fact that they belong to a personal consciousness. They possess no verifiable 'objectivity' such as belongs, for example, to the 'facts' with which astronomical science deals. They are wholly, as far as the tests which natural science can supply, in the mind. And the only 'verification' possible to the outside observer is, *first*, their intellectual coherence with the rest of human knowledge, and, *second*, their pragmatic justification in a life which can be universally recognized as *good*.

The psychologist, therefore, has only one source for his 'facts,' and that is the *expression*, whether in words or in action, of the people who have, or claim to have, religious experiences. He cannot enter the mind of the religious experient and feel and see as, or what, *he* does. He is thus dependent upon the varying capacities of the religious experients to *express* in some objective form their experiences, and this expression, it is obvious, will be in considerable measure decided by the finitudes, the frailties, the confusions, which belong to our human personalities.

If, therefore, the sceptical psychologist rejects *in toto* the claim made by the religious experients themselves, these latter may regard themselves, to use James's famous and much quoted word, as 'invulnerable'—in the sense, that is, that they can say: 'The insight I have had, I have had; what I have felt, I have felt; I do not dispute your personal unacquaintance with such experiences, but at least such should make you hesitate before explaining all "religious experience" away as "illusion."' But this 'invulnerability' does not, as I imagine, mean that the details of the



experient's creed are thus rendered 'invulnerable.' And James himself sought, not too successfully it would seem, to guard himself against such a criticism. For he held that this 'invulnerability' does not absolve those who have not such experiences from regarding them critically, though it does, as he held, 'break down the authority of the non-mystical or rationalistic consciousness, based upon the understanding and the senses alone.'

This last is, as it seems to me, the main, the abidingly valuable, contribution of James to the discussion of the philosophic status of 'religious experience'; and, so far as I am able to understand the situation, this is a position which religion surrenders at the cost of her own essential quality. I wish to suggest that the real question is not whether religious experients have made mistaken or exorbitant claims for their experience. That they have done so is obvious to those acquainted with the mystic literature of the several religions of the world. If every claim made by the possessors of mystic experience were valid, then the most heterogeneous, the most contradictory, credal assertions would all be vindicated. This, I take it, is obvious. It is indeed as obvious as the fact that those who deny any validity to mystic experience reach themselves the most heterogeneous, the most contradictory, theological, and philosophical conclusions. Ungrudgingly it should be admitted that the mystic's experience is not the validation of what is called his 'creed.' Into the making of his creed, as into the making of any one else's creed, have gone many factors, impossible of analysis to a finite intelligence. Behind him there is a whole heritage of racial, national, sectarian idiosyncrasies of belief, outlook, endeavour. Neither mystic nor philosopher can say with Coleridge's Ancient Mariner :

We were the first that ever burst  
Into that silent sea.

It is as idle for a Christian mystic, for example, to say that

he has derived his *whole* religious belief from his inner experience as it is for the philosophical or psychological materialist to make a similar claim on behalf of *his* creed. All he can say is that this has been made *his own* within the depths of personal experience, and within these depths there has been, in normal healthy minds, a process of reflective interpretation.

Nevertheless, the question arises : Reflective interpretation of *what*? The mind does not work *in vacuo*. Our rational operations presuppose experiences with which they deal. We do not stand solitary in a universe of our own mental creation. We think when we have something to think about. The picture of man elaborating a universe out of the solitudes of his personal consciousness is not one which either common sense or reflective analysis will permanently regard, I believe, as other than a metaphysical aberration. And the real question is whether in the whole universe with which man has to deal there is, or is not, anything given other than through the sensational and the rationalistic consciousness.

We do not here, therefore, maintain that our religious experience authenticates the details of our theological creed. A certain distinction must be drawn between *experience* and *interpretation of experience*. But this does not mean, as I see the matter, that a non-rationalized experience has not a certain inherent ' validity ' of its own. ' I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes.' If these words of Jesus mean anything, they mean at least that He regarded unsophisticated experience as giving insight into Reality. And what we here maintain, against the psychological illusionists on the one hand and against the anti-mystic theologians on the other, is that there is such a thing as a *religious* consciousness which authenticates a Reality which then has to be articulated in coherent thought and ethical insight. Religion, in other

words, stands for something *sui generis*. It is neither to be equated with a philosophy nor with an ethic. Religion stands for an awareness of a Beyond, a consciousness of a Presence, a 'knowledge' of a Higher-than-I.

I have used terms to describe the content of this consciousness that are, I know, vague and indeed ambiguous. I can only say that I can at the moment think of no others which more adequately express the experience as known within. I wish merely to be as true as I can to the experience, and so, on the one hand, to avoid any exorbitant claim, such, for example, as that the *personality* of God is *given* in this experience, and, on the other, to maintain that there is a religious consciousness which can neither be equated with a philosophical or theological inference nor with an ethical insight. 'The sense of the Presence of a personal God is adequately explicable as an illusion,' says Leuba (*The Psychology of Religious Mysticism*, p. 294). This position of Leuba's, so expressed by him, confuses, I believe, the real issue. What precisely is here regarded as illusion? Does Leuba mean that the 'sense of Presence' is illusion? Or that the ascription of personality to this 'sense of Presence' is an unwarrantable mistake? I take it he means *both*. But it is important to note that there are two quite distinct, though interpenetrative, issues involved. I wish to maintain, on the other hand, *first*, that this 'sense of Presence' has its own inherent validity, and, *second*, that the ascription of personality to this 'sense of Presence' is reached by interpreting this consciousness in the light of our theological beliefs and ethical insights.

Dr. F. R. Tennant, as is evident from his weighty contributions to the literature of theism, maintains an attitude in some respects similar to that of Leuba and the illusionists. He holds that the way of immediate religious experience is a 'no thoroughfare' to theism (*Philosophical Theology*, Vol. I., p. 311). Mystic experiences 'vouch nothing beyond their own occurrence' (op. cit., p. 317)—to which the pantheist

or the materialist may be expected to reply that the theist's proofs 'vouch nothing beyond their own occurrence.' If we are going to argue in that way, the criterion in the realm of thought, as well as in the realm of religious experience, would seem to be purely personal; and all will depend on the type of thought which commends itself to the individual thinker. Illusionism is a gulf which will swallow much more than *religious* experience. In the absence of unanimity among thinkers, this refuge, or gulf—choose which word you will—yawns gaping wide for every thought as well as every aspiration of mankind, for our inferential interpretations, as well as for our intuitive apprehensions. As long as men continue to reason differently about the meaning of the universe, as they reason differently about the facts of the interior life, illusionism is as much an abyss for science and philosophy as for religion. An approach to theism which has no place for a non-discursive experience is, to my own view, a *facilis descensus* to complete agnosticism.

I agree with Dr. Tennant if he is merely anxious to reveal the inadequacy of a theistic statement which grounds itself *solely* on 'the objective validity of religious experience,' as if no metaphysic were necessary. But, however salutary such a reminder may be, it does not warrant the suggestions, as far as I see the matter, which are both explicit and implicit in the statements of his position. In any theistic metaphysic, religious experience must have a definite place. The religious literature of the world is meaningless and valueless if this be not so. 'If we cannot,' says Dr. Tennant, 'without begging the question at issue, positively repudiate the mystic's claim, and so must leave him invulnerable as to his private conviction, we can also leave him powerless to substantiate his claim.' Precisely. But in every age the religious seer has known this taunt, and I do not know that he was daunted thereby. On such reasoning, our Lord Himself would seem to require to be left 'invulnerable in His private conviction.' I can only regard such an attitude

as an excessive reaction against the excesses of others, and to be, as clearly, a 'no thoroughfare' to a valid theism.

Our belief in God, says Leuba, is 'a product of elaboration and interpretation' (op. cit., p. 310). If by 'belief in God' is meant our *whole* belief in God, this is inescapably true. Obviously, the history of human belief about the Divine is a history of man's elaboration and interpretation, which, indeed, are probably yet in their infancy. But it is not true that intellectual elaboration and interpretation exhaust the whole content of our meaning when we say 'God.' There is that which is prior to mental elaboration, without which, indeed, the latter would never have eventuated in the lofty, spiritual, ethical monotheism of our worship and of our service. God is not just a name to indicate a hypothesis to account for the phenomena of the universe. Certain metaphysical affirmations about God may be, and are, believed in by us which seem best to accord with our endeavour to understand the meaning of the universe and of life—His wisdom, personality, eternity, omnipresence, &c. But these beliefs are by no means all we mean when we say 'God.' When the affirmations of our intellectual elaborations are successively stripped away, we are not left with a void. When I say 'God'—and here each must speak for himself and not take shelter behind the generalizations he may deduce from those who seem to agree with him—I mean One who speaks to us, communicates with us; One who may be *known* in personal experience.

I therefore share the doubt of William James in regard to this issue. 'When I call theological formulas secondary products,' he said, 'I mean that, in a world in which no religious feeling had ever existed, I doubt whether any philosophic theology would ever have been framed. I doubt if dispassionate intellectual contemplation of the universe, apart from inner unhappiness and need of deliverance on the one hand and mystical emotion on the other, would ever have resulted in religious philosophies such as we now possess.'

Further, religion as we find it to-day in the world is a potent fact in so far as it is associated with feeling, intuition, vital experience. It is not the mere belief in the Deity which can explain the authoritative sway of religion in the world. A conviction of God which is solely intellectually grounded is not religion. If we grant for the moment the existence of God and of the Devil, the latter's belief in the former's existence does not constitute the possession of religion. The question of the future of religion in the world is much more than the question of the future of a philosophic belief in an Infinite and Eternal Ground of the universe. While the death of such a belief would be, I believe, in the end fatal to religion, the presence of such a belief might be conceived as co-existing with the absence of all vital religion. The question of the future of religion in the world is the question of the future of 'religious experience.' And, if people cease to be quickened to the sense of the Presence of God, they will cease to worship. 'The mere proof of the existence of a supreme being,' says Thouless, 'would lead us little further towards a religion than the proof of the existence of infinite numbers.' With religion goes a sense of awareness which has, I believe, an emotional content all its own, and we learn to worship as we add to that content these ethical intuitions which are as immediately luminous as itself; and we learn to worship least unworthily when, to our spiritual and ethical intuitions of God, there is added the least inadequate of our metaphysical affirmations.

I am not here contending that religious experience is the *ground* of belief in God. It is, I believe, both the psychological *beginning* of that belief and the factor which is most necessary to the persistence of any vitalizing theological belief. Religious experience has a most essential place in any reasoned statement of the meaning of existence. The conception of God which commends itself to our

---

<sup>1</sup> Intro. to *The Psychology of Religion*, p. 90.

intellectual and to our ethical insight rests upon, and is coherent with, a sense of awareness, of communion, a consciousness of the Divine, which has been the possession of those from whom we have derived our supreme religious heritage.

I do not, I trust, under-estimate the contribution made by the theistic philosophers of the past to the cause of religion. As far as I am acquainted with their literature, they were the first to acknowledge that the heritage impelling them to make their own contribution was that derived from the prophets and the mystics of the ages. In any adequate valuation of religion we shall not lose sight of this inheritance; nor must we permit ourselves to be intimidated from this emphasis, whether by the illusionist psychologist or by the anti-mystic theologian.

The call that comes to religious thinkers to-day is not to surrender an emphasis upon religion as an experience of communion with God. It is to show that this experience is compatible and coherent with the discriminating light of the intellect. The mystic, said Feuerbach, 'cannot endure the luminous fire of discriminating and limiting criticism; for his mind is always beclouded by the vapours which rise from the unextinguished ardour of his feelings' (*The Essence of Christianity*, Eng. tr., p. 292). Of many of the feeble-minded mystics this is no doubt true. Similar things could be said of the narrowly developed in other realms beside religion. Intense specialism in any branch of human experience very frequently closes a man's eyes to the value or validity of every other branch. But the healthy and strong-minded religious experient does not evade intellectual issues by a retreat upon morbid or luxurious sentimentalism. He will seek to show—and what finite mind is adequate for the task?—the philosophic coherence of a religious experience of God. And, however conscious he may be that the Ineffable, the Indefinable, must ever be the last word of a mind confronted with the thought of God, he will refuse to

regard man's reason as other than a road to lead to Him.<sup>1</sup> It was no mystic, but a deeply religious theistic philosopher, who put what I wish to say with great *justesse* and clarity. The legitimate aim of thought in religion, said the late Principal John Caird, is 'to infuse into the spontaneous and unsifted conceptions of religious experience the objective clearness, necessity, and organic unity of thought' (in *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*).

And there must, as already suggested, be another 'infusion,' without which religious experience may become an unhealthy 'introversion,' as Freud might call it. It is the infusion of the claim, the challenge, the imperative, of conscience in its highest, intensest, truest, most sacred moments. Religious experience and ethical experience are indeed closely related. In my own view, they are not to be equated, and I believe with Otto that 'to be *rapt* in worship is one thing; to be morally *uplifted* by the contemplation of a good deed is another' (*The Idea of the Holy*, p. 8). Nevertheless, a *developed* religious experience is not possible without moral perception and certitude. Ethical insight gives ethical content to the Reality apprehended in religious experience. In simple words, God is Good. No metaphysical affirmation may be allowed to make this Goodness a secondary 'attribute,' to be accommodated, for example, to the necessities of the non-moral attributes. And, further, such moral insight brings with it its own urge to reveal in personal life the goodness, the love, that is of God. The religious seers have not failed at this test. They have validated by their lives their religious and ethical experience. It is a special pleasure to quote Leuba on this issue: 'We have seen,' he says, 'how great Christian mystics strove to establish the Kingdom of God on earth. Without regarding their social ideal as perfectly conceived, the Divine in them might be seen, if

---

<sup>1</sup> I confess I dislike intensely such a phrase as that of James—'the loquacious level which rationalism inhabits' (op. cit., p. 63).



anywhere, in the unrelenting effort with which they endeavoured to realize in themselves and in others a lofty ethical ideal. In this effort they were not attempting to adapt themselves to the demands of actual society: they strove instead, with unconquerable tenacity, to create something to which the world opposes a stubborn and cruel 'resistance' (op. cit., p. 817).

As long as religious experience inspires to such tasks of the Kingdom, its validity has one further support, and one which a practical age will be most inclined to acknowledge. Many, if not most, of us have had moments—too few alas—of communion, of awareness, of insight, of vision, of rapt contemplation—call it what you will, and no words are adequate to describe it.<sup>1</sup> These 'visions' may 'fade into the light of common day.' But, as long as they leave behind a memory pervading us like a subtle aroma, or haunting us like a strain of distant music, as long as they leave behind vestiges which inspire our tasks of thought and tasks of service for coming days, they will not lack validity, either for ourselves or for others. As long as religious experience is shown to be coherent with thought and with ethics, its validity is secure, for we have no higher criterion of truth than an experience in which cohere a personal knowledge of God, a rational belief in God, and a self-spending service of God.

C. J. WRIGHT.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is idle I think to gird at the 'ineffability' of religious experience, to explain this, e.g., by a 'mental emptiness.' (Cf. G. A. Coe, in *The Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1908, pp. 865-6: 'The experience does tend to be ineffable, certainly, but not because of an unusual fullness of mental content: rather because of an unusual emptiness.') The whole task of man's development is to explicate and elaborate and make coherent that which is given in experiences whose full mental content is not yet understood. Still less is it justifiable to reject religious experiences as 'privileged intuitions,' (cf. Durkheim, op. cit., p. 418). The development of humanity aesthetically, ethically, mentally, spiritually, has been historically determined by those who have had 'privileged intuitions,' and I cannot see adequate justification for the resentment which this fact causes.

## THE OPEN DOOR OF AFRICA<sup>1</sup>

[The Rev. Allen Lea, President of the South African Conference, the writer of this article, was, until last June, General Missionary Secretary of the South African Methodist Church. In 1927-8 he travelled no less than 52,000 miles, visiting East Central twice in two years. He has preached his way across South Africa from Kosi Bay to Walvis Bay, and has had unique opportunities of seeing the developing missionary work in the southern half of the continent, particularly that of the Methodist Church.—Ed.]

**T**HE continent of Africa has been opened up! What a thought to hold the student of life—with his nerve of reverence uncut, with the eyes of his soul not obscured by the irrelevant, and whose imagination still has wings! Africa, the sphinx, tempting the curious and yet denying their research, holding her secret with the strength of ten thousand years. Africa, the mausoleum of a dozen varied civilizations, has been for many years the silent challenge of the archaeologists who have delved in the ashes of half-forgotten Empires for lost African gods, and who have endeavoured to rediscover the romance of her history. Our readers who are in love with the romance of other days, might peruse with profit the work of the famous archaeologist, Byron Khun de Prorok, *Digging for Lost African Gods*.

There are those who wish to find 'the soul of Africa's charm.' Is it locked in the majestic ruins of a Carthage 'where Tanit ruled' in the old days? Is it to be found in the north—the land of Tertullian? Or on the east, where the Portuguese were irresistibly drawn? Or on the west, where men were once lured to the 'white man's grave'? Or in the south, where her romance is being re-touched to life? Or in the central zones, where her forests are a hiding-place

---

<sup>1</sup> 'The whole continent of Africa has been opened up in little more than two generations, divided up among the dominating European races, and drawn irresistibly into the vortex of modern civilization.' —JULIUS RICHTER, D.D., in *International Review of Missions* (January 1929).

and her swamps still hold unconquered sway. What is it about Africa that holds a wizard's influence over men's minds and hearts, and captivates their imagination—their very soul—and ever lures them to their death in her swamps and forests and fevers—and then mocks them! Like a god conscious of its power to tantalize and damn—half revealing and then hiding its face and its soul. Is it that it is the last continent where the devil has had almost undisputed sway over the ways of men and the destiny of races, and where he has disputed every attempt to be overthrown? Is it—and there are Bantu thinkers who believe it to be—the last continent to be wrenched from the grip of the Evil One, and that is why superstition and witchcraft die so hard in the land? There may be some reason in this contention for the almost unending crises that afflict the land and the almost mysterious thwarting of the best designs of men.

Up to the present the soul of Africa has resisted capture by any gods and she has buried the glory and wealth of a dozen civilizations in her ubiquitous sand, that the eyes of posterity might behold her splendid and contemptuous vandalism. There is a world of forgotten work lying silent under the tantalizing sand dunes of this mighty continent. We see even in South Africa miniature deserts in the making where slowly but surely the evil genius of Africa is finding expression. In other and more subtle ways this is verily true, and the observant thinker, the man whose soul is 'tuned in' sufficiently to catch the sounds—the spiritual vibrations that are about us—can detect the sinister power at work in an insinuating manner, full of quiet guile, in the recrudescence of heathenism that is manifest everywhere in the land. Said a thoughtful Bantu to the writer not long ago, 'the devil is loth to lose his hold on Africa.'

Without a doubt the biggest problem we have to solve is the destruction of *the fear-complex of Africa*. The message Africa needs is that of deliverance from its multiform obsession with the terrors of an oppressive spiritism. Africa's

troubles are not so much material, great as these problems are, but that her fear-complex shall be destroyed. It is this that like a mighty chain binds her to darkness and death. From north to south, from east to west, she needs deliverance from a trinity of evil—degradation, desolation, damnation. This is no pious ineptitude. It is seriously stated and solemnly real. To those of us who have eyes to see and hearts to understand, and who by sympathy, insight, and service have given a lifetime to this ministry, there is a great yearning in the soul of Africa after a better life, a nobler experience, a purer spiritual expression, and a worthy system of love-relations.

The feet of the African are held by the swamps of moral unworthiness, but his eyes are wistfully scanning the horizon as if longing for the coming of a worthy God, a God who can deliver. And thus in a new and mystic way Africa is open. We speak of the open door. It is a figure of speech, of course, beautiful in suggestion, full of inspiration and compelling in arresting thought. But to Africa there is no door; every river provides an open roadway; at a thousand points on sand or rock, he who wills may enter. The whole continent lies open to approach and entrance—and possession under certain conditions. For him who enters it means a grave or a throne. And Africa is waiting still for a God who will be Master of the continent. Africa is open! How unlike China with her high walls, and India with her higher walls of prejudice, and Japan with her materialistic concepts, as brazen as repulsive.

Africa has no formulated religious creeds to break down. She has no insuperable self-containing systems of life to buttress and guard against foreign invasion. She has religious instincts of immeasurable worth, but these have been horridly exploited by witchery. We believe she is capable of loving and living up to the best *when* she sees it. The point of emphasis will be noted. On that we would dwell were there time and space at our disposal. Let Africa

see, and see long enough for the vision to become a power and a life, and, in our deliberate judgement, she will overcome her fear-complex, the heathen lamp that she holds in her hands will be lit with a new radiance, its vessel being supplied by the grace of God ; the blood of a new and holy mysticism will replace the old animistic spiritism. The Bantu nerve of reverence will be reinforced by a more moral element, and Africa will one day find her sufficient God.

*Africa has been Touched by Christian Romance.* No student of Christian Church history forgets the land of Origen, Tertullian, Augustine, and Athanasius. Who does not remember the story of the Alexandrian shoemaker who became a bishop? North Africa was the scene of the martyrdom of Felicitas and Perpetua. What a beatific vision! What victorious spirit! What splendid fortitude! It would be a benediction to our young Christians to-day to be baptized in that vision, and spirit, and power. The days of testing are different; the calls upon us for the expression of our Christian fidelity and loyalty are not the same; but the same vision, spirit, and fortitude are required.

Was not Moses born in Africa? Was not our Lord sent there for safety? Was it not an African who carried His cross? The writer of the 1928 Fernley Lecture tells us that Israel owed a debt to Egypt. It is a wonderful story he gives about this indebtedness. But if Africa on the north contributed much by way of preparation to the Old Testament's sublime monotheism—and says Dr. Sugden, 'Egyptian henotheism prepared the way'—then the New Testament has amply repaid the debt by giving to Africa, largely through the west and the south, the gospel of the redemptive love of God in Christ.

They tell us that the Church of Egypt was founded by St. Mark, and that he won the shoemaker for Jesus, whose name was Annianus and that he became a bishop—giving

up the soles of shoes for the souls of men ! By the year 411 there were 565 bishops. The Christian Church was powerful in what is described as the North African littoral, and yet to-day little remains of the once splendid pomp and power of which Tertullian once boasted. The Church began to quarrel about her theology instead of preaching the gospel as commanded. The Church ceased to be missionary and began to lose what she had gained. What a comment ! The truth is that propagation is essential to maintenance of spiritual life. The Christian Church maintains her life by her missionary spirit. We can only keep the Christ-gift by sharing it with others. The Church in the north lost her position because she lost her missionary spirit.

Islam gained the ascendancy and dominated the major portion of North Africa. She conquered by force and held her position by the creation of a Mohammedan brotherhood of faith in Allah. We think with shame of the tragic fall of the Christian in the north and of the terrible grip Islam still has on her people, who are content largely with the twilight of Mahommedanism when they could have the sun of Christian truth. So we see Africa of *yesterday*—foul and repulsive ; Africa of *to-day* in transformation—attractive and repellent by turns ; Africa, *to-morrow*—graceful and noble in ideal and desire. For we see not yet in Africa what we wish, but we see Jesus the hope of every race and every land, and He is the One equal to Africa's real redemption.

We have come to think that all roads in Africa should lead to God, and equally by every avenue of approach Christ should come near to the African. The prevailing purpose of missionary enterprise is to unveil Christ in His personal, redemptive, and uplifting power. Is it necessary to say to all the Churches—open your doors wide and let Christ out, that He may find His own way to the heart of the continent ? Is it to be urged that we must open every door into the mind and soul of the Bantu ? We must take care not to sin against the spiritual openness of Africa to the Christ love and spirit.

We fear this is being done in the land to-day. Whilst we rejoice in the martyr-men of science who have died in reconstituting the history of Africa, the Church must, as it has already done in the west, in the east and down south, provide the missionary men and women—who will live to make Africans to-day and to-morrow Christians, worthy of the God whom we love and serve. West Africa is being won into the Kingdom of Christ in a wonderful manner. Our Church is embarrassed by the multitudes who are thronging her doors waiting, pressing to enter the temple of Christian love and life. The 'Harris' movement is a movement toward God attracting world-wide interest.

On the East Coast feeble and sporadic attempts at evangelism in the earlier centuries met with little encouragement, and to-day not a vestige remains of some two hundred churches that once existed, save a few crosses reared as mascots on the huts of the East Coast native people. But in these times we are experiencing a day of 'modern miracles.' In Uganda—the 'Pearl of Africa' Mission—a nation has been born of God as in a day. Other areas in the east are revealing what can be done with 'open doors' when Societies have the men and means to enter in. Please God the day will yet come when the Methodist Church shall be able to take her proper share in the mighty task of claiming East and East Central Africa for Christ. The doors of opportunity are flung wide open, and we can see a thousand hands stretched out to us, appealing, 'Come up and help us to the Christ who has done so much for you.' We are persuaded that appeal, when it reaches the Oecumenical Conference in Washington in 1981, will not be in vain.

From the southern gate of the continent the ambassadors of Christ have gone like a flame of fire, and the story of the last 125 years of South Africa is largely the record of the impact of missionary enterprise on the native races of the

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer has twice been privileged to see much of the work of this mission in Uganda.

land. The Dutch Colonists began to preach and teach the gospel to the aborigines at the Cape. As early as 1660 the slaves heard of Him who died to save them. Dr. Theal records much of those early attempts at a Christian ministry of preaching and teaching. To the Moravian missionary, George Schmidt, belongs the honour of real pioneer work amongst the Hottentots. He came through the gateway in the south in 1787, and was closely followed by the earliest L.M.S. agent, Dr. Van der Kemp, in 1798. But the first thirty years of the eighteenth century brought British missionaries. Henry Martin, of Indian missionary fame, and our own *voorloopers* touched the Cape in 1806, and McKenny arrived in 1814, not, however, to stay. With the coming of the first Methodist missionary, Barnabas Shaw, to work in South Africa, there began a service that has been touched with enthusiasm, sacrifice, romance, and victory, that is deserving of more detailed record than has at present been attempted. Hungry passion for the conversion of men—white, black, and coloured—has ever driven our agents to attempt great exploits for God.

The writer visited the small port of 'beautiful St. John's' in 1928, and saw the rock formation that is supposed to resemble some picture of the Apostle John and from which the port takes its name. The Gates of St. John's are gorgeous. What a scene—gigantic in proportion, graceful in outline, majestic in bearing—almost mystic in its symbolism, as if the gods had conspired to make it the gateway for the waters of half a continent to flow into the sea. The Umzimvubu River, coming from the mighty meeting-places of the waters in Pondoland, seems to be almost conscious of its unique privilege as it makes the best of its passage into the mysterious depth of the Indian Ocean. One rock formation is described as the Devil's Bite. If he did so rend the rocks he must have been angry! Maybe he had heard a whisper that Africa was to be taken from his grip and given to Christ—the Master of St. John. It was easy



to see the symbolism of it all and to rejoice in the mastery of a continent passing into the hands of our God. The sooner this is accomplished the better for all the people, particularly the Bantu of the land.

Over thirty years' experience in South Africa has taught many lessons. One of the most serious dangers facing the Bantu is that of having the doors of opportunity, of progress, and of light closed under the pretence that it is necessary in the interests of the *white South Africa*. Let this be said, and said with a gravity that is profoundly real, that such is the dictation of a wrong fear, based on racial prejudice, and not the obligation of righteousness as between race and race. All that is worthy of preservation in the possession of the white race in South Africa is more endangered by any unjust repressive measures against the Bantu. Injustice works its nemesis upon the perpetrators, be they individuals or institutions. John White of Rhodesia is utterly right when he says, 'We have no right merely on the ground of colour or race to shut any door an African is capable of entering.' The Christian Church stands four-square on the 'politics of righteousness' as applied to the Bantu and Europeans in the land. And in the highest places of legislation the time will surely come when these ethics will have more regard.

For the good of a *white South Africa* we are profoundly convinced that a door must be kept open before the Bantu in our midst—a door into a state of peace and contentment—the door of adequate education and economic opportunity—the door of real individual ennobling and race development. Reacting to these opportunities, the Bantu will make his contributions to the common good. A native citizenship in South Africa, good in character, economically

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a relief to state that the South African Union Government has appointed a Commission of Inquiry into Native Affairs. The last great Commission of 1908-5 rendered a national service by its exhaustive review and report. This may be equally momentous.

efficient, contented and happy in daily experience, will be a blessing and not a menace to the white race in the land. That is the thought behind all missionary enterprise—to redeem for this life as well as for that which is to come. That is why the missionary is against repressive legislation. In co-operation, under the high motive of Christian sanction, lies the secret of contentment for South Africa. Here we can quote more precisely, and the Government Census reveals something of the difference missions of all Churches have made. To-day there are over 2,000,000 Bantu Christians in the Union. What a triumph of redemptive power! In this we all rejoice. The missionaries have not entered the open door for naught.

But, thinking of Africa as a continent, what have we? The population, roughly speaking, is 148,000,000. Of these, we are told by Dr. Zwemer, '49,000,000 are Mohammedans,' and not more than 7,000,000 are Christians. Think what this means. There are over 92,000,000 *heathen still in Africa*. Of these, 80,000,000 live in Equatorial Africa, and over 8,000,000 in the Union of South Africa. To thoughtful Christian men and women these figures dictate a challenge that must have regard. There is the sad reflection, we have not yet been able to enter every open door; not all that can be done has been attempted for Christ. We are restricted by shortness of money and man-power. On every hand there is the open door—the opportunity—the need—the call, and yet . . . and there rings in our ears the word of the old Book—'The Harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few.' That is as modern as we can well conceive it. The writer visited areas in the Transkei during 1928, where the darkness of heathenism is as dense as in the days before Shaw began his work, where witchcraft is practised with a devilry that makes one shudder, where superstition hangs over the land as a heavy pall. There he stood and looked out on the land with a sadness that hurt to the very soul. Something must be done and done quickly for the people

there. But that is only one of the many open doors through which one could pass with a message of light and deliverance—there are a hundred others.

Our fathers prayed for open doors. We do not need to pray so to-day. A continent is open with opportunities for evangelism of which we cannot fully avail ourselves. Our prayers to-day should be for a greater willingness, a fuller possession of evangelizing zeal, and a more adequate equipment for the days of service that lie ahead of us in Africa.

The need of Africa to-day, as in the beginning, is for three things—*emancipation* from the grip of every devil that is seeking her ruin, *illumination* that comes from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God, *harmonization* of all her powers—her contacts—man with man, tribe with tribe, and race with race (black, white, and brown), and her aspirations, intellectual and moral. All these blessings are in the heart of the gospel of Christ. Thus in a word Africa needs Christ, and through the thousand doors that lead to her great heart the ambassadors of our Lord must continue to pass until the continent confesses Him to be Lord and Master of her life.

O then shall dawn the golden days  
To which true hearts are pressing,  
When Africa's discordant strains shall blend,  
The One true God confessing.  
When Christly thought and Christly deed  
Shall bind each heart and nation  
In one great Brotherhood of men  
And one High Consecration.

ALLEN LEA.

## THE QUESTION OF 'ORDERS' WITHIN THE FREE CHURCHES

**E**VERY one interested in matters ecclesiastical at the present time is familiar with discussions on the validity of 'orders' as between the episcopal and the non-episcopal Churches. Here it is admitted important differences exist which involve primary principles affecting the ministry of the Church.

The suggestion, however, that differences exist regarding the relative value of ministerial status as between the Free Churches themselves may occasion surprise to those who are not familiar with the origins and history of the respective Free Church communions. Judged by the supreme test of spiritual efficacy and indubitable signs of divine approval, no reasonable misgiving can be cherished. But judged by standards of historical succession in unbroken continuity from apostolic times, differences of degree may become apparent.

These differences have recently found focus in a significant incident. The Church of Scotland, whilst engaged in consummating its union with the United Free Church of Scotland, has either permitted or required re-ordination in the case of a Wesleyan minister, duly ordained and of considerable standing, who had applied for transfer from the Wesleyan Methodist ministry to that of a sister Free Church stoutly maintaining non-episcopal orders. Precedents for this procedure can be quoted in several earlier incidents in which the Church of Scotland, a Church holding presbyterian orders, has in practice declined to recognize the full ministerial status of ministers of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, a Church which also claims the authorization of presbyterian orders. Without passing judgement upon this situation, regarding it indeed as *sub judice* for the moment,

it is obviously a situation asking for elucidation and, if necessary, for re-adjustment.

Fortunately the incidents just referred to do not stand alone. Questions similar to those suggested by these incidents have arisen on a larger scale, and in a situation directly affecting immediate proposals for union between Free Churches. In this case they have been frankly faced and happily adjusted in the formation of the United Church of Canada. Quite naturally when negotiations for this remarkable and divinely prospered union between the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches of the Dominion were undertaken, the provision for the United Church of a valid ministry of the Word and Sacraments held a foremost place. The local origins of the three Churches were diverse. Their earlier history in the rough days of pioneer evangelism appeared dim, and their methods of procedure obscure. How far were missionary evangelists and pastors regularly authorized for their work? Had the several Churches come into being through the efforts of zealous but self-appointed ministers? Had the principle of continuity with the Church Catholic been observed in respect of ministerial qualification and appointment? Could terms such as 'superior' and 'inferior,' 'regular' and 'irregular' be fairly applied as distinctions to the ministerial status existing in one or other of the communions contemplating union? Were differing ideals of ministerial authorization present, and, if so, could they be harmonized? What was a minimum basis of validity? Could three Churches with differing antecedents cordially agree upon a common doctrine of the ministry and upon a procedure for its appointment and ordination such as would be regarded as ecclesiastically authentic and acceptable to the historic Churches with which they had primary affinities and organic fellowship? These were grave and fundamental questions for a living Church. They occasioned hesitation. Very wisely a Commission was appointed to scrutinize with the

utmost care the history, in each of the three Churches, of the choice and appointment of men to the ministry and their method of ordination, and to weigh the claims made by each of the Churches that its ministry was in fact 'holy, catholic, and apostolic.' The *Report* of this Commission is now published. It is an interesting, and, so far as we know, a unique document in Free Church records. Its evidence and findings, which run to 256 pages, form the basis of the positions considered in this article. It is not unlikely that they may also suggest a method of dealing with kindred problems, pressing for solution, in missionary and colonial Churches, and ultimately in the home Churches themselves.

These three Churches, when set to work upon their historical antecedents and precedents, easily came, as we should naturally expect, to agreement upon several important ecclesiastical issues. These we can only briefly summarize. The members of the Commission were, for instance, at one in maintaining that the supreme test of a valid ministry in the Christian Church is its spiritual efficiency and its divine source. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' The continuity in experience of indubitable signs that the Holy Spirit has manifestly blessed such ministries and used them as effective means of grace and salvation constitutes their ultimate authorization. For this authorization derives directly from Christ, the one Head of the Church. The ministry is not a mere canonical institution, nor the outcome of a popular election within the Church. It is a divine appointment. Christ Himself calls, consecrates, and empowers ministers for the edification of His Church and the establishment of His Kingdom.

At the same time, each of the three Churches held that continuity of ministerial orders in some historic succession

---

*'A Statement concerning Ordination to the Ministry in the Presbyterian Church in Canada, the Methodist Church, the Congregational Churches in Canada, and the United Church of Canada. Prepared and published by order of the Executive Committee of the General Council, Toronto, 1926.'*

from apostolic times and apostolic men should be regarded as an integral element in the constitution and perpetuation of an authentic ministry.

If the ministry of the Church is to be one, as the Church itself is one in a visible fellowship, some principle of succession must express this unity. For ministers are ordained to the ministry of the universal Church of Christ and not merely to that of the denomination to which they belong and with which they labour. As 'the Church Catholic hath not her being from particular Churches, but doth descend from preceding generations until it connects with the first Church that ever was,' so also 'unto this catholic, visible Church Christ hath given a ministry' which is 'the organ of the whole body' although 'the universality of the function is compatible with variations of mode and degree as to its exercise.' This principle of historic succession, once acknowledged as essential, creates a problem regarding a valid ministry which has, unfortunately, proved more divisive than any other in the long history of the Church. For directly the principle is accepted, the inevitable interrogation asserts itself, By what line of apostolical succession is the divine authority that constitutes an authentic ministry conveyed from one generation to another?

As the three uniting Churches were all non-episcopal in their order of ministry, agreement in rejecting the claims made for apostolical succession conveyed solely through the continuity, unbroken through the life of the Church, of the historic episcopate was reached without difficulty. Against this claim the origins and continued existence of the Free Churches concerned constitute an unbroken protest. 'The doctrine of uninterrupted succession from the apostles in a third order, by a triple consecration, as distinct from and superior to presbyters, has been discarded by many of the most eminent ecclesiastical historians, as resting upon no solid foundation, nor being susceptible of proof from any authentic source.' 'In the apostolic times, the terms

bishop, elder, overseer, and presbyter were interchangeably applied to the same men and office.'

If 'an uninterrupted succession of bishops, as a distinct and peculiar order, is incapable of proof' and yet it is held that 'the Christian ministry has been perpetuated from apostolic times, without interruption,' it is clear that the remaining line of succession is to be reckoned through the unbroken historic continuity of the presbyterate. The *Report* attaches great importance to this position. '*The fundamental and radical order of the ministry is the presbyterate.*' This is the keystone on which rests the whole structure of the claim made on behalf of the uniting Churches that each of them possesses and exercises a ministry in the Church Catholic that is sustained by a true historical succession from apostolic times. Authorities, patristic, mediaeval, Anglican, who certify that 'bishop is presbyter writ large,' are carefully cited in company with reformers and Puritan divines and modern scholars. Particular emphasis falls upon the power and rightful authority of presbyters to convey to others the orders they themselves have received and exercised; 'it is held in all the Reformed Churches that the power of ordination belongs to the presbytery by divine right and that bishops were not necessary to carry on succession in the ministry.' In the Primitive Church presbyter preceded bishop and presbyters consecrated bishops. The presbyters of the Church at Alexandria, who, through a period of some two hundred years, were in the habit of consecrating their bishop, whenever a vacancy occurred, afford a precedent Luther and Wesley were not slow to follow. This insistence does not prevent the frank recognition that early in the sub-apostolic age a difference came to be established between bishops and presbyters. What is maintained is that there is no evidence that this distinction was primarily of divine appointment. It grew by custom and justified itself as contributing to the well-being and convenient ordering of the life and ministry of the



Church. The position that cannot be surrendered is that 'all ministers of God's Word and Sacraments, wheresoever they minister, have the same power and authority, because they are all ministers of Christ, the only universal Bishop of the Church.'

It is at this point in the inquiry, when it has been agreed that the ministry of the Church depends for its authoritative credentials upon a historical succession from apostolic times to the present, through an uninterrupted continuity of presbyters, that the critical stage of the investigation is reached. For each of the three Churches is thrown back upon its historic antecedents for evidence that will furnish authentic confirmation of its claim to share in this succession of regularly appointed presbyters. Can each Church produce reliable documentary or traditional support sufficient to establish this claim?

In the case of the Presbyterian Church, which throughout its history has been distinguished amongst the Free Churches for a relatively 'high' view of the Church, the ministry, and the Sacraments, the documentary evidence sustains the claim that 'at the time of the Reformation continuity of orders was, through the presbyterate, maintained unbroken in the Scottish Church.' And although many divisions took place in the Church of Scotland during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there is adequate evidence that 'in all those parts of the Scottish Church which contributed to form the Presbyterian Church of Canada, continuity of orders was maintained.'

In the case of the Methodist Church, the evidence substantiating a claim to continuity, on the basis of a recognized succession through the presbyterate, places the orders of its ministers in the same degree of validity as those possessed by the Church of England. How this position is sustained is a story requiring an article for itself. It must suffice to say here that the ministry of the Methodist Church in Canada derived from two separate sources. The first Methodist

ministers in the colony were sent forth with presbyter's orders conferred by the recently constituted Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. The orders of this Church derived immediately in presbyteral succession from the Church of England. With extraordinary prevision, John Wesley, himself a presbyter in that Church, in association with other presbyters in the same Church, took the greatest pains that the succession of the Methodist Church in America should be, on a presbyteral basis of continuity, historically valid and, as he considered, ecclesiastically so as well. This was the recognized authorization for many years of the Methodist ministers who laboured in Canada. Names and dates are furnished from authentic records to show that this succession was unbroken. The second source from which the ministry derived was, by singular prescience, equally guarded so that the succession through the presbyterate should be maintained. As pioneer work in Canada developed, the ministry of Methodism was reinforced by missionaries sent out direct from England by the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, recently established through the missionary zeal of Dr. Coke. By a rule strictly observed from that time to the present day, all missionaries were ordained to the office and work of the ministry by 'the laying on of the hands of the presbytery,' before proceeding to their appointments on the mission field. The Church of England form of ordination, with slight modifications, was used on these occasions. The conclusion to which the evidence leads is thus stated: 'The Methodist Church has firmly and continuously held the principle of succession, the sending by those who are sent. And it has maintained an uninterrupted presbyterial succession derived from presbyters of the Church of England, which Church had from its earliest beginnings maintained an unbroken succession in its ministry.'

On the surface the ministry of the Congregationalists, because of their claim for autonomy as local and independent

Churches, might appear at a disadvantage when the question of apostolic continuity in orders is presented as a condition of validity. But in this case also sufficient evidence is set forth to support the claim that in its origins it derived directly from the presbyterate in the Church of England. 'The Congregationalism of New England was not separatist, but prized the continuity of its ministry with that of the Church of England. The first ministers of New England had been parish ministers of England, and were mostly graduates of Cambridge University.' They confess, we 'esteem it our honour to call the Church of England, from whom we rise, our dear mother.' After going carefully over the detailed evidence the *Report* presents, we are of opinion that there is no reasonable ground for misgiving that, granted that a succession through the presbyterate of the Church constitutes a satisfactory warrant, the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational Churches now forming the United Church of Canada have established for their respective ministries a line of historical continuity with the Primitive Church, and we venture to add that in our judgement this line of succession from apostolic times and apostolic men by means of the presbyterate is susceptible of more satisfactory historical vindication for the universal Church than the line of succession through the historic episcopate.

As we pass on from the consideration of the place held by the principle of succession in estimating the validity of ministerial orders, another question emerges. This has reference to the actual and individual method of appointment and ordination of men to the office and work of the ministry. This raises a question which has threatened to assess degrees of validity to the orders of the Free Churches respectively. What constitutes a valid ordination? How is the ministerial status conveyed in word and act from those possessing it to candidates for it? The answer usually presents two aspects. First, the act of choice and appointment by the Church, acting through the

presbytery. Second, the solemn setting apart 'by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery.' Are these two factors equally of the essence of ordination? The first is acclaimed as universal and unquestioned by the principles and practice of the three Churches. In principle the second meets with common assent as both a scriptural precedent and an ecclesiastical sanction of value. But in practice it is regarded as secondary and not of the *esse* of ordination. All the three Churches would cordially subscribe to the statement in the *Report*, 'Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands and prayer with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom ordination doth belong,' as a counsel of perfection. Yet each of the Churches at certain periods in its history and for high spiritual reasons has refrained from requiring imposition of hands as essential to an authentic and authoritative ministry. In the Presbyterian Church 'the First Book of Discipline (1560) made no provision for ordination by laying on of hands.' 'The rite of imposition of hands was not held by the Reformed theologians to be of the essence of ordination.' The intention to ordain was effective. This 'intention' implied the inward call of the Holy Spirit, 'election by the people, examination by the learned, the declaration by the Superintendent that the person there presented is appointed to serve the Church.' 'Other ceremonie we cannot approve; for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremonie we judge not necessarie.' (We assume that by 'miracle' is meant here the gift of a charismatic ministry.) Six years later, however, and again in the Second Book of Discipline (1578) ordination with the laying on of hands was required, and has been the unbroken practice in Presbyterian Churches up to the present. Apparently the fear of countenancing the assumption that the spiritual grace of orders could be conveyed through physical and mechanical contact in the manual acts of ordination lay behind the hesitation of the fathers of the Scottish Church.

For other reasons, probably not less worthy, a similar hesitation in associating the imposition of hands with the spiritual call, examination, election by the Church, and declaration by its chief minister of appointment to the office of the ministry appears in the early history of Methodism. John Wesley's unfaltering loyalty to the order and form of appointment to the ministry observed in the Church of which he was a presbyter to the close of his life led him to exercise the most meticulous care in conferring orders on any of his 'preachers' during his lifetime. Francis Asbury, who may be taken as the most typical case, was ordained, in 1784, under Wesley's instructions, by Dr. Coke, himself a presbyter-superintendent, and two other presbyters, as deacon, presbyter, and presbyter-superintendent respectively on three successive days and in each case by imposition of hands. The Church of England form of ordination was used in this authorization. Wesley's conservative attitude in the matter of ordination led, after his death, to considerable embarrassment in the Connexion he had legally established. There were, at that time, two classes of ministers: a small group who had received for special reasons presbyter's order from Wesley and his fellow presbyters in the regular ministry of the Church of England; and a larger group of ministers who had been chosen, authorized and appointed in and by the 'Conference' through the solemn setting of them apart for the work of God by a corporate act, which was known as 'being received into Full Connexion with the Conference,' but who had not been ordained by imposition of hands. If the contrast in status between these two groups were to become permanent, there was a fear that the Connexion would be divided by a serious schism. At the third Annual Conference (1798) held after Wesley's death, it was, therefore, resolved 'that all distinctions between ordained and unordained ministers should cease' and that 'being received into Full Connexion by the Conference and appointed to administer the ordinances should be considered a sufficient

ordination without the imposition of hands.' This action was an expedient accepted for the time being to ensure unity and peace. It continued to operate until 1886, when the danger of division had subsided. Ordination by imposition of hands was then resumed, and has continued unbroken as the normal usage. Its scriptural authority and primitive example had never been questioned, but it was held, in company with the Reformed Churches generally, that the imposition of hands was not of the substance and essence of ordination, but an accessory of it, rightly and duly to be observed.

Among the Congregational Churches, owing to the independence claimed for each local Church, it is difficult to make general statements as to the manner of election, appointment, and ordination of the ministry. There is no doubt of the intention to ordain men to a valid ministry of the Word and Sacraments by those already authorized and exercising such a ministry. In *The Cambridge Platform*, the first outstanding declaration of Congregational Church order in America (1648), the following ordinance appears. 'Church-officers are not only to be chosen by the Church, but also to be ordeyned by Imposition of hands and prayer, with which at ordination of elders, fasting also is to be joyned.' In subsequent procedure, however, it is acknowledged that imposition of hands was, at times, lacking, but that 'the intention solemnly to set apart by the Word and prayer was always abundantly present.' This lack was occasioned by 'dread of superstition,' 'theories of mechanical and "tactual" grace.' The detailed examination in the *Report* justifies the following judgement: 'Ordination by authority of a council of ministers and lay delegates, and with prayer and the laying on of the hands of ministers, was the accepted principle and the regular practice' in Churches of the Congregational order in Canada.

The general conclusion at which the Commissioners—who have conducted this remarkably thorough and candid

inquiry with judicial care—arrived is : i. That the existing ministry of the United Church of Canada is a true ministry of the Church of God ; and, ii. That those ordained by the United Church of Canada have a true ministry in the Church of God.

We may venture to suggest that, in view of confessed or unconfessed misgivings existing among the leaders and constituted authorities of certain Free Churches regarding the historical validity of the ministerial succession in other Free Church communions, and in view also of proposals for re-union between episcopal and non-episcopal communions, a similar inquiry to that which we have here reviewed should be undertaken by the mother Free Churches in the Motherland. It would tend to remove many lingering misapprehensions, if, say, the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England could initiate or carry through such an investigation. And if, in addition to inquiry into origins, historic settlements, and questions of succession, other and more fundamental questions might be faced, the ultimate gain for the re-interpretation of primary Free Churches principles would be inestimable.

At present many minds, seeking to be true to Catholic ideals of Church unity and at the same time loyal to the spiritual traditions of the Free Churches, are asking such questions as these : Are we to assume that inability on the part of any Free Church community to establish satisfactory continuity in an unbroken line of succession, either presbyteral or episcopal, would lead to the validity of its ministry being questioned, when that ministry itself has been and is demonstrated to be of God by the authority of indubitable signs of the divine presence and blessing ? Is the *essential* qualification for a true ministry of Christ in our own day to be regarded as spiritual or historical ? Is the historic past or the living present the ultimate sphere in which the true authority of 'orders' is to be sought and established ? Would success in establishing apostolical succession in the

line of the presbyterate by groups of Free Churches tend towards an attitude of exclusiveness towards other Free Church communities on the one hand ; and, on the other, to hesitation or unwillingness to accept the episcopate as a third order of ministry in order to find a basis for re-union with episcopal communions ?

These and other kindred interrogations are ecclesiastically of the first importance for the Free Churches, if they are to act corporately. And such questions ought not to be left to hurried, intermittent, or individualistic judgement or action at critical moments which may now at any time easily arise.

FREDERIC PLATT.

---

*G. H. S. Walpole, Bishop of Edinburgh.* (Wells Gardner & Co. 8s. 6d.) This is a brief memoir by W. J. Margetson, with reminiscences by Hugh Walpole, and selected letters. It is a book that should not be overlooked. The bishop's father had been a soldier before he took Orders and was a military martinet who practically disowned his son because he was resolved to be a clergyman. The son's work in Truro, Auckland, New York, Durham, Lambeth, and Edinburgh, makes a fine record, and Hugh Walpole's reminiscences of his father and his shy, yet most attractive, mother are real human portraits. No less interesting are the glimpses of himself, a dull scholar and a born story-teller who had to make his own way to fame. The letters are full of sympathy and spiritual insight. The bishop was pre-eminently a missionary, a lover and winner of souls.



## THE ARTISTIC IMPULSE AND THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

**I**N responding to the invitation to lecture before the Oxford University, John Masefield elected to speak on 'Shakespeare and the Spiritual Life.' The association of our great poet with a particular kind of life created among some a decided flutter of curiosity. Tradition and training had led them to believe that they alone were the custodians and interpreters of the spiritual life. The title had in it the ring of a challenge. Since when had art and religion become so closely identified? That poetry, painting, and drama might provide a devious, not to say direct, road to the Temple they had hardly dreamed. It is of course true that those influences that pushed back the horizon, gave more breathing space, or dyed the skies a deeper blue had received some sort of recognition; but the definite inclusion of Beauty as an essential element in religion had not been deliberately considered. Now the gage had been thrown down, and the free and frequent use of the term spiritual by creative artists in our day forced the question of the relation upon attention.

When the fount of art is pure and undefiled, there should be no hostility between religion and art. There was a time when painting, music and the drama recognized their inspiration as coming from the same source as preaching and teaching. To-day constrained feelings exist between the two and into the cause of this we propose to make a brief entry.

The fault in art seems to have been a very serious one. There came a day when she prepared her table and opened her doors to welcome an unsanctified guest. Then she forswore her alliance with holiness and set up instead a divinity, not altogether bad but certainly not altogether good. Mr. Clutton Brock calls her 'a fairy angel,' a wilful spirit that has dragged her pinions in the mire—a beautiful,

bewitching creature but quite outside the moral code. Art may have been provoked to rebellion ; at any rate there came a parting of the ways and a subsequent decadence of the creative impulse. Dr. Percy Dearmer thinks that the separation came through Perugino. This painter arrived at such rapidity of execution that once he replied to his wife, when she called him to dine, 'Serve the soup while I paint one more saint.' Now saints are not served up with the soup. Perugino seems to have been something of a rascal, and, though he continued to paint religious subjects, he ceased to paint religious pictures. He introduced mawkish sentimentality into art, and from his influence neither art nor religion have entirely escaped. The Florentine made the breach, and since his day it has widened. Later we see in some artists an almost complete renunciation of any kind of tie either to Christian faith or morals.

No creed for me. I am a man apart :  
 A mouthpiece for the creeds of all the world ;  
 A soulless life that angels may possess  
 Or demons haunt, wherein the foulest things  
 May loll at ease beside the loveliest.

Indeed, the gratification of sexual desire as an almost indispensable preliminary to poetic inspiration has been frequently preached.

It must be admitted that there have emanated from the creative imagination of men whose moral character will not bear close scrutiny conceptions of sublime beauty ; and the discrepancy between personal character and artistic creation is still a problem unsolved. Balzac offers a dictum which may shed a little light on the difficulty. 'The cowl does not make the monk. It is extremely difficult to find among literary men a nature and a talent that are in perfect accord. The faculties are not the man himself.' In order that the gifts of God may not be squandered it may well be that the faculty is preserved in spite of 'the wrath of man.' But really fine things are not conceived whilst Beauty and the Beast

are dwelling together. The new Professor of Poetry at Oxford, Mr. E. de Selincourt, said in his inaugural lecture, 'Only when the stream is pellucid can the poet see into its depths.' Any element destructive of the unitary principle that binds the triad Beauty, Truth, and Goodness together is in the long run destructive. Either the output is restricted, the range of subjects limited, or else, as seems to be the case, a blight settles on the fruit.

Mr. Clutton Brock argues that when something so essential to her very existence as righteousness and goodness goes out of art there is an inner consciousness of distress. He goes so far as to speak of 'a sense of sin' in art.

Many of our poets, he argues, are beguiled and bewitched by the 'fairy angel' to their own hurt. La Belle Dame Sans Merci is an enchantress who allures and can never be possessed. Men follow, and she leads at last to 'the cold hill side,' and there

The sedge is withered from the lake  
And no birds sing.

'Certainly the poets who believed in her have been sad, if not bad or mad. Keats could never forget those

Magic casements opening on the foam  
Of perilous seas in faery lands forlorn.

For him they are cut off from reality, or he is made forlorn by being cut off from their reality.' And so the fairy angel lures men often to destruction, certainly to disappointment, surely not the result we should expect from obedience to a purely spiritual impulse.

That there should accompany the first activity in the direction of either the absolute Beauty, Truth, or Goodness a sense of pain, we naturally expect. This sense of distance from, or discord in comparison with, the ideal is variously described. Walter de la Mare calls it 'Poor mortal longingness' and Walt Whitman 'the sweet hell within, the unknown

destiny of me.' And life here can never offer a complete satisfaction ; but the pursuit of true values should certainly yield a never growing sense of satisfaction, and though the Holy Spirit often comes into our breast as the Holy Critic, He does not tantalize us by leading us so far only to thrust us further and further away from the totality of a complete and satisfying experience. But when such a writer as Stackpool confesses in public that he is not wholly satisfied with the rewards of his art, that if he could have his choice he would be a doctor in Somerset with a fairly large practice and beloved of his patients, and so serenely, it reads very much like a statement of failure. This is not to argue that art may not provide the main arm for some to reach out to absolute values, but simply that it is bound to prove unsatisfactory when not strengthened and nourished by the two other essentials of a complete life—righteousness and truth. When we study the life of the saint it is the sense of his having found his right place that impresses us ; always a traveller, he has found in Christ the way that progresses as well as the truth that abides. Before, then, there can be reconciliation between art and religion, the former must bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.

Are we then to consider religion in the light of ' the just man made perfect ? ' Religion may not have coquetted with the lawless fairy, but has it not often sat down to eat and drink with something less fair but equally destructive—an ugly, clumsy beast that lurks in prosperity and materialism.

Says Dr. Dearmer : ' Our creative workers and artists dislike the communal world of to-day, and I am afraid they sometimes have similar feelings towards the religious world. The cause of this is that Churches have seemed to be on the side of Mammon ; at least they have acquiesced in the aesthetic degradation of the world—they have not been on the side of the poets and the artists. Therefore the poets and the artists ignore the Church.'

Art and religion are very much like two brothers who have

fallen out among themselves, each going their separate ways into a far country. Or if the elder brother—shall we call him Religion—has physically stayed at home, he has nevertheless made a long spiritual journey separating himself from the Father's heart. And we have to ask whether the absence of some of those generous qualities, so mismanaged and misdirected by the younger, has not had something to do with the prodigal's wild and wasteful escapade. And further, if the artistic impulse in artist and poet, divorced from the informing spirit of righteousness, is a defective experience, is not that also an incomplete faith that forgets the beauty of holiness and the holiness of beauty?

Reverting now to Dr. Masfield's lecture, selected paragraphs may be cited to show certain correspondences between the working of the spiritual impulse in both art and religion. 'All life is an attempt to get beyond the barriers of self. . . . Many attempt it blindly, many more under guidance which may be blind. They attempt because they hope that beyond their own personal nature they may touch the nature of the world.' Now the spiritual principle informing art is an attempt to escape from a world that is too much with us. The passage may be in the direction of a purely imaginary existence—a faery land forlorn washed by perilous seas, or it may be 'an escape out of the make-believe existence of every day in which perhaps an employer seems more huge and imminent than God, and to explore Reality where God and love and beauty and life and death are seen in truer proportions and where the desire of the heart is at least brought in sight of a goal.' From the bitter insistence of material things the poet longs to flee

To the island-valley of Avilon  
Where falls not hail, or rain, or any snow,  
Nor ever wind blows loudly, but it lies  
Deep-meadow'd, happy, fair with orchard lawns  
And bowery hollows crown'd with summer sea;

and the saint yearns with equal fervour for 'land of pure delight' where 'infinite day excludes the night and pleasures banish pain.'

Mr. Masfield again : ' Now artists of all kinds exist and progress by destroying those selves of them which having flowered have served. They are constantly sitting in judgement upon themselves and annihilating their past by creating their opposites. They know better than any one else that they can only be saved if they are born again.'

These features enumerated above are shared in common by both art and religion. There is the flight from the alone to the Alone, and the discovery through discipline and culture of the real self, the relation of the new-found self to a new creation, and, finally emerging, that larger experience of the whole, a cosmic sense, or, as the saint would say, an experience and communion with Christ in whom the Godhead dwelleth bodily.

Now where there is such apparent affinity between the two branches of endeavour, we are compelled to inquire whether there is any inner correspondence between the two impulses. Should we not be doing less than justice to the artist if we roundly declared that he had no spiritual experience worthy of the name? He may, as many do, disown any knowledge or belief in God, yet his very endeavour to reach some kind of unity and perfection in Beauty is due to the Eternal Spirit who is the author of peace and concord. And such an urge, imperfect as it may be, as it must be, when separated from truth and goodness, nevertheless derives what strength it has from God, who is Beauty as well as Truth and Goodness. Whatever partial satisfaction the artist may enjoy, the feeling of being attuned to a higher order is to some degree an experience of God. But it is an incomplete experience, and its defectiveness must register itself somewhere and prevent that fullest expression of inspiration that is dedicated to the glory of God.

The sharp dividing line between the two expressions of the

creative impulse is seen when art is satisfied with self-expression or the enjoyment of a sense of harmony. Mr. Selincourt admits the analogy between much of the highest poetry and religion, though he thinks we learn more 'of the distinctive character of both poet and mystic if we contrast them rather than seek to identify them.' He then proceeds to make a rather amazing statement. 'To the mystic, experience is an end in itself; his sole desire is to become merged in that divine life of which he is sublimely conscious. But what matters to the poet, as a poet, is not so much his experience as what he can create from it.' We should have thought that the use to which the saint can put his experience is as important to him as the experience itself. Certainly the great Christian mystics exemplify this dual aspect of experience. A novelist has invented an artist who fled the world, and in the heart of Africa painted upon the walls of his hut exquisite paintings which he at once proceeded to destroy. Such self-enjoyment of spiritual impulse, whether in art or religion, is to be roundly condemned. It is a denial of the spiritual life whose orbit rings round the universal, whose animating principle is fellowship and service. When the artist, struggling through his medium, exists, not simply to paint perfect works of art, but in painting them to perfect his own character and make his particular contribution to the world, then his art so consecrated is surely touched with live coals from off the altar.

J. H. BODGENER.

## PERSONALITY AND PROVIDENCE

**I**N these headlong days it seems a far cry back to 1894, the year in which appeared Illingworth's Bampton Lectures on *Personality, Human and Divine*. But that volume was in some sense a landmark in the religious thought of this country—a fountain-head from which issued streams of speculation and discussion which have grown stronger and wider ever since. To-day there is a whole literature of which Personality is the key-note, or perhaps the storm-centre. Many volumes in the monumental series of Gifford Lectures have brought out the far-reaching problems of theism before a wide reading public. Contemporary science and philosophy have widened the scope of theology and made the subject of Personality to be for all thinkers and teachers a central and fruitful theme. It would be tedious to enumerate the books published during this century which go to prove this statement. But the works of two archbishops—Temple's *Mens Creatrix* and D'Arcy's *God and Freedom in Human Experience*—are significant. Professor Clement Webb's two volumes on *God and Personality*, R. C. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*, Dr. W. Brown's *Science and Personality*, Professor J. E. Turner's *Personality and Reality*, and Principal Oman's *Grace and Personality* help by their very titles to illustrate the point. In America, Borden Bowne, one of the ablest writers on theism of our time, developed a philosophy to which the name 'Personalism' was given; and one of his disciples, Professor Flewelling, has developed his ideas in his *Creative Personality*, a book which has had many readers in Britain. A bibliography of the subject, containing only English books, would occupy several pages of this REVIEW.

It must not be supposed that this copious literature is the



fruit of a merely academic discussion, interesting only to theologians and philosophers. The writers may seem to be arguing about metaphysics, but they are really trying to answer afresh for this generation certain age-long questions of humanity—the deepest and most searching that can exercise the mind of man. What is God—if there be a God?—and, in any case, ‘What do we mean by God?’ What is man? For man certainly *is*, though he be pronounced the strangest, most contradictory, and inexplicable of creatures. Whence comes he?—and, as Carlyle says, ‘O heavens, whither is he going?’ What is the real relation between God and man, what has it been, what ought it to be, and how is it to be made right, when once it has got out of gear? If there be none but an impersonal God—almost a contradiction in terms—to worship, how can man learn to become his own god in a ‘wide, grey, lampless, deep, unpeopled world’?

One of the latest books on these momentous topics that has come into our hands is entitled *Divine Providence in the Light of Personality*.<sup>1</sup> It represents the Fernley Lecture delivered by Dr. T. Stephenson in Leeds last July, and is a valuable contribution to the discussion of theistic problems. The subject of Providence had indeed already been ably dealt with in the series of Fernley Lectures by the editor of this REVIEW, the Rev. J. Telford, B.A. His book, entitled *Man's Partnership in Divine Providence*, contains a careful and comprehensive study of the theme, and it has been widely read and greatly appreciated. But there is no danger of discrepancy, or of overlapping, between the two books. More than twenty years separated the thirty-eighth from the sixtieth Fernley Lecture, and much water has flowed under the bridge during those two eventful decades. The two books necessarily have some features in common, but they differ in scope, in treatment, and in the circle of readers for whom they were

---

<sup>1</sup> *Divine Providence in the Light of Personality*. By Thomas Stephenson, B.A., D.D. (Epworth Press. 5s. net.)

severally intended. They usefully supplement each other and show how travellers may be led by diverse guides along different paths, through varying scenery, to one common goal.

Dr. Stephenson has chosen his subject well. For him the word 'Providence' covers the whole sphere of God's government, in His guidance of the individual man, the Church, and the whole universe; its field is the whole life of man in all its relations—physical, moral, and religious. And, inasmuch as for Christian thought man is personal and God is fully personal, his object in this book is 'to bring the implications of Personality, human and divine, to bear on the chief problems and aspects of the providential order.' As he says, he cannot develop his argument in one straight line: he attempts, rather, 'to focus upon one centre considerations drawn from various departments of human life and experience.' The undertaking is no small one: nothing is too minute, nothing too vast, for his investigations. His chapters deal with the subjects of the Trinity and the Incarnation, predestination and grace, creation and evolution, with miracle, and with special and general Providence, as those words are generally understood. He further considers the subjects of faith and prayer, discusses the function of pain, the riddle of the existence of moral evil in God's good world, and crowns the whole by pointing out the necessary completion of the study of Providence in the life immortal. A supplementary chapter sketches in outline the testimony of the Bible on the subject of Providence. An appendix contains brief but valuable essays on 'God and the Absolute,' 'Immanence and Transcendence,' and kindred topics. If such an outline sounds all too ambitious for one small volume, it is to be said that there is nothing exaggerated about the author's scheme, or the style of his exposition. Very quietly, directly, and logically, for the most part in clear and simple words which all readers can easily follow, he reveals the height of his great argument and seeks to justify the ways of God to

man. He covers the wide field that we have described, with skill and judgement ; and if he does not pretend to clear up the mysteries on the fringe of which he touches, he lights up many a dark corner by the lamp of truth and the light of a devout faith. Throughout, the author shows himself a modest, but widely read and greatly gifted, theological teacher, one who knows well what he is doing and what he cannot do, and who never allows himself to be diverted from his course by friend or foe. He disdains ' frills '—and thrills ; but no student who really wishes to learn what can be known about some of the most difficult topics in the Christian religion will fail to find help in this volume, almost on every page of its closely compacted argument. Some of its readers are sure to be disappointed. Dr. Stephenson has laid down his own lines of procedure, and you must accept his premisses if you are to be convinced by his reasoning. But a host of intelligent readers in our day utterly refuse to accept his postulates and axioms. They will say that he begs the question ; meaning the questions which have been sorely racking their minds and perhaps have disturbed their life. Even a Fernley Lecturer cannot do everything in 800 pages ; and while the author does from time to time anticipate and fairly meet objections, he is not out to convince gainsayers, but to strengthen the reasonable faith of disciples. This task is not so easy as it looks. It may appear cheap to preach to the converted. But, to change the metaphor, there is need in every battle of some who are willing and able to ' strengthen the wavering line,' to encourage the disheartened, heal the wounded, and rally the stragglers along the line of march. Dr. Stephenson does his work well, and it is certain that upon the difficult field that he has chosen there is great need of timely reinforcement and succour for other pilgrims besides Mr. Ready-to-halt and Mr. Fearing. The problems of Providence are always with us ; the harvest-field is wide and the labourers are few.

Perhaps the two most useful, as they are the two central,

chapters in the book are those on miracle and on general and special Providence. Did space permit, it would be right to dwell upon them in detail, but a few words must suffice. On the subject of miracle, Dr. Stephenson says that, presupposing a personal God, Father and Creator, who has made the world for spiritual ends, whose fixed laws are fixed modes of activity, His guidance of individuals is to be described as fully personal, not quasi-personal, and it is carried on within the physical field for their direction and succour. It takes place 'chiefly within the regular limits of physical law, but it may, and sometimes does, go far beyond this, in what, for science, is contravention of that law.' Hence appears the miraculous. But our author guards against an arbitrary interpretation of this super- or praeter-natural activity of the Divine Being by reminding us of the ever-recurring ambiguity of the word 'Nature,' and quoting Augustine's well-known phrase that miracle is not contrary to nature, but only to what is known of nature. Dr. Stephenson cites with approval Dr. F. Platt's words that 'miracle is more a problem of personality than of natural science, and it is certainly in the personal life that we must look for miracle in the religious or Christian sense.' Again, what are called 'special providences' lie for the most part within the sphere of natural law; 'but now and again there occur events the perfectly unique appropriateness of which, in the peculiar needs of some individual, seems to leap to the eye.' Then it is that 'an event, or disposition of events, shows itself so brimful of worthy purpose as to appear self-evidently the work of a Divine Will . . . dealing with the situation on its individual merits and not on mere general principles.' Of this language, taken from Hogg's *Redemption from the World*, Dr. Stephenson says, 'I do not think it could be bettered,' but in his own words he proceeds to work out and apply the principles thus laid down. His argument rises repeatedly from what we know of human personality to that which we may reasonably infer concerning the divine. In this part of his argument,

though he does not quote the words, the author seeks to rise from man to God, to find

Nearer and ever nearer Him who wrought  
Not matter, nor the finite-infinite,  
But this main miracle that thou art thou,  
With power on thine own act and on the world.

He agrees with Ferishtah that

God is soul, souls I and thou; with souls should souls have place.

The argument that is implied in these words is—with a difference—that of the Psalmist: 'He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see? Has He no knowledge, He that teaches man? Knowledge! The Eternal knows that human plans are but an empty breath.' This same argument in another shape is developed in the volume of which we have been giving an imperfect description. It fully justifies its suggestive title, *Divine Providence in the Light of Personality*.

One word more is needed. In an article like the present, which does not profess to be a formal review of an interesting and valuable book, it is impossible to ignore one tremendous fact. Those who accept the author's premisses must thankfully follow his arguments to their conclusion. It helps to assure them of our fathers' adage that he who watches for Providence shall never lack a Providence to watch. But so many in this generation are not like their fathers, and are still less like their grandfathers. A terribly large proportion, if not the majority, of people in this country have lost their hold on God. They do not believe in a personal God, perhaps not in a God of any kind; and, what is more, they do not care. That is, to all appearance they do not care; though, in our opinion, tens of thousands of them are restless and dissatisfied, and would shout for joy if they could but obtain a fresh vision of the living God. Some may be rejoicing in

what they call the freedom—in reality, the licence, or licentiousness—of those for whom God is blotted out from the universe. Others are echoing with a sigh Clifford's despairing note, 'The Great Companion is dead !' For them, as for Richter in his dream, a world without the guiding hand of God is like an Eye-socket without an Eye—not a beautiful, but a ghastly, sight. They have lost—if they ever possessed it—all belief in a future life. They are, though they would not like to be told so, pagans, 'having no hope and no God, in all the world.' Their number is sadly, appallingly large. They do not read Bampton Lectures, or Gifford or Fernley Lectures, and would be none the better if they did. But they do need a prophet who should bring home to heart and conscience, as well as to intellect, the meaning and reality of the God who is at the same time Creator and Redeemer, the glory of God in the face of Christ.

Mr. H. G. Wells, whose great ability and greater popularity no one questions, is not, and does not wish to be thought, a theologian. His Invisible King neither reigns nor governs. But he knows better than most theologians how the world of society is thinking to-day, and he is probably drawing upon his own experience when he says that 'the Western mind has broken loose from the conception of God that has dominated the intelligence of Christendom for centuries. . . . It is like a ship that has slipped its anchors, and drifts, still sleeping, under the pale and vanishing stars, out to the open sea.' Hundreds of thousands are so drifting, but the open sea is more poetical than habitable. The Greeks called it inhospitable—it may make a fine picture, but it makes a poor home. And the prophet, who is perhaps among us now and will make his voice heard ere long, will show the multitude, as well as the elect, that the God of Providence is the God of grace, and the God of grace is the God of Providence. That the universe, in its amazing vastness and almost terrifying splendour, is not, and can never be, an object of worship, but that He who brought all into being in His own inconceivable

time, and His own marvellously perfect way, is the same God without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground, whose good pleasure it is to give the little flock their place in the Kingdom. The high and holy One who inhabits eternity dwells also in the lowly, contrite heart. He makes His home in every heart that will make room for Him.

It would seem, if we read the signs aright, that, by a process we can but dimly discern, God is preparing the way in the minds and hearts of men for indefinitely enlarged conceptions of Himself. It is the same God who has done the same work, generation after generation. The process of enlarging men's minds to make Him room is slow, difficult, often painful, and always hard to understand. What revolutions of this kind occurred in the history of Israel!—when, for example, the tribal God, a mighty and sometimes cruel God of war, disappeared to make way for the Lord of all nations—‘the God of the whole earth shall He be called.’ Our ideas of the universe are being enlarged, not that we may lose faith in the God of Providence, but that our ideas of the meaning of ‘Providence,’ too often narrow, selfish, and prejudiced, should broaden out into a larger faith, a more glorious hope, and a boundless, inexhaustibly patient love. Those who think out to the full the thoughts of what has been called the ‘cosmic’ Christ—really, the universal Saviour—will be able to understand and preach the gospel of

One God who ever lives and loves ;  
One God, one law, one element,  
And one far-off divine event  
To which the whole creation moves.

W. T. DAVISON.

## THE PARSON IN ENGLISH LITERATURE

THE term 'parson' affords a good illustration of the influence of political and social life upon the use of words. In some country districts the folk still differentiate between the religious leaders of the Churches, calling the Roman Catholic 'the priest,' the Anglican 'the Parson,' and the Nonconformist 'the Preacher.' But in our literature the word parson was current six hundred years ago. In those early times it would mean the Roman priest, for his was the only Church in the land. The change-over at the Reformation transferred the title to the minister of the Church as then by law established. The very quietness of the alteration throws a vivid light on the character of the Reform, and of the nation which accepted it. Under Puritan influence, the term gradually widened in its reference, because men who were not Episcopalians were licensed to hold Church livings. The sermon began to take a place in the service as important as that of the Prayer Book ; and after the Evangelical Revival, in which preaching was a chief factor, it came to pass that any man set apart for the conduct of public worship, whether his work were of the priestly or the prophetic order, was commonly called a parson.

There lies more than popular usage, however, behind the term. The *Oxford Dictionary* suggests a derivation from the French *personne*, showing that, whatever else he was, the parson was not a nonentity. The dictionary's definition is as follows : 'The parson is the holder of a parochial benefice, in full possession of its rights and dues—a rector.' In passing, it may be noted that here is the original difference between a rector and a vicar, the latter being in the first instance a substitute, the vicarious holder of the office.

The parson did not rise to his place of honour and of power without a struggle. The religious and social history of early England is largely concerned with the conflict between



the monastery and the parish. The monks brought Christianity to these shores. Their message created a new respect for law and order, introduced a love of agriculture, made possible a system of land-tenure, and gave birth to the sense of national unity. They taught men of the north and of the south to call themselves Englishmen.

The monks belonged to the regular clergy of the Roman Church. They lived in communities in obedience to their own abbots, and were governed by the rules of their own Orders. But outside the monasteries were the bishops, who before the Norman Conquest had evolved a policy very suitable to the genius of the English people. They divided the country into parishes, each of which had its own parish church, with its own priest, who owed allegiance to his diocesan bishop, and drew his living from the parish lands. In Saxon times these priests were often sons of the soil; they were not forbidden to marry, and they mingled freely with the people, for whose rights they frequently stood as against the abbot, who, as likely as not, was a foreigner. These parish priests belonged to the secular clergy.

As time went on, bishoprics and benefices grew richer and more influential. Just as the church was the central building of all the village life, so its priest became more and more important in his parish. The village knew little of change, for the labourers were tied to the soil, and the marriage registers and the stones in the churchyard were the epitome of the history of the place. If he wished to be so, the parish priest could be more than a father to his folk. Political and economic causes greatly enhanced the power of the secular clergy after the Conquest. To become a bishop threw open the way to authority in the State, and the parish clergy were exposed to all the temptations of ambition. Men of education began to look to the Church as to a desirable calling, and sought the most influential benefices. What Englishmen thought of this process of deterioration may be seen in one of our earliest poems,

*The Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman*, a work which was begun in 1362, and coincided with the outbreak of the Black Death. This terrible visitation swept from end to end of a continent which knew nothing of the laws of health. Within a few years the population of our island was reduced from four millions to two and a half millions. The clergy did not escape. In many a remote parish church there hangs a list of its incumbents since its foundation, and one often finds that, about the middle of the fourteenth century, there are vacancies, or there is the record of the appointment of two rectors in one year. Thousands of acres fell out of cultivation, reducing the incomes of landlord and priest alike almost to vanishing-point.

In such a time the author of *Piers Plowman*, himself possibly a priest, wrote his poem. He is deeply concerned with the sufferings of the country folk. Their spiritual pastors have forsaken them for more remunerative livings.

Persones and parisch prestes pleyned hem to ye bischop,  
That here parissches were pore'sith ye pestilence tyme,  
To have a lycence and a leve' at London to dwelle,  
And syngen there for symonye' for silver is sweet.

But only the better educated priest might hope to escape to the life and wealth of London. The village was left to be served by such as the man who confesses :

I have been prest and persoun' passynge thretti wynter,  
Yet can I neither solfa ne synge' ne seyntes lyves rede ;  
But I can fynde in a felde' or in a fourlonge an hare,  
Better than in *beatus vir* or in *beati omnes*  
Construe one clause wel' and teach it to my parochienes.

One wonders if this is the earliest reference to the hunting parson.

The scene of *Piers Plowman* is laid in the western midlands, round the Malvern Hills. In those days this was 'outlandish' country. Other parts, in closer touch with the culture of

the Continent, were more readily affected by the romance and by the finer religious feeling which were among the most valuable contributions of the Normans to our national character. Under this influence, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries witnessed the completion of many a fine parish church, and of our most beautiful cathedrals. The murder of Thomas à Becket, in 1170, before the altar in the north transept of Canterbury Cathedral, had given to that fair shrine a special sanctity, and for nearly four centuries there came, from all parts, constant streams of devotees to worship at the spot where he fell. The very word *canter* is a record of the leisurely pace at which they travelled; and the Pilgrims' Way can still be traced through the finest part of southern England.

Chaucer has made these pilgrims immortal. In the Prologue to the *Tales*, he tells how, in the Tabard Inn, at Southwark, he found twenty-nine people, all bound for Canterbury. The landlord proposed to go with them, and invited each to tell a story to relieve the tedium of the road. The time of the year was

When April hath his sweetest showers brought  
To pierce the heart of March and banish drought;  
When the light zephyr, with its scented breath,  
Stirs to new life in every holt and heath;  
Then folk to go as pilgrims greatly long,  
And specially, from every shire's end  
Of England, unto Canterbury they wend,  
The holy blissful martyr for to seek,  
Who oft hath holpen when that they were sick.

The company was a motley crew. There was 'a veray parfit gentil knight'; a Miller, whose 'mouth as wide was as a forneis,' and who could 'blowe and sounne the baggepipe'; a 'good wif was ther of beside Bathe'; a Summoner with a fiery red face and a passion for garlick; and a Pardoner who, by selling indulgences, collected more money in a day than the parson did in two months. It is with the Parson that

we are here concerned. Chaucer's pen-portrait of him is a work of loving art.

A good man of religion was there,  
 Who was a needy parson of a town ;  
 But rich he was in holy thought and work.  
 He also was a learned man, a clerk  
 Who Christ His Gospel truly used to preach,  
 And all his flock devoutly would he teach.  
 Wide was his parish, the houses far asunder ;  
 But never did he fail, for rain or thunder,  
 In sickness and in woe, to pay his call.

This parson was not one of those who, for fear or greed, would let out his benefice on hire, while he himself sought in London some rich chantry where he might make money by saying masses for departed souls. He held that

To draw the folk to heaven, by fairnesse,  
 By good ensample, was his businesse.  
 But Christes lore, and his apostles twelve,  
 He taught, but first he folwed it himselve.

There is a great difference between these contemporary portraits of the parish priest. Langland writes in a spirit embittered by the poverty, pestilence, and feudal tyranny of the times, circumstances which put a severe strain on the morale of the country clergy. Not unnaturally, he sets the tune for the doggerel rhyme which occurs in a work of a date nearly five hundred years later :

Like the rude guide-post some a parson call,  
 That points the way, but never stirs at all.  
 (*The Banquet*, 1819.)

Chaucer is a much more cheerful person. While his sympathy with suffering and poverty is real and deep, his spirit is touched by the breath of the Renaissance, which was already bearing a spring-time life to England. Whether saints or sinners, his characters are full-blooded, thorough-going folk, who make the most of life according to their bent. His 'Clerk of Oxenforde,' whose horse was as lean as a rake, and who had 'but litel gold in cofre,' is a man who

would *gladly* learn and *gladly* teach. His parson, likewise, is one of cultured spirit, keen conscience, and faithful zeal.

This line of cleavage between the shepherd and the hireling, the pastor of the flock and the man whose main object is to feed himself, runs all through our literature. In the legal *Commentary of Blackstone* (1765), we find the case put thus: 'A parson is sometimes called the rector of the parish: but the appellation of *parson* (however it may be depreciated by familiar, clownish and indiscriminate use) is the most beneficial and most honourable title that a parish priest can enjoy.'

The 'honourable title' was nobly won by such as Chaucer's hero, who, faithful in all duty, dared to 'snib' the sinner, whatever his rank. But the parish parson could not always afford, from the worldly point of view, to cross the wishes of his patron. In Elizabeth's day, severe restrictions were placed even upon his choice of a wife, as will be seen from a letter of the period quoted by Miss de Havilland in *The Times* of March 9, 1929:

— 'After my very hartly comendacons Sr, the berer hereof, beyng the minister of the p'she wher I dwell, beyng w'oute a wife, ys very desyrus to marry a mayde dwelling in the same pish; and for as much as by her Maties. injunccions a minister cannot marry but by the examinacon and allowance of the Bishop of the dioces, and two justices of the peace nere unto the place wher the sayd minister and woman do dwell, I am for hym to desyr your assent thereunto. The man is of honest and good conv'sacon, and the woman is of good yeres, towards xxx, and a very sober mayde and honest, and so reported of by the substantiallest men of this parish, where she hath dwelled almost seven yeres. . . . I sent to divers of the pish wher he serveth to know ther oppinions before I wold wright, and before yow sygnify yor assent to my L. Busshopp.'

Passing thus to Elizabethan literature, a significant fact should be noted. Shakespeare has no play in which he makes religion the main theme. He treats of the great human motives—ambition, love, desire for wealth, courage;

he can analyse the mind of Hamlet or Lear. But he does not set himself to look at life from the angle of Shaw's *Joan of Arc*, or of Masfield's *Everlasting Mercy*, or of Bridges's *Testament of Beauty*. Shakespeare writes as an actor, and if religion or philosophy ask for a place in his work, they must show reason why, for it is with the working motives of living men that he is concerned. As a student of life, however, he has many references to things religious, to the Bible, and to the ecclesiastical customs of his day. The reason for the laughter caused by Jacques is 'Plain as way to parish church.' Celia, reading the rhymes of love-sick Orlando, is checked by Rosalind, 'O most gentle pulpiteer. What tedious homily of love have you wearied your parishioners withal, and never cried "Have patience, good people?"'

He knows about the Dissenters of his time, and makes Sir Andrew Ague-cheek declare that he 'had as lief be a Brownist as a politician.' The Clown in *Twelfth Night*, dressed up as a curate, piously wishes that he 'were the first to dissemble in such a gown.' There is a line at the end of *Love's Labour Lost* which opens up another aspect of the subject—namely, the parson and the sermon. He is describing Winter :

When icicles hang by the wall,  
And Dick the shepherd blows his nail,  
And Tom bears logs into the hall,  
And milk comes frozen home in pail,  
When all aloud the wind doth blow,  
And coughing drowns the parson's saw.

It is evident that Shakespeare went to church. One wonders where his thoughts wandered as he sat shivering in his seat, with his eye on the hour-glass in the pulpit.

The dread of becoming a bore seems to have kept John Milton out of the ministry, for in a letter to a friend he says : 'This, therefore, may be a sufficient reason for me to keep as I am, lest having tired you thus singly, I should deal

worse with a whole congregation, and spoil all the patience of a parish.' A further illustration of the too frequent tedium of the pulpit is given by Dorothy Osborne, in a letter to her lover, Sir William Temple, written about 1658.

'God forgive me,' she writes, 'I was as near laughing yesterday where I should not. Would you believe that I had the grace to go to hear a sermon upon a week day? In earnest, 'tis true, and Mr. Marshall was the man that preached. He is so famous that I expected rare things from him, and, seriously, I listened to him at first with as much reverence and attention as if he had been St. Paul. And what do you think he told us? Why, that if there were no kings, no queens, no lords, no ladies, no gentlemen or gentlewomen in the world, it would be no loss at all to God Almighty; this he said over some forty times, which made me remember it, whether I would or not. I had the most ado to look soberly enough for the place I was in that ever I had in my life. I cannot believe his sermons will do much towards the bringing anybody to heaven, more than by exercising their patience: yet this I'll say for him, he stood stoutly for payment of Tithes, though in my opinion few deserve them less than he. What think you, might I not preach with Mr. Marshall for a wager?

Contemporary with Dorothy Osborne was one of the most lovely characters produced by our national church, George Herbert. A fellow of King's College, Cambridge, Public Orator to the University, and a favourite at the Court, he appeared to have a great career before him. But, turning his back upon fortune, he chose a village parish near Salisbury. There he laboured as a country parson, and wrote his exquisite poetry. Out of a ripe experience he passes on his ideal of a faithful pastor's use of Sunday.

'The country parson, as soon as he awakes on Sunday morning, presently falls to work, and seems to himself as a market-man is when the market day comes, or a shopkeeper when customers use to come in. His thoughts are full of making the best of the day. He begins the day in prayer, that all may be done with due reverence to God's glory, and with edification to his flock. He preacheth constantly; his pulpit is his joy and his throne. He exceeds not an hour in

preaching, for he that profits not in that time, will profit less afterwards.

'As he opened the day with prayer, so he closeth it, humbly beseeching the Almighty to pardon and accept his poor services, and to improve them, that he may grow therein, and that his feet may be like hinders' feet, ever climbing up higher and higher unto God.'

This is the exact opposite of the careless minister portrayed by Richard Baxter :

'When preachers tell people of the necessity of holiness, and yet remain unholy themselves, the people will think that they do but talk to pass away the hour, and because they must say something for their money, and that all these are but words. Indeed men will give you leave to preach against their sins, and to talk as much as you will for godliness in the pulpit, if you will but let them alone afterwards, and be friendly and merry with them when you have done, and talk as they talk, and live as they live. But remember that, as long as men have eyes as well as ears, they will think they *see* your meaning as well as *hear* it ; and they are apter to believe their sight than their hearing.'

Amid the coarseness of the earlier part of the eighteenth century, which did not spare to make a fool of Parson Adams, one writer still retains respect for the ideal. Goldsmith's Vicar of Wakefield is not a hero, but he has a Puritan simplicity which is very charming. It is, however, in the 'Deserted Village' that we find the picture of the parson which will rank as one of the most sympathetic pieces of work in our language. He 'Allured to brighter worlds, and led the way.'

As the eighteenth century drew to its close amid the gloomy terrors of Napoleon's triumphs, the social and religious condition of England became steadily worse. Once more, the parson suffered with the rest. In many cases, though he was still in name the rector of the parish, he became in reality the tame chaplain of the Lord of the Manor. In the transept of the church the squire's pew was as big as



a room. One may still find such a pew in remote places, complete with table and cupboard, and a comfortable corner for a snooze. Up in the gallery, as in Hogarth's pictures, sat the apprentice, holding hands with the serving-maid, while the children kicked their heels against the hard benches under the tower. Aloft, by the screen, was the two-decker pulpit, exalted so high because—according to Swift—however dense the crowd below, there is always room for the parson overhead. Long after the time appointed, the squire's lady walked across the lawn to her own door dressed in fashion's height, the cynosure of all eyes. It is a picture of the dullness, the subservience, and the class-difference of the England of the day.

Into this valley of dry bones came the breath of the Evangelical Revival. Following the work of Whitefield and the Wesleys there sprang up a race of great preachers, Anglican and Nonconformist, clerical and lay, and real piety became a widespread experience. Leaders of the religious life of the country, in consequence, were honoured for their merits. This is not a matter of surprise, for Wesley's discipline was as salutary as that of St. Francis. To his 'Helpers' he gave such pithy and practical directions as these: 'Be diligent. Be serious. Do not affect the Gentleman. Use all the grace and all the sense you have, and have all your wits about you.' Such men, called from their own ranks, the common people gladly heard, and, generally, the term 'parson' shook off some of its 'indiscriminate abuse.' The reference of the word came to be extended to any preacher. Dorothy Osborne might have won her wager to preach against a Mr. Marshall, in the days of Adam Bede. One recalls the scene in the shop when Wiry Ben twits Seth for forgetting to put the panels in the door, for was not Dinah Morris going to preach on the Green that night?

"Which was ye thinkin' on, Seth," said Ben, "the pretty parson's face or her sarmunt, when ye forgot the

panels?" "Come and hear her, Ben," said Seth, good-humoredly; "she's going to preach on the Green to-night; happen ye'd get something to think on yourself then, instead o' those wicked songs you're so fond on. Ye might get religion, and that'd be the best day's earnings y'e'ver made."

The Industrial Revolution was, in part, the result both of the struggle against Napoleon and of the Evangelical Revival. Much of the literature of the early nineteenth century shows marks of these forces. But on one writer they seem to have had little effect. Jane Austen wrote *Pride and Prejudice* in 1796, five years after Wesley's death, and published it in 1818, two years before Waterloo. Yet in her novels she has only one reference to Methodism, and no direct reference to the wars. The daughter of a clergyman, living for the most part in Hampshire, Bath, and Surrey, she seems one of those quiet but observant souls who have the art of transporting people away from care and stress into the wide spaces of unchanging human nature. Jane inherited a pretty wit from her grandfather, who, when told that a friend had been egged into matrimony, expressed the hope that the yoke would sit easy on him. She excelled in miniature sketches of character, one of the best of which is the picture of Mr. Collins, who is also her typical parson.

Collins's patroness, Lady de Bourgh, was a pompous, meddlesome person, who loved to call on her friends, examine into their employment, look at their work, and advise them to do it differently. The minutest affairs of the parish were carried by Collins to this lady; and whenever any of the cottagers were disposed to be quarrelsome, discontented, or too poor, she would sally forth into the village to settle their differences, silence their complaints, and scold them into harmony and plenty. Mr. Collins, who knew that there were other family livings to be disposed of, tried to marry Miss de Bourgh to her cousin, Mr. D'Arcy. When the rich young landowner finally chose Elizabeth Bennett, the

latter's father wrote to the parson a letter which hits him off in a sentence. 'Dear Sir, I must trouble you once more for congratulations. Elizabeth will soon be the wife of Mr. D'Arcy. Console Lady Catherine as well as you can. But, if I were you, I would stand by the nephew. He has more to give. Yours sincerely,' &c.

If the world-movements of the early nineteenth century left small mark on the work of Jane Austen, they deeply affected the writings of George Eliot, Charlotte Brontë, and Anthony Trollope. In the case of the last named, we trace the influence of the Oxford Movement, which, unlike Methodism, centred round the altar, rather than round the pulpit. In *Barchester Towers* one sees a lurking sympathy with Oxford. Mr. Slope, the bishop's ambitious chaplain, believed in preaching, for 'with Wesleyan Methodists he had something in common, but his soul trembled in agony at the iniquities of the Puseyites.' After reporting one of Slope's militant efforts, Trollope lets fly at him :

'There is, perhaps, no greater hardship inflicted on mankind in civilized and free countries, than the necessity of listening to sermons. No one but a preaching clergyman has, in these realms, the power of compelling an audience to sit silent, and be tormented. No one but a preaching clergyman, perhaps a complacent young parson, can revel in platitudes, truisms and untruisms, and yet receive, as his undisputed privilege, a respectful demeanour. A Member of Parliament can be coughed down, or counted out. Town Councillors can be tabooed. But no one can rid himself of the preaching clergyman. He is the bore of the age, the old man whom we Sindbads cannot shake off, the night-mare that disturbs our Sunday's rest, the incubus that overloads our religion and makes God's service distasteful. We are not forced into church ! No ; but we desire more than that. We desire not to be forced to stay away. We desire, nay, we are resolved, to enjoy the comfort of public worship, but we desire also that we may do so without an amount of tedium which ordinary human nature cannot endure with patience ; that we may be able to leave the house of God, without that anxious longing for escape, which is the common consequence of common sermons.'

Such an outburst might seem to be an expansion of some of the dry comments of Samuel Pepys, but the other side should be remembered. Over against the worldly-minded Slope, Trollope has drawn for us an appealing picture in the meek and retiring Warden of Huntly's Hospital; and one cannot forget Mr. Arabin, the fervent preacher and faithful pastor, who, on his merits, rose to be Dean of Barchester.

The Evangelical Revival and the Oxford Movement have coalesced, in a remarkable fashion, to produce the modern ideal of the parson as a social servant. Toward this change of rôle, Maurice and Kingsley led the way. It is, in part, a revolt against the professional hypocrisy which is pilloried by Dickens in the person of Mr. Stiggins. The same recoil, though in quite a different direction, is shown by Browning's Bishop Blougram, whose character must always be a puzzle to the moralist. Our age has not the time, possibly also it lacks the ability, to follow Blougram's struggle to save both his comforts and his orthodoxy.

Modern fiction is too deeply interested in the detective to pay much attention to the parson, or to the religion of which he is the exponent. When the future historian turns to the *Forsyte Saga* as the classic record of the life and manners of the middle classes of our Society, he will find small guidance as to their creed or ritual preference. But he will discover a thumbnail sketch of Monty's Uncle Hugh,<sup>1</sup> a cleric who lived and worked in the slums, and who visualized a cleaner and fresher England in which there would be a better chance for the building of God's Kingdom. Galsworthy may be more than a little of a Stoic, but he, in common with all the great English writers, enforces the truth that the Parable of the Sheep and the Goats applies not least to the parson.

In summary, we may note a change which has come over

---

<sup>1</sup> Galsworthy's characters of Strangway (in *A Little Bit o' Love*) and Latter (in *Windows*) are worthy of note.

English thought about our subject. Chaucer suspected the clergyman who sought a living in the town ; his duty was to meditate, and to be a shepherd to his rural flock. To-day, our hero is a Padre, or a slum-worker. Earlier pictures of the ideal parson portrayed him as being simple-minded, almost to the point of being ' green ' ; now he must be educated, not merely by books, but by the rough-and-tumble of ordinary experience. In former times, he must say ' ditto ' to his patron ; in our day, the more independent and startling a preacher can be, the more likely he is to secure a public, especially if he can contribute to a popular evening paper. One impression, however, has not varied. If a parson is to do real and valuable work, he must be human, quick in sympathy, eager and tender in action, for, to quote Richard Baxter, ' a kind and winning carriage is a cheap and easy way of doing good.' The finest picture of the parson in our language is still that which Bunyan saw in the Interpreter's House—the ' picture of a very grave person, and this was the fashion of it ; he had eyes lifted up to heaven, the best of Books was in his hand, the law of truth was upon his lips : he stood as if he pleaded with men, and a crown of gold did hang over his head.'

R. WINBOULT HARDING.

---

MR. F. C. GLASS has followed up his *Adventures with the Bible in Brazil* by a companion volume, *Through Brazilian Jungles with the Book*. (Pickering & Inglis. 8s. 6d.) He tells how St. John's Gospel fascinated a boy of twelve, who kept on reading it with all his eyes, despite the distractions around him. The Book had a warm reception among convicts, and is already a power among all classes, despite the hostility of the priests. We agree with the Rev. Stuart Holden that Mr. Glass seems specially set apart for this Bible work in Brazil.

## THE DRAMA OF JOB

**T**HE book of Job is one of the great dramatic works of the world. Its action is alive with histrionic quality. Its feeling sounds the depths of human nature. For these reasons the book of Job will never grow old so long as human nature remains young. But our approach to the book has always been made by the religious mind rather than the dramatic mind, with a consequent loss of interest and understanding. It is a religious book, but it is cast in dramatic form, and we shall discover the religious worth of the book only when we have recovered the dramatic form, and when we are able to judge the dialogue aright by knowing the character of those who are taking part. More than any other piece of Hebrew literature it needs bringing home to the modern reader, and nothing would serve this purpose better than to recognize its dramatic qualities and perhaps attempt its dramatic representation.

The characters in the drama are very clearly defined. They are not a mere crowd of onlookers who have gathered to witness the sufferings of the chief character, and pity him. They are clearly cut and they stand for separate and distinct attitudes. They cannot be confused, the one for the other, when you have become familiar with their strange names and their own particular arguments. The drama was written some four hundred years before the birth of Christ. The patriarchal colouring is not a proof of an earlier date, but of the skill of the unknown author who has set the play in an age earlier than his own. This colouring wears thin at times, especially when we find ideas represented as patriarchal which did not make their appearance in Hebrew thought before the date we have mentioned. To regard the work as a record of historical events is to miss the significance of the drama and incidentally to pay tribute to the realism of the author. The picture of the heavenly council in the prologue,

the symbolic number of Job's family and flocks, the miraculous escape of only one servant after each disaster, and lastly the poetic justice at the end, where Job's possessions are doubled, makes it quite impossible to regard the work as a piece of historical writing. Yet it would be equally fallacious to regard the drama as pure invention. Authors, in ancient times, worked with traditional material as our own Shakespeare did. The author probably took some traditional story of a man named Job who was regarded by all as a man of great piety, a righteous man who was overwhelmed by misfortune, and about this traditional character he wove his argument. The various attitudes that might be assumed as answers to Job's outpourings are represented by other characters who might have been, or might not have been, historical. Perhaps the story was borrowed from abroad. Job is represented as a dweller in the land of Uz—outside the Hebrew border—and his name is probably of non-Hebrew origin.

The book is concerned with the age-long question, Why do we suffer? The questions which are discussed are our questions—the meaning of life, the purpose of pain, religion, and authority. At the time when this drama was written, it was generally maintained that prosperity was the reward of piety. With bad logic they argued that because wickedness entailed suffering, therefore suffering was the result of wickedness. If a man was clever enough or lucky enough to escape detection in wrongdoing among his neighbours, he could not evade the range of the Divine eyes, and, as surely as night followed day, he would suffer for his sin. This theory of suffering—that men got what they deserved—was held throughout Old Testament times, and it lies behind most Hebrew writings. It was a popular theology at the time of Christ, as we see in the incident where they brought to Him a man born blind and asked 'Who did sin, this man or his parents?' The Hebrew would argue that Job was prosperous because he was pious. The drama was

written to shatter this smug and comfortable creed. The author found that it was not true, and, while he has no definite and clear conception of the purpose of suffering, he is in hot and angry revolt against the popular theology of his time. He works out his case against this popular theology by personifying the arguments for and against, in characters who were either the creation of his own imagination or typical of certain attitudes towards the problem among people whom he had met.

The *dramatis personae* are : Job, the Heretic ; Eliphaz, the Religious Neurotic ; Bildad, the Traditionalist ; Zophar, the Man-In-The-Street. Elihu does not figure in the original cast. The speech of Elihu is probably a later insertion. A young man reading the drama at some later date thought that Job's friends had made out a very bad case, so he set about improving it in a most impetuous and blustering way. He is the Infallible Youth of the Drama.

Job, the Heretic is the chief character. He is a man of unquestioned piety who had lived a blameless and beneficent life. He is enjoying his life and surrounded by prosperity. His children are his joy, and there is nothing to mar the blessedness of his environment. Of course, he is not aware, as we are, of the Heavenly Council which this great poet has daringly portrayed in the prologue. Quite suddenly, and without warning, Job's household is smitten with disaster. Blow after blow of the cruellest kind falls upon him. There is nothing to explain why this sudden hurricane of evil should sweep across his life. Family and friends, wealth and happiness, health and love are swept away by a series of almost miraculous disasters. Job is left on the ash-heap, a mass of maggots and misery. The very theory of piety and prosperity in which he has been nurtured is shattered to bits. As a result of this, he faces God almost throughout the drama with a mark of interrogation, and his heart is hot in revolt against the existing order of things. His friends readily admit that they cannot charge him with



any wrong, but surely, they say, there must be some grave and secret sin in his life, hidden successfully and therefore the more heinous. 'Whoever suffered, being innocent?' they argue. Job, with all the intensity of his strong nature and all the daring of a bold thinker, repudiates this vile suggestion. At times his words border on impiety and irreverence. We can almost see the hair standing on the heads of his friends when he swears by 'Almighty God, who has wronged and embittered my soul.'

Job hurls a sustained and furious challenge at the existing order of things, and he pours out a magnificent scorn upon these friends who one after the other try to show him where he is wrong, try to persuade him to repent of his sin, try to give reasons for his suffering. According to their ability and their distinct standpoints they seek to defend the traditional and conventional ideas. The proverbial 'patience' of Job is a misnomer. James speaks of his 'endurance,' not patience. It is easy to see that the author is speaking through Job. As our dramatists to-day pour out scorn and ridicule upon Society and conventional modes of thought in the characters in their plays, so this ancient thinker arraigns his own generation and charges them with folly in their mental attitude to the moral order. But he does not condemn them unheard. He is ready to hear their arguments, and those arguments are presented by the other characters in the drama.

We should judge that Eliphaz, the Religious Neurotic, is an old man, perhaps considerably older than Job. He begins his reply by paying a gracious tribute to the Heretic who in former days has been such a comfort to many and whose integrity none have questioned. Then with growing firmness he goes on to show Job how his words and attitude are rebuked by the experiences which have occurred in his longer life. Eliphaz has always found that men get what they deserve without exception. But, as so often happens in such lives which ignore the exceptions, Eliphaz is imposing

theory upon experience and not deducing theory from experience.

Eliphaz passes on in his argument to establish his case against Job by relating a dream in which he was the recipient of a special revelation. In a passage of weird beauty he proceeds to relate a most wonderful nightmare in which all his faculties are frozen with horror as the deep mysteries of life and the soul are revealed to him. But, when we come to examine this great experience, we find that the mountain has been in travail to produce a mouse. The man is a neurotic, and thinks that the vagaries of a disordered brain are a revelation of the Divine will. It is evident that the theory produced the dream, and not the dream the theory. His talk is as vapour and his ideas bear no relation to life. His strange experiences have unfitted him to deal with such a problem as this ; or, rather, he cannot deal with a problem until he faces that problem in a living, excruciating example of it.

Bildad, the Traditionalist, is probably a man in middle life. He is strictly conventional, and bases his contribution to the dialogue entirely on what their fathers have told them. He is not so courteous as Eliphaz, and we miss those gracious and tender words of appreciation of the character of Job. He is annoyed and impatient with Job, and asks, 'How long wilt thou utter these things, these, thy blustering windy words?' Bildad is very reverent, but he is very commonplace. In common with all the friends, he is static in his thought and bound by traditional interpretations of this strange problem of Job. He confesses that he hasn't brains enough to think out the problem for himself. It is beyond his understanding. But why try to think it out? Has it not all been thought out long ago by our fathers? Why not accept their wisdom and be done with it? He argues after the manner of his fathers, that the moral order is in just hands and the wrongdoer must expect to get what he deserves. There is no occasion to argue about it, says

**Bildad.** So he calls upon Job to repent in true evangelical fashion.

The argument is taken up by Zophar, who is a typical man-in-the-street. He is young and insolent, and, if possible, more incapable of dealing with the problem than the other two. He has not grasped the gravity of the problem and thinks that it can be dismissed with a flick of the fingers. Zophar prides himself on his common sense, or his horse sense. He is flippant, fond of proverbs, well versed in all epigrammatic cynicism, and fond of the wisdom of the market-place or the music-hall, or what was the equivalent of the music-hall at that time. To him this was only another case where a man had a reputation for piety, but he had been found out.

Elihu is, as we have said, an interloper. His speech is an insertion of a later date. It represents the point of view of a very immature mind—the Infallible Youth who is too young to know the meaning of problems, but thinks that if there are problems, and this seems to be one, well, he knows all about it. ‘Listen to me,’ he says. He is full of wisdom and is simply at bursting-point to give expression to it. What he says has already been said by the others, and, what is more, better said by them. It is easy to imagine some youth with a bag of words and a ready pen inserting this speech at a later date.

In a series of speeches, repeated several times, the arguments of orthodoxy are pitted against the heresy of Job. The words of the friends seem queer sympathy. They only serve to irritate Job, for they give no light upon the problem, while Job tells them frankly that he knows all that they know, but it does not explain his suffering.

The great climax of the drama comes where Job is answered out of the whirlwind. The voice calls upon him to review the order and beauty, the wonder and majesty of the natural order. In a series of rhetorical questions Job is asked if he can understand and explain the mysteries of the world and

the origin of all things within it. If he is ignorant of these things, how can he expect to understand the greater mysteries of the moral order, which is infinitely greater than the natural ?

The friends are rebuked from the whirlwind. The voice, speaking to Eliphaz, says, ' My anger is kindled against thee and thy two friends in that ye have not spoken of Me the things that are right as My servant Job hath done.' Job is quieted and comforted. He has been led to that serene trust which only those who have faced up to the moral problems of life can know. He has discovered that peace which transcends knowledge. The dialogue ends with the confession of Job. ' I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore, I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes.'

In the Epilogue, we have a poetic restoration of Job in which all his former possessions are doubled. Some intuition in the soul of the author will not allow Job to remain on the ash-heap for ever. This book, while ancient, is also modern. While it deals with a problem which is half as old as time, it touches us in some of the deep and sore places of our life. Some such characterization as we have given above is essential to the book, and should be prefixed to it as an introduction.

W. H. STUBBS.

---

*Documents on Christian Unity.* Second Series. Edited by G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. (Oxford University Press. 6s.) Dr. Bell's first series of documents appeared in 1924. His second series includes fifty-four fresh documents, and forms another chapter in the movement for the Reunion of Christendom. The collection is, as the bishop says, ' both a text-book and a chronicle,' covering ten remarkable years which link together the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930. The selection begins with the World Conference on Faith and Order, and passes to the Roman Catholic Church as represented by the ' Conversations at Malines, 1921-5.' The old Catholic Church, the Church of England and the Free Churches, the Moravian Church, and South India are all represented in this significant series of documents. They show how the fire is burning, and they will do not a little to fan the flames.

## DANIEL DEFOE'S VIEWS ON EDUCATION

**T**HE England of Defoe's day was sorely in need of educational leadership, for the nation had undoubtedly suffered a severe set-back in its educational programme. The zeal of the promoters of the charity schools is perhaps the one bright spot in the educational policy of the country. The brilliant accomplishments of individuals in various fields of knowledge appear in sharp contrast to the general indifference manifested toward the training of youth. The failure of the leaders to provide schools for the children was clearly pointed out by a serious student of the history of British education, who claimed that only eight or ten grammar schools were provided by the city of London for its one hundred thousand or more children of school age.<sup>1</sup> Higher education was likewise neglected. At the universities the passion for learning had ceased. The very low requirements for the B.A. degree<sup>2</sup> were indicative of the low ebb of scholarship in the colleges. The general lethargy of university professors which presumably continued up to the third quarter of the century, led Adam Smith to remark that 'at the University of Oxford the greater part of the public professors have for these many years given up the practice of teaching.'

The part played by Defoe in arousing his contemporaries to a sense of their responsibility in providing more adequate instruction for all the people was by no means inconsiderable. Early in his public career, he suggested proposals for the education of women which were so far in advance of his generation that they were shelved for almost a century. While it is true that he was not alone in making proposals for the intellectual improvement of women, it is certain that no leader of his generation was more thoughtful in devising a plan, nor as courageous in proclaiming it. To his forward-looking mind

---

<sup>1</sup> Montmorency, J., *Progress of Education*, p. 229.

<sup>2</sup> Adamson, J. W., *Short History of Education*, p. 222.

the time had come for the men of England to allow the women a chance for a liberal education. Any objection which the men might offer he claimed was due to their fear that the 'women would vie with the men in their accomplishments.' In the following paragraphs we have his comprehensive plea for women students.

'The persons who enter should be taught all sorts of breeding suitable to both their genius and their qualities, and in particular music and dancing which it would be a cruelty to bar the sex of, because they are their darlings ; and besides this they should be taught languages, as particularly French and Italian ; and I would venture the injury of giving a woman more tongues than one.'

'They should, as a particular study, be taught all the graces of speech and all the necessary air of conversation which our common education is so defective in that I need not expose it. They should be brought to read books, and especially history, and so to read as to make them understand the world. . . . To such whose genius would lead them to it, I would deny no sort of learning.'

Because of his plebeian origin and early educational contacts, it was perhaps natural for Defoe to become interested in the education of the masses. In several of his works, he speaks with enthusiasm concerning those who were toiling with little or no reward to elevate the poor and unfortunate ; commends those from the humbler walks of life who have acquired some training in the rudiments of knowledge ; or reproves those who were attempting to stand in the way of movements which were designed to aid in the intellectual advancement of the people. In *Duncan Campbell*, he praised the efforts of Dr. Wallis, geometry professor at Oxford, who had devised a plan for the training of the deaf and dumb. Among the many attainments of the Scotch, none was more

---

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Projects* (Hazlitt Edition), Vol. III., p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *The Novels and Miscellaneous Works of Defoe* (1840), Vol. II., p. 4.

significant to him than the high level of understanding among the 'instructed poor,' who were 'knowing in sacreds.'<sup>1</sup> The gunner in *Captain Singleton* meets his approval, because 'he was an excellent mathematician, a good scholar, and the possessor of useful scientific knowledge.'<sup>2</sup> Defoe attributes the vagabond qualities of Colonel Jack to his lack of education. When he thinks of the many youths who were following in the footsteps of Colonel Jack, he thus concludes :

'Here's room for just and copious observation on the blessings and advantages of a sober and well governed education and the ruin of so many thousands of youths of all kind in the nation for want of it. Also many public schools and charities might be improved to prevent the destruction of so many unhappy children, as in this town every year are bred up for the gallows.'

That this interest in the education of the poor was genuine may be observed from his subsequent attitude toward the charity schools. During the year 1718 Defoe exposed the narrowness and partisan prejudice of a justice of the peace who would not permit a collection to be taken in the parish church to aid one of the charity schools.<sup>3</sup> In 1723, when the British journal advocated the suppression of charity schools because of a few irregularities among the pupils and the unpatriotic utterances of some of the masters, Defoe took to task the British journal for its unfair and absurd stand in the matter. 'If the nation should follow such advice,' he argued, charity schools would be closed because of poor leadership, universities and colleges cease to function because of the influence of a few masters and teachers, and all parents prevented from teaching their children because a few set the bad example of 'swearing and blaspheming the name of God' in the presence of their children. If such conditions exist, he continued, 'then rid the schools of such masters

<sup>1</sup> *Caledonia* : A Poem.

<sup>2</sup> *The Novels, &c.*, Vol. III., p. 68.

<sup>3</sup> *The Novels, &c.*, Vol. V., p. 9. <sup>4</sup> *Mist's Journal*, August 2, 1718.

and others of better principles may be found.' He concluded his defence of the charity schools by urging the public to support the schools, because 'they will put out to trades both boys and girls, teach the boys to get their livings and the girls to spin and work with their needles, and in short be able to live on their own labours, keep themselves out of snares and idleness and preserve them from beggary and want.'

Even Defoe's enemies were often forced to respect his sane and progressive views on economic subjects. In several of his pamphlets and in the columns of the many periodicals with which he was associated, he discussed the economic problems of the nation. Here, as elsewhere, he seldom allowed himself to stray from practical issues. In his complete *English Tradesman*, his classic on business principles, he offered some much needed advice to the business leaders of England. In one section of this work, in which he gives his views concerning the writing of business letters, we have the basis for our practice in business correspondence. In the two letters which follow he presents, first, an example of an unsatisfactory business, secondly, his conception of the manner in which such a letter should be written.

1. 'SIR,—The destinies have appointed it, and my dark stars concurring that I, who for nature was framed for better things should be put out to trade, and the time of my servitude being at length expired, I am now launched forth on the great ocean of business. I thought fit to acquaint you that last month, I received my fortune which by my father's will had been my due two years past, at which time I arrived to man's estate and became major, whereupon I have taken a house in one of the principal streets in this town where I am entered upon my business, and hereby let you know that I shall have occasion for the goods hereafter mentioned which you may send to me by the carrier.'



2. 'SIR,—Being obliged by my late master's decease to enter immediately upon business and consequently open my shop without coming up to London, to furnish myself with such goods as at present I want I have sent you a small order as under written. I hope that you will use me well and that the goods will be of the best sorts, though I cannot be at London to look them out myself. I have enclosed a bill of exchange for 75 pounds on Messrs. A and B & Company, payable to you or to your order at one and twenty days sight. Be pleased to get it accepted ; and if the goods amount to more than that sum I shall when I have your bill of parcels send you the remainder. I repeat my desire that you will send me the goods well sorted and well chosen and as cheap as possible, that I may be encouraged to a further correspondence.'

'In short,' he concludes, 'a tradesman's letters should be plain, concise and to the point ; no quaint expressions, no book phrases, no flourishes, and yet they must be full and sufficient to express what he means, much less unintelligible. I can by no means approve of studied abbreviations and leaving out of the needful copulatives of speech in trading letters, they are affected to the last degree ; for in a word it is effecting to be thought of a man of more than ordinary sense, by writing extraordinary nonsense ; affecting to be a man of business and expressing your meaning in terms which a man of business may not think himself bound by.'

The native tongue had a stalwart champion in Defoe. His interests in his mother tongue ranged all the way from the idea of establishing an academy for the betterment of the language to the teaching of English to the most humble member of the nation. He viewed with alarm the ineffective use of the language by professors and students at the universities, the failure of the clergy to cultivate a homely and vigorous style of English speech, and the tendency of misguided zealots to substitute far-fetched and meaningless

conceits for the more accurate and dignified forms of writing. It may be argued on reasonably substantial grounds that through his own creative work in English prose, which was so widely read, as well as through his critical suggestions concerning its improvement, he exercised as wholesome an influence on the advancement of prose of the dignified work-day type as any other writer of the eighteenth century.

But our author did not confine his attention solely to the general field of the English language. He also had advanced views on the place of the English language in the school curriculum. He knew that the colleges and the universities of eighteenth-century England gave little or no attention to the study of English. Professors and tutors were not satisfied with lecturing in Latin when they met their students in classical studies, but in philosophical and scientific subjects lectures were delivered in the ancient tongue.<sup>1</sup> His contact with fellow journalists who had come from the universities convinced him that English composition was neglected in the institutions of higher learning and that few men were receiving the training necessary to equip them for successful work in English prose. To show them the very practical nature of the training which he received under the Rev. Charles Morton, M.A., at Stoke Newington, he informed those who were constantly casting reflections on the schools of the Dissenters that his 'master or tutor read all his lectures, gave all his systems whether of philosophy or divinity in English, and had all his declamations and dissertations in the same tongue.' He further claimed, with a degree of just pride, that 'the scholars from that place were not destitute in the languages, for they were by this made masters of the English tongue and more of them excelled in that particular than of any school of that time.'<sup>2</sup> Morton himself was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, and the father of the Wesleys was at his school with Defoe.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete English Gentleman*, p. 64.    <sup>2</sup> *Present State of Parties*.

'Such thorough training in the rudiments of English was not offered at the universities. Many of the university men, he contended, 'can hardly spell their mother tongue, they have no style, no diction, no beauty or cadence of expression, but are so dumb, so awkward and so should be further informed by the help of reading.' To remedy this defect he suggested that it would be a 'happy encouraging step toward the improving young gentlemen in science and the study of all the liberal arts, as they are justly called if they were taught in English and if all the learned labours of the masters of the age were made to speak in English.' Equally guilty were the professors of divinity who gave more attention to Greek and Hebrew than to the study of English. To this failure to stress English in the divinity schools he attributed much of the poor preaching of the Anglican clergy.

'Preaching the gospel which is the end of our study is done in English and it seems absurd to the last degree that all the time should be spent in the languages which it is to be fetched from, and none in the language it is to be delivered in. A man would blush to read the very orthography of some amongst us who are masters of all the oriental languages, who can place the accent right in the Greek ; can criticize the Latin, can point the Hebrew and cannot spell their English.'

Many of our universities might profitably ponder over Defoe's remarks concerning the indiscriminate granting of degrees. In his very interesting work, *A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain* (1725), he made several observations on the schools and colleges. In one instance, he singles out an institution of considerable prestige and takes the officials to task for their laxity in the conferring of degrees. Commenting on this practice, he advised that 'It would be for the honour of the university and others in North Britain that they were less liberal in conferring degrees than they

---

<sup>1</sup> *Present State of Parties*, p. 66.

<sup>2</sup> *Complete English Gentleman*, p. 65.    <sup>3</sup> *Present State of Parties*.

too frequently are.' That this criticism was not prompted by any sectional prejudices may be inferred from the constructive suggestions which he offered to the authorities, which in all probability would have greatly improved their curriculum, and opened up for the institution a larger field of educational service. But these academic men brushed aside the counsel of this practical educator and continued leisurely in the old way.

That Defoe was at times prompted to criticize university men because of their frequent attacks on his learning cannot be doubted. But it is clear that he had a very genuine interest in higher education. He was a staunch advocate of worthy research in and out of university circles. As a further evidence of his fair-mindedness and his desire to promote all branches of education, one may observe the zeal with which he defended the universities when they were attacked by the British journal. No university men of the day came forward with a stronger argument for their institutions: 'As I said in the affair of the charity schools, so I say of the universities. . . . This man flies not at the people in the universities, but at the universities themselves. . . . He reproaches the founders more than the fellows and the foundation more than the people established upon the foundation; so that according to him our universities ought to be purged by fire.'

A further proof of Defoe's interest in higher education may be gathered from his suggestion concerning the establishment of a university in the city of London, as well as his words of praise concerning the members of the Scotch Parliament who made ample provisions for collegiate instruction. It was his firm belief that England needed a wide-awake university in the metropolis. It need not be inferred that he had any evil designs on Oxford and Cambridge, for he made himself very clear on this point. 'We may have

---

<sup>1</sup> *Appleby's Journal*, July 20, 1728.

<sup>2</sup> *Augusta Triumphans*.

universities at those places and at London, too, without prejudice'; for he contended that 'knowledge will never hurt us, and whoever lives to see an university here will find it gives quite another turn to the genius and spirit of our youth.' Such an institution, he felt, would minister to the needs of the poor students of the nation who were eager for an education. Again, he thought that this proposed metropolitan university would kindle the zeal for knowledge. Anticipating the objection to the founding of another institution of higher education when Gresham College was already in existence, he claimed that the teachers at Gresham were not equal to the tasks which should be undertaken by the new university. He earnestly advised that such teachers, 'who only read in term time,' be avoided in the selection of the staff for the University of London, for 'their lectures are so hurried over, the audience is the little better.' He further explained that the teachers at Gresham College 'cannot be turned out, it is a good settlement for life and they are very easy in their studies when once fixed.' In the prospectus, he advocated the securing of the best of tutors and professors who should not be appointed for life, for he adds, 'were the professorship during good behaviour there would be a study to maintain their posts and their pupils would reap the benefit.'

That Defoe recognized the importance of learned bodies as necessary aids to the development of the intellectual life of the nation is manifested by his suggestion for the organization of a Royal Academy of History. He promised that when the society was established, he would contribute a paper on the history of all the Secretaries of the State. But the man was not through. When his eager readers were beginning to think that he had come to the end of his many plans, he surprised them with a plea for the foundation of a Problematic Society, a society that would concern itself largely with contemporary social questions. It is not going too far to say that this man of ideas was laying a foundation

for our modern societies for the study of sociological questions.

Two centuries of educational effort in England have justified the wisdom of the reforms for which he fought. When we remember what he advocated for the education of women, for the more adequate teaching and studying of English in school and college, for improving the quality of English in pulpit and Press, for a more useful system of business training, for university reform, and serious research, we are once more reminded of his versatility and the practical service which he rendered to his country.

CHARLES EATON BURCH.

---

*The Wheel of Fire.* By G. Wilson Knight. (Oxford University Press. 10s. 6d.) Those who read Mr. Knight's 'Measure for Measure and the Gospels,' which appeared in this REVIEW, will be drawn to his 'Essays in Interpretation of Shakespeare's Sombre Tragedies.' His title comes from *King Lear* and his aim is to view Shakespeare's 'transcendent' work with a poetic vision which sees the whole play in space as well as in time. 'Each person, event, scene, is integral to the poetic statement; the removing, or blurring, of a single stone in the mosaic will clearly lessen our chance of visualizing the whole design.' The nature of Hamlet's mental suffering is the theme of the first essay. Hamlet sometimes recovers 'his old instinctive friendliness, humour and gentleness.' But to him 'the universe smells of mortality, and his soul is sick to death.' A second essay argues that we only know Hamlet when he is alone with death; 'then he is lovable and gentle, then he is beautiful and noble, and, there being no trivial things of life to blur our moral vision, our minds are turned to the exquisite music of his soul.' Mr. Knight explores the *Julius Caesar* universe; makes us see in *Macbeth* Shakespeare's most profound and mature vision of evil; lights up the *Lear* universe, with its many human and natural qualities. It 'travails and brings forth its miracle' of love. The essays justify Mr. T. S. Eliot's tribute in the introduction, to Mr. Knight's insight in pursuing his search for the pattern below the level of 'plot' and 'character.' 'The work of Shakespeare is, like life itself, something to be lived through. If we lived it completely we should need no interpretation; but on our plane of appearances our interpretations themselves are a part of our living.' Mr. Knight's essays open our eyes to the wonder of Shakespeare's work, and no one can afford to overlook his fine volume.

## PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

*The Vatican Council.* The story told from inside in Bishop Ullathorne's letters. By DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER, monk of Downside Abbey. Two volumes, with portraits. (Longmans, Green & Co. 1930.)

**T**HE literature of the Vatican Council is immense, but the letters of Bishop Ullathorne, on which this history is mainly based, are contemporary records which seem to admit a reader into the Council itself. The bishop sent every week to friends in England news of the Council and of events in Rome. 'In these letters we have his impressions, almost from day to day, of the course of events, his estimations of men and movements, his hopes and fears at every turn, told with great actuality : in all, a living picture of the Council from inside.' There is no such picture of the course of events. Ullathorne was 'a plain straightforward Yorkshireman, of high character, with wide experience of men and affairs, shrewd and intelligent. At the Council he took up and maintained a "moderate" or middle position, holding aloof from all movements, all intrigues outside the Council Chamber, refusing to act with any party, or to sign any petition, protest, or other document whatever; yet closely in touch with leading bishops on both sides. Thus we have in him probably a witness as well informed, and as independent, impartial, and objective, as could well be found.'

The Papacy was the chief subject dealt with in the Council, and led to 'the settlement of long-standing controversies concerning the position and authority of the Pope in the Church.' Government circles in Austria and Bavaria, and in a lesser degree in France, were not so much concerned about papal infallibility as about the relations of Church and State. They feared that the Council would lead to a reassertion of the claims to temporal power associated with

Gregory VII and other Pontiffs. That was Mr. Gladstone's view in 1874, when he wrote that 'Rome had refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.'

Dom Butler's first chapter sketches the papal monarchy which culminated and was shattered when Philip the Fair, of France, to avert excommunication, resorted to physical force which brought about the death of Boniface VIII. The seventy years at Avignon followed, and the thirty years of the Great Schism. 'This century of depression of the Papacy ended the mediaeval conception of the Pope's temporal power and reduced it to the limits of the Civil Sovereignty over the hereditary States of the Church. Instead of being the general arbiter and director of the affairs of Western Christendom, the Pope, on the temporal side, became one of the Italian Princes.'

Political Gallicanism reached its culminating point in the victory over Boniface VIII; theological Gallicanism set itself against certain claims of the Papacy in the spiritual and religious sphere. Over against this stood the Ultramontane Conception, which prevailed beyond the Alps, in Italy and Rome. Its representative, Cardinal Bellarmine, regarded the Pope simply and absolutely as above the Universal Church; he could recognize no judge on earth above himself. If he became a formal heretic he would by that very fact cease to be Pope, and could be judged and declared deposed by the Church. Ultramontanism based itself on our Lord's words as spoken to Peter individually; he himself, and not his profession of faith, was the Rock. Wilfrid Ward described the reaction from Gallicanism as 'The New Ultramontanism.' He strained the doctrine of infallibility beyond the traditional teaching of the Ultramontane schools, whilst Louis Veuillot, in the *Univers*, showed 'an almost unbelievable exuberance of quite untheological devotion to the Holy Father, sometimes bordering, it seemed to many, on blasphemy.' Ward and



Veillot exercised a profound influence on the atmosphere in which the Vatican Council was held. Their New Ultramontanism was the chief cause 'of the bitter hostility of the whole non-Catholic world, and the fears of the Governments of the Catholic States. This, too, was the real cause of the action of the Minority bishops in opposing the definition—they were afraid of the kind of infallibility that might be defined.'

On December 8, 1864, Pius IX, in a private conversation with the Cardinals resident in Rome, expressed his desire for an oecumenical council which should meet the extraordinary needs of the time. He invited suggestions on the subject, and in the following April broadened his appeal to include certain bishops, among whom were Manning and Dupanloup. Eight of these included the infallibility of the Pope when teaching *ex-cathedra* among the subjects to be considered. The 'recalling heretics and schismatics to the bosom of the Catholic Church' was prominent in their minds. The way was now prepared, and on June 26, 1867, the Pope announced that the Council was to be held. Dupanloup and other bishops hoped that the Council might prepare the way for the Reunion of Christendom. Keen and bitter controversy broke out on the question of 'defining the Pope's infallibility. Dr. Döllinger was protagonist of those who opposed any definition. He was author-in-chief of *The Pope and the Council* by 'Janus,' 'a vehement frontal attack on the political papacy, the papal monarchy as conceived by Hildebrand and Innocent, the centralizing tendencies at Rome, the Roman Curia, the Inquisition, the Temporal Power and the administration of the Papal States, the Syllabus taken as the condemnation of modern political ideas, Ultramontanism both new and old, with the Jesuits as the principal devils of the piece.' Ullathorne wrote this book is 'the gravest and severest attack on the Holy See and the Jesuits, and especially on the policy of Rome for a thousand years, and will be a great storehouse for the adversaries of the Church.' Fourteen of the twenty German

prelates signed a letter to the Pope expressing their conviction that, in view of the actual state of things in Germany and numerous requests made to them by clergy and laymen devoted to the Church and the Holy See begging that the definition be not made, the definition would be inopportune. The turmoil of feeling in Germany led to some of the bishops being publicly insulted and almost mobbed by the people. Dupanloup's pastoral of November 1868—in which he said the Council would have two great objects: the good of the Church and the good of human society—made a great impression and called forth an affectionate letter of thanks from the Pope. That must be remembered, in view of the fact that he became 'perhaps in a way the chief leader and chief driving-force of the opposition to the defining of the Papal infallibility.'

On the eve of his departure for the Council Ullathorne wrote: 'The Pope, I believe, is bent on the definition, if he can, as the crowning of his reign, and I think it will in some shape probably pass. What I am anxious most about is to get a balance on the side of the episcopate, by defining its divine origin as a counter-balance, and by putting landmarks about the *ex-cathedra*. If this is not done we shall have a wild enthusiasm, especially on the part of converts; and a disposition on the part of the clergy and even laity to lower the power of the episcopate; and a stronger centralization, leading ultimately to reaction; and a narrower door prescribed to those who are seeking the Church; and a fanatical extending of the papal prerogatives beyond the fact, after the style of Ward.'

The Council was formally opened on December 8, 1869, with 'such an assemblage of prelates, whether you consider numbers, or the character of their training and breadth of experience, as was never witnessed in this world before.' Six days later the election of the deputation *de Fide* marked the beginning of the Infallibility contest. Ullathorne felt that on these twenty-four 'much will depend when the

*question* comes on.' Manning was actively at work keeping up 'a running fight,' as he calls it, with the Minority. To them his share in the Council was 'almost an unearthly joy.' 'All the cautious people, as opposed to the *Zelantes*, feel that our Archbishop's rooms are the centre of a determined intrigue, and that if they get their committee it is because they are organized, restlessly active, and have the strongest backing. It will only transfer the conflict to the General Congregation.' Manning gloried in the intrigue by which the international committee of infallibilists secured the election of the *de Fide* deputation. Its twenty-four were all in favour of the definition ; the Minority had not a single representative on the most important committee of the Council. Dom Butler feels that this was the one serious blot. 'It was surely an error of judgement not to accord to a considerable and influential minority, counting among its members a number of the foremost and most justly respected bishops of the Church, some representation, some vehicle for the expression of its views on this committee. The practical effect was that the Minority became an Opposition, exasperated by the sense that the Majority was bent on overwhelming it by mere force of numbers, without giving it a fair hearing. And it afforded to the enemies of the Council outside one of their most effective weapons in inveighing against the lack of real freedom of the bishops, contending that the appearance of election was camouflage, everything being engineered by the Curia.' Some of the bishops themselves shared this feeling. Outside the question was being violently agitated.

The Council cost the Pope £200 a day, for he maintained missionary bishops or those from poor dioceses. There was much dissatisfaction with the management both of the discussions and the general business of the Council, but on February 22 a new code of regulations was introduced and generally welcomed, with some protest against the closure. That, however, was applied only once.

The great scene of the Council arose when, on March 22, Bishop Strossmayer, the chief fighting member of the Minority, made a vigorous onslaught on the Proem to the schema on Catholic Faith, which he said ascribed to Protestantism all the errors of the day—rationalism, pantheism, materialism, atheism. All these, he pointed out, existed long before Protestantism, and many grave Protestants were a real help to Catholics in opposing those errors. ‘I believe that there are in the midst of Protestantism a great crowd of men in Germany, England, and America, who love our Lord Jesus Christ and deserve to have applied to them those words of Augustine, “They err indeed, but they err in good faith (*murmurs*): they are heretics, heretics; but no one holds them for heretics.”’ The President and another Cardinal called him to order, but he persisted in his statement, and maintained the right of a morally unanimous consent rather than a mere majority of votes. He came down from the ambo amid cries of anathema, and ‘He is another Luther, let him be cast out!’

On March 6 the formula on the Pope’s infallibility which had been prepared by the commission of theologians was distributed to the Council. Ullathorne writes on April 1: ‘The Pope takes every opportunity of expressing his views on the infallibility, both in audiences and in letters that at once get into the papers. He has quite changed his old policy on our arrival, when he professed neutrality before the Council.’ The *Zelantes* had carried their point that the great question should be brought forward out of its turn. Four hundred bishops petitioned the Pope to take this course. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry, wrote to Newman that the Minority had arranged a counter-demonstration. ‘Speaking *Secundum hominem*, I would say that neither time nor place are suited for a General Council. The Pope, the bishops of Italy, of Spain, of Mexico, are smarting under a sense of recent wrong done under cover or pretext of those great principles of liberty of which we in England and

America are enjoying the blessed fruit. Nor does the place suit. The presence and presidency of the Romanus Pontifex necessarily takes from the Council the *pouvoir constitutif*—we cannot be *une assemblée constituante*; we have only the power of discussion and opposition and declamation. . . . If it is in the secret counsel of God that the infallibility should be defined, there must be not only truth in the definition, but also some great need of it which we do not foresee. But seeing only, and not foreseeing, some of us are resolved to oppose to the last hour—to the final *placet* of the Pope.' Dupanloup sent a personal letter to Pio Nono urging that 'Nothing could be more dangerous' than to bring forward the question of the infallibility 'on the spot, abruptly, before its time and out of its place.' 'The question,' he said, 'has already set Europe on fire: the fire will become a conflagration, if by a violent haste it seems that, at all costs and by a change in the natural order of things forestalling the hour of Providence, the thing is being carried by assault.' He felt that he would be betraying the Holy See and the Church did he not warn the 'Holy Father, while there is yet time, to spare the Church and the Holy See from evils that may become disasters for all Christendom during long ages, and cause the loss of an incalculable number of souls.' 'This is what makes a number of holy bishops tremble and groan unto tears.' In reply the Pope warned him not to be wise in his own eyes, but to return to 'the golden simplicity of little ones,' and to cast away prejudiced opinions which 'may obscure the holiness of your character, and which may make, if not pernicious, certainly useless for the Church those great gifts of intellect, alacrity, eloquence with which God has so liberally endowed you for the extending of His Kingdom.' Pio Nono was not to be turned from his course.

On June 18, Cardinal Guidi, Archbishop of Bologna, made a speech which was one of the sensations of the Council. He was a distinguished theologian who had been professor in the Universities of Rome and Vienna. He contended that a

condition of infallibility was that it should not be exercised rashly (*temere*), but that the Pope was bound to use ordinary human diligence in arriving at a right judgement, as prayer, consultation, study ; and that the normal means was consultation with a greater or less number of bishops, according to the circumstances, the bishops being the witnesses to the belief of their churches. He proposed to insert these details in the definition. When he stepped from the ambo the Minority bishops crowded round to thank and congratulate him ; one of them even embraced him. That afternoon his speech was reported to the Pope, who sent for him and it is said upbraided him, a bishop of the Pontifical States and a Cardinal, for opposing him. Guido was surprised, and said he had only maintained that bishops are witnesses of tradition. 'Witnesses of tradition?' said Pius, 'there's only one ; that's me.' Dom Butler notes that Fénelon, and apparently also Bossuet, held that the Roman See was infallible, but not its occupant. Individual Popes might err in teaching, as Honorius, but the Papacy would recover itself, and other Popes would put right the error that had been made. The Infallibilists wished to destroy this distinction between the Roman See and the individual Popes.

The definition of infallibility was adopted by 451 in the crucial trial ballot : 88 voted *non-placet* ; 62 *placet justa modum*, (i.e. with a reservation) 76 absented themselves ; others had left for their dioceses. On Dupanloup's suggestion the Minority bishops left Rome before the deciding vote, on July 18, 1870, which was 538 *placets*, two *non-placets*. Not one of the Minority bishops afterwards failed to announce his adhesion to the decree. Whatever their intellectual convictions, they gave up their private judgement and accepted 'the judgement of the Church that the doctrine is part of the divine revelation.' Dr. Newman did not come well out of the struggle, for he denied that he had written to Ullathorne, 'Why should an aggressive insolent faction be allowed to "make the heart of the just to mourn, whom

the Lord hath not made sorrowful " ? ' His denial was due to his misreading of his rough draft, and he had afterwards to admit the use of the words. But the letter expressed his real feeling : ' If it is God's Will that the Pope's infallibility should be defined, then is it His blessed Will to throw back " the times and the moments " of that triumph what He has destined for His kingdom ; and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable inscrutable Providence.' He had to bow his head, but no one can dream that his heart went with it.

Pio Nono's personal influence was quite extraordinary and this, added to his ' dominant authority as Vicar of Christ and Head of the Church on earth,' had much to do with the final decision on which he had set his heart and to secure which he exerted all his powers. Bishops of moderate views found personal interviews a sore trial. Dom Butler feels that his action was very regrettable and quite unnecessary, for the bishops would have given him what he wished.

Cardinal Manning told Mr. Purcell that since he had attended a Council all that was obscure or perplexing or disedifying in the Oecumenical Councils of the past was accounted for to his mind. Nothing, he felt, was too base for the partisan spirit. The calumnies of yesterday were not one whit worse than those of to-day. Dom Butler is indignant at such ' ill-natured reminiscences,' but they have gained new point as his volumes enable us to look inside the Vatican Council. Dollinger stood his ground, and the Old Catholics numbered 150,000, but that was only part of the mischief. Dom Butler says the definition does not extend infallibility to the private teaching of the Pope, still less to his conversation, his ordinary actions, his political functions, or his judgements of causes between man and man. It is only when he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals *ex cathedra* in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority that he is infallible. That reduction of infallibility to a minimum will make many readers of this history feel that it was a

ruthless and cruel thing to treat such a minority as they were treated in the Vatican Council, and also to create world-wide suspicion and unrest and incur the loss of such men as formed the backbone of the Old Catholic party. 'John Inglesant' expresses the feeling of many when he says that for the sake of preserving its dogma Ultramontanism risked the growth and welfare of humanity. In looking back over the sixty years that have passed since 1870, Dom Butler holds that the panic fears of Dupanloup and Acton, as well as the hopes and expectations of such men as Ward and Veuillot, that there would be a constant flow of *ex cathedra* utterances on doctrine, philosophy, science, social ethics, and the relations of Church and State, setting up a veritable theocracy, have been completely falsified.

It was at Munich, in 1845, that Mr. Gladstone met Döllinger and formed what Lord Morley describes as one of the most interesting and cherished friendships of his life. He tells his wife that he has lost his heart to him. Gladstone hesitated to express his feeling that Wesley's 'views and intuitions were not heretical, and that if the ruling power in our Church had had energy and a right mind to turn him to account, or if he had been in the Church of Rome I was about to add, he would then have been a great saint, or something to that effect. But I hesitated, thinking it perhaps too strong, and even presumptuous, but he took me up and used the very words, declaring that to be his opinion.' They were entirely in accord as to the Vatican decrees of 1870. Gladstone spent much time with his friend at Munich in September 1874, and felt his blood run cold to think of his treatment in his old age. 'I know no one with whose modes of viewing and handling religious matters I more cordially agree. He is wonderful and simple as a child.' Gladstone's pamphlet *The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance: A political expostulation* appeared in November, and caused intense excitement. He felt that a real injury had been done to human liberty by the decrees.



Dom Butler's work will we hope send some readers to William Arthur's monumental volumes published in 1877, *The Pope, the Kings, and the People*. They are described on the title-page as 'A History of the Movement to make the Pope Governor of the world by a Universal Reconstruction of Society from the issue of the Syllabus to the close of the Vatican Council.' Mr. Arthur was in close communication with Dr. Döllinger, who gave him free access to all his pamphlets on the Council. He knew how Döllinger held his ground even after the dogma had been accepted, despite the fact that Von Scherr, the Archbishop of Munich, who had acted with the Opposition, changed his front and wanted to win over Döllinger. Mr. Arthur gives his own conclusion in strong terms : ' If the authors of the movement are not deceived, the generations that will come up after I am no more will witness a struggle on the widest scale, and of very long duration, during which will disappear all that to us is known as modern liberties, all that to Rome is known as the modern state, and at the close of which the ecclesiastical power will stand alone, presiding over the destinies of a reconstituted world.'

Set side by side with Dom Butler's volumes, Mr. Arthur's work gains new importance and stands out as a monument of patient and skilled research. It is a profound defence of Protestant principles, which is more important and more needed even than when it first appeared.

JOHN TELFORD.

---

# Notes and Discussions

---

## ADOLPH VON HARNACK

A LITTLE more than twenty years ago, when the writer was a student at Berlin University, there were two men who stood out as kings among the many who were well known throughout the world of scholarship: Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Mommsen's son-in-law, and Adolph Harnack. The latter was not yet forty when he was called to Berlin, having held professorships at Dorpat (where he was born, and where his father had been a professor in pastoral theology), at Leipzig, Giessen, and Marburg. He had already published an edition with Gebhardt and Zahn, *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, and a series of essays in New Testament and patristic fields which continued for many years—also in collaboration with Gebhardt—under the title *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*. In 1881, in a public lecture on 'Monasticism—Its Ideals and History,' he showed himself a lecturer who could present the results of erudite scholarship in a way to fascinate an intelligent audience. And in Berlin it was to an audience of five or six hundred that both Wilamowitz-Moellendorf and Harnack were accustomed to lecture—an audience representative of most of the peoples and of the universities of the Western world.

Harnack's appointment to Berlin followed not long after the publication of his *History of Dogma*, the writing of which occupied him about ten years. The Conservative authorities strenuously opposed him. But Frederick William was dying, and the Kaiser to be—William II—who was eager to have as many brilliant scholars as possible in the university of his capital, supported Bismarck and the Ministry in the appointment.

It is not too much to say that his *History of Dogma* firmly established the author's reputation, not only within, but also beyond, his own country. It was soon translated into English, and has passed through many editions since its first publication. In it Harnack showed that he combined the power of minute investigation with a singular faculty for bold generalization. Here, and in the many other books he wrote, his industry was seen to be unflagging and his learning both wide and exact, but he was always master of his facts and showed a great capacity for tracing out the effect of thought on political and religious life. The author himself defines the aim of a history of dogma to be, first, to explain the origin of dogmatic Christianity, and, secondly, to describe its development. So he traced the rise of the authoritative doctrinal system of the fourth century and its development up to the Reformation. There is more than one explanation

of the cause of the differences between the earlier and later doctrines of the Church. The Roman Church maintains that the later doctrines were later only in the sense that they were published later. They had been handed down from the apostles and preserved in the Church by unbroken succession, although they were not made known until later times, when the need for further teaching arose. Another explanation is that the later doctrines were for the most part a corruption of the primitive truth of the gospel and a degeneration from the purity of the original revelation. Harnack stated his own position thus: 'Dogmatic Christianity stands between Christianity as the religion of the gospel, presupposing a personal experience and dealing with disposition and conduct, and Christianity as a religion of cultus, sacraments, ceremonial, and obedience—in short, of superstition—and it can be united with either the one or the other.' For him, what happened during the first four Christian centuries was a secularizing, an 'acute hellenization,' of the faith. 'Dogma in its conception and development is a work of the Greek spirit on the soil of the gospel.' It is important to remember the two sides in that statement. The influence of Greek thought in the expression of the gospel is already apparent in the Fourth Gospel, though, as Harnack recognized, that influence forms only one element in the development of Christian thought which in its own way tried to preserve the primitive and apostolic traditions—the faith once delivered to the saints. Christian dogma comprehended and expressed the religious conceptions contained in Greek philosophy and the gospel, and by that means 'conquered the world and educated the modern nations.' Greek thought was the medium in which the gospel was so expressed as to be intelligible to the world, and that same thought became blended with the contents of the gospel itself, so that much that is not essential found its way into what we call Christianity. As a Protestant, Harnack claimed to be not only free to criticize dogma, but bound to do so, because there is a sense in which, for a Protestant, Christian dogma cannot be said to exist.

His position at Berlin was too firm for him to be disturbed by any criticism of his orthodoxy in Germany or abroad. Nor did he wish to provoke controversy either by this or his other works; although, if controversy arose, he was ready to defend his position frankly. When in 1892 the question of the Apostles' Creed and its use as a test for ordinands was hotly debated, Harnack issued a pamphlet declaring that his own preference was for a briefer symbol which would be more suitable to be exacted from all candidates for ordination.

It has been said that in his *History of Dogma* the author does not make clear what were the characteristics of this pure and primitive Christianity, which was corrupted by its gradual hellenization; and Pfleiderer claimed that, without any definite conception of the nature of Christianity based on history, what was primitive and what was later corruption was a matter of personal taste. Harnack's own conception of original Christianity was given to the world in his famous lectures, 'Das Wesen des Christentums,' translated into English under

the title 'What is Christianity?' All who know these lectures know the story of how they came to be published. The lectures, sixteen in number, were not written, but were delivered without even any elaborate notes. Unknown to the lecturer, they were taken down in shorthand by one of his students, and sent to Harnack, when complete, with a request that he would publish them. This he did with no alteration other than here or there the correction of a word. This was thirty years ago, and there are many who recall to this day the extraordinary impression which the lectures made upon those who heard them. Nearly ten years afterwards the present writer attended a course of lectures, by the same lecturer, on 'The History of the Christian Religion.' Twice a week for a period of two consecutive hours, with a break of a quarter of an hour between, the lecturer delivered orations, for they were nothing less, on Church history. In five months he covered the whole period up to the time at which he was lecturing. He had no notes except one sheet of notepaper, on which were written the names of the paragraphs or chapters. He would begin with a characteristic gesture, pushing up his spectacles to read the number and title of the lecture. For example, 'Numero zehn—Das Mönchtum.' Then the paper would be laid on the desk, and for three quarters of an hour we listened to a lecture as carefully balanced and constructed as a chapter in a book, but with all the warmth of the living word. His son and daughter both attended these lectures: the one was killed and the other widowed in the Great War.

*What is Christianity?* was taken to be the expression of the creed of Liberal Christianity. It was answered by Loisy in his critical-historical, but strongly Catholic, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*. Loisy maintained that, 'whether we trust or distrust tradition, we know Christ only by means of, athwart, and within the Christian tradition.' English scholars like Dr. Sanday, who frankly avowed their great indebtedness to Harnack for his historical and critical studies, while acknowledging the emphasis which he placed on the uniqueness of the character, his description of and sympathy with the moral and religious content of the teaching of our Lord, were not slow to attack the Christology, which was the outcome of the historical-religious methods of this Liberalism. Sanday felt that the spiritual value which Harnack emphasized must require, in order to be justified, a background of more orthodox doctrine. But, by these lectures and the criticism they provoked, Harnack's fame reached many who had neither the interest nor leisure to read his *History of Dogma*, or even the summary of it which he subsequently published.

The increasing number of his pupils as Professor of Theology did not prevent him from publishing books with amazing industry upon diverse subjects. Not all were equally substantial, but all were marked by the same exact scholarship, and written in the same attractive style. In 1898 he had written a *History of Christian Literature to Eusebius*, in which he reminded his readers that in the modern criticism of the sources of Christianity we were returning to

primitive tradition. In 1908 he issued *The Mission and Expansion of Christendom in the First Three Centuries*. In this he maintained that Christianity triumphed because it gave the world a gospel of salvation and love, because it was a religion of the Spirit and of power, which was shown in the new morality. In addition to books like these, there were many smaller books and pamphlets.

His Liberal Christianity was not welcome to the orthodox Lutherans, and it is said the Kaiserin was particularly averse to him. But his position was secure because of his wide renown and the favour of the Kaiser, and in 1905 he was appointed to be 'Director of the Royal Library' in the Unter den Linden. When he was appointed, the library contained more than one hundred works by himself, and the number has steadily increased in the years that have followed. The Kaiserin and the Conservatives are said to have favoured the appointment, because they thought the professor would no longer have time to lecture. But, although Harnack was obliged to give up some of his teaching work, he still lectured to large audiences in the university; and still carried on his famous Seminar, in which have been trained many who have carried his ideas and methods far beyond the borders of Germany; and he still published books, beginning a series of studies on the New Testament, most of which were at once translated into English. There followed one another within a few years: *Luke the Physician*, *The Sayings of Jesus*, *The Acts of the Apostles*, *The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels*, *The Origin of the New Testament*. It is difficult to discriminate, but perhaps his work on the Acts has been the most significant of his studies of this character. It was not so many years before that Ferdinand Christian Baur had described the Acts as a book 'the statements of which can only be looked upon as intentional deviations from historical truth in the interest of the special tendency they possess.' For the Tübingen school it was a second-century production written to gloss over the quarrel between the Petrine and Pauline parties. Ramsay, without having given special study to it, was much of that opinion, until his own investigations and explorations in Asia Minor convinced him that the book is that of an historian of first rank, written by a companion of Paul, who was also the writer of the Third Gospel. Harnack from another point of view came to the same conclusion, and by an exhaustive linguistic analysis confirmed the tradition that the writer of the Third Gospel and Acts was Luke the companion of Paul. After the linguistic analysis he devoted himself to studying the trustworthiness of the Lukan writings in chronology and geography, and gave the Acts, on this ground, a high place among the historical works of the period. No one has brought out in more striking fashion how, as the Gospel describes the power of Jesus as He moved among men, so the Acts describes the power of the Spirit of Jesus in the primitive Christian community, in the mission of the Gentiles, in the spread of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, the centre of the world.

Into the vexed question of chronology it is not possible to go, but all subsequent writers have taken careful notice of Harnack's *Chronology*

of *Early Christian Literature*, published in 1897, although in the life of Paul and in the Gospel of Mark and in the Lukan writings he has argued for a somewhat earlier date than most modern scholars are inclined to accept. There is hardly a book in the New Testament and in the rest of the early Christian literature about which Harnack has not had some fresh and stimulating suggestion to make, even if it has not won universal assent. Since his retirement he has made noteworthy contributions to the study of the heretic Marcion, and of the First Epistle of Clement. His publications have extended over fifty-three years.

No record of Harnack's activity would be adequate which did not refer to his interest in social questions. His study in early Christian literature and history only increased his interest in Christianity as a present religious life and not a mere system of theology. There is a volume of *Essays on the Social Gospel*, by Harnack and Hermann, in Williams & Norgate's series of translations. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that if the Reformation left a gulf between the Lutheran Church in Germany and the working classes, it was because Luther's courage failed him at a critical moment in the Peasants' Revolt, when he hounded on the princes to crush the rising, in that tract which has left a stain on his noble life—*Against the Murdering, Thieving Hordes of Peasants*. It might have been so different, for it was those peasants who first looked upon him as their heaven-sent leader and marched under the banner of the Cross. But the Lutheran Church, though always alienated from Labour through this, developed a social conscience in the latter part of the nineteenth century, and Harnack played his part nobly in its development. The writer attended a congress of eight hundred delegates at Heilbronn in 1909 called the 'Evangelical Congress over the Social Question.' Harnack was the President, and his presidential oration was worthy of the occasion and of its author. He was on his way to some similar congress at Heidelberg when he died a few weeks ago.

Unlike some of the Teutonic professors who never missed an opportunity of displaying their knowledge of English and of many other languages, Harnack used to tell those who had the privilege of visiting him at home that he was a man of one language. He certainly disliked to talk in anything but German. But he was eager for friendship between the Churches of England and Germany, and came to London not long before the war in this connexion, and spoke in German on the brotherhood of the two peoples and their common desire for peace. Despite this, it was not altogether a surprise that Harnack joined the other German professors in their manifesto in the early months of the war. Originally he came from beyond East Prussia, and there was something of the Prussian both in the hard guttural of his speech and in his character. Besides, he was not the only scholar in those years of storm who failed to apply the same impartial judgement to national responsibilities as to minute points of historical criticism.

In his own country he was honoured by admission to the Academy

of Sciences in Berlin soon after he first went there, and later he was ennobled by the Kaiser. But the greatest tribute to him is that no scholar has exercised a wider influence on his generation. He will be remembered as a most learned historian and alert critic who claimed absolute freedom in his study of Church history and of the New Testament and its literature; as a courageous leader of thought who cultivated through all his researches the keenest interest in practical Christianity as a religious life. To his own question, 'What is Christianity?' his own answer was that it is not the elaborate ecclesiastical system of which history tells the story; it is something at once simple and sublime; 'it is one thing only, eternal life in the midst of time, by the strength and under the eyes of God.'

F. B. Clogg.

### MORE ABOUT THOMAS HARDY.

*The Last Years of Thomas Hardy (1892-1928).* By Florence Emily Hardy. (Macmillan & Co. 18s. net). Mrs. Hardy in this book has brought to a close the story of her husband's life. She has done her work with great care, and wherever possible has allowed Thomas Hardy to speak for himself. We found her first volume of great interest, and this second one has done much to illumine the ways and habits of the great poet and novelist. It deals in the main with that portion of his life when he abandoned novel-writing and gave his enthusiastic service to the writing and publication of his poems. It is clear to us that he was a master in both fields, and it is hard to decide where his greatest triumphs were won. He certainly brought poetry into his stories, and the story into his poems. The old belief that Hardy had spent all his years in Dorset, and that he lived as a recluse, is completely shattered in this volume and the earlier one. He spent much time in London, moved easily in Society, and then, when he was wearied by it, slipped back into that Wessex that he knew so well, and loved so much. But wherever he was, he was always using his eyes, was moved by the mutability of things, and, while conscious of the world's laughter, was more swift to hearken to its tears. He saw with surprising clearness the moving panorama of life; but the ancient world called him, and the sight of some ancient barrow, or of some old family name, transported him down the centuries. There is a passage from his note-book which illustrates this—'At Great Fawley, Berks. Entered a ploughed vale which might be called the Valley of Brown Melancholy. The silence is remarkable. Though I am alive with the living, I can only see the dead here, and am scarcely conscious of the happy children at play.' This shows the mood of the man, and explains much of the sombre hue of his writings. He lingers on the painful moments, and makes a note of them. 'Hurt my tooth at breakfast-time. I look in the glass. Am conscious of the humiliating sorriness of my earthly

tabernacle, and of the sad fact that the best of parents could do no better for me. Why should a man's mind have been thrown into such close, sad, sensational, inexplicable relations with such a precarious object as his own body !'

In this volume we can peep into Thomas Hardy's workshop and see him at work, and we can almost overhear him expressing his thoughts on his craft. All readers of Hardy must have been struck by the way in which his characters, such as Tess, Jude, Henchard, and others, are chased like trembling leaves by inscrutable forces. Hardy certainly meant us to think of some of his characters in this way. He writes : ' The best tragedy—highest tragedy in short—is that of the *worthy* encompassed by the inevitable. The tragedies of immoral and worthless people are not of the best.' Hardy's stories certainly grip our attention, and we are carried along by the sweep and excitement of his tale. Whatever he is, he is never dull. He sought to interest and to excite his readers. ' A story must be exceptional enough to justify its telling. We tale-tellers are all Ancient Mariners, and none of us is warranted in stopping Wedding Guests (in other words, the hurrying public) unless he has something more unusual to relate than the ordinary experience of every average man and woman.' This leads us to say that it is strangely unfair to Hardy to say, because he took tragedy as the medium of his art, that, therefore, he believed that life was, in the main, tragic. That may have been his view ; but it is not just to deduce it from his tragic novels. Mrs. Hardy gives us some interesting information concerning her husband's great poem *The Dynasts*. The reception of the first two parts was not calculated to encourage him in his formidable task. But he was undaunted, and toiled at his great work. He, like Keats, was ' not afraid of failure.' He knew that, in the great tasks, what the world called failure was, in truth, success. ' Critics can never be made to understand that true failure may be greater than the success. . . . To have strength to roll a stone weighing a hundredweight to the top of the mount is a success, and to have the strength to roll a stone of ten hundredweight only half way up the mount is a failure. But the latter is two or three times as strong a deed.'

Mrs. Hardy tells us that her husband was greatly interested by a remark, made at a scientific gathering, ' that all great things were done by men who were not at ease.' We can understand why the remark appealed to Hardy, for he was ill at ease in the presence of many of life's happenings, and it was his challenging spirit and restless discontent that gave to his writings their distinctive and characteristic note. He was more of a questioner, than a man who presents answers. But his questionings are more provocative to thought than many cheap and familiar answers. We see in this book Hardy's charm and sensitiveness, his fidelity to his craft, and his unconquerable industry. His wife says that ' sensitiveness was one of Hardy's chief characteristics, and without it his poems would never have been written, nor, indeed, the greatest of his novels. He used to



say that it was not so much the force of the blow that counted, as the nature of the material that received the blow.' He was a true patriot, of that nobler type of which he speaks—'Patriotism, if aggressive and at the expense of other countries, is a vice; if in sympathy with them, a virtue.'

In the following entries we see into the heart of Hardy. 'Dec. 27. Our famous dog, "Wessex," died at  $\frac{1}{2}$  past six in the evening, thirteen years of age.' '28. Wessex buried.' '28. Night. Wessex sleeps outside the house the first time for thirteen years.' In Max Gate (Hardy's old home) there is a headstone with Hardy's inscription:

The  
Famous Dog  
WESSEX  
August 1918 — 27 Dec. 1920  
Faithful. Unflinching.

It is good to realize that Hardy, after so many years of lack of recognition, lived to enjoy many years of well-earned fame. In this volume we see how modestly he wore his many honours, and that in days of world-wide praise, as well as in the days of public neglect, he lived to perfect his mastery of his craft, and to give to the world, both in poetry and prose, work which will be for ever a part of the world's imperishable literature.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH.

### WAS CHRIST HUMAN OR DIVINE?

THE answer, of course, is that He was both. Difficult as that may seem, it is the fact that you can get no satisfactory gospel unless He was both, and you cannot make the gospel story fit on any other theory. But it is one thing to say that there is no other theory, and another thing to explain what this theory means. The theologians have rarely explained it. They have stated it, but their subsequent interpretations have generally been one-sided. Naturally the Church has been most anxious to prove the divinity of Christ. It was that which would be in question at the beginning. A man is a man unless you prove him to be something else. But, as I understand it, what people really want to know to-day is, Was Christ human? The pendulum has swung over to the other extreme. The theologians have been so anxious to prove the divinity of Christ that they have proved too much. They have made Him so divine that it is His humanity that is now in question. And people are asking, with real point, Then if Christ was divine, what point of contact has He with us? How can He be an example to us? And so on. And that raises the whole question again. And there is very little doubt that it will have to be answered again, that the new age will call for a new statement.

Of course, it all depends on what you mean by divine. Some will say, That is easy : Was Christ divine ? means, Was He God ? Yet if it means that, Jesus was *not* divine. Because He was *not* God. He prayed to God, He talked *about* God, all His attitude showed that He thought of God as at least in some sense separate from Himself. And, in any case, you cannot have it both ways. If that is the sense in which Christ was divine, then He certainly was not human. On the contrary, the Incarnation is reduced to a mere masquerade.

I do not believe that that is the New Testament doctrine at all. This is how I understand the New Testament doctrine. God had wanted to express Himself in a man. He had expressed Himself in many ways—'by divers portions and in divers manners'—but none of them had really been satisfactory in its appeal to human nature. And therefore He decided on a new way—to express Himself to men in one of themselves. Now, it is obviously essential for that that the one through whom He was to express Himself should be a real man. Otherwise the whole project breaks down. God therefore caused a man to be born, and into that man He put Himself—all of Himself that could be put into a man. Obviously the whole of Himself could not be put into *any* man, or he would not *be* a man—he would be God. But He put all that could be put. As John has it, 'the Word became flesh.' That is to say, the purpose and will of God sought to express itself in concrete terms, just as we seek to express our thoughts in words. We can do so up to a point, but there must always be something left over. There is something in thought that cannot be put into words. And there is something in God that cannot be put into a man. But He put all that could be put.

And Jesus was such a man that it was possible for Him to put the absolute maximum. There was nothing else in Him to interfere with it, as there is in all other men. And hence He became a God-filled man—a man, if we may put it so, in whom there was nothing *but* God. There is something of God in every man, but in Jesus there was nothing *but* God. In his physical and mental powers He was man. But in His spirit He was entirely God.

Hence Jesus is divine. But He is still human. Thus, He is what the Bible says He is—a man in whom God dwells, through whom God expresses Himself, the Word become flesh. But He is not now merely a God dressed up like a man. He is a real man.

And that is not heresy. It is orthodoxy that Christ was human, though those who have most boasted their orthodoxy, and been most ready to call others heretic, have often failed sadly to be true to it. They have often obscured and whittled away, even though they have confessed, His true humanity. But we must stand uncompromisingly by the true and genuine humanity of our Lord. In Jesus we see clearly both what God is and what man is. He is—may we not say it?—the perfect example of both. To quote an illustration of Fosdick, He is as when the sunlight shines brightly on a jewel. The effect is to reveal, in a new and brighter and more perfect way than before, both the jewel and the sunlight.

But I wonder whether it is really sound to talk about the divinity and the humanity of Jesus as though they were two separate things. Indeed, I am sure it isn't. I am sure it is wrong to divide Jesus up as though there were a sort of line drawn across His nature somewhere. There is no one in all history who less suggests that. The higher and more perfect a personality is, the more is it a unity. And Jesus was the most perfect Personality ever known. Never was a nature a truer and a more convincing unity than His.

But more than that. If in Jesus there is no real division, does not that seem to suggest that the hard and fast distinction between divinity and humanity is itself a false one? Are humanity and divinity so entirely separated? We say that human nature is divine. May we not also say that God is human? God includes in Himself all that humanity means. Otherwise there could be no point of contact between us and Him. God made us, the Bible says, in His own image. That is to say, He made us like Himself. So that what God put into man to make him man was first in God Himself. It was part of God. God did not have to alter Himself to take on human flesh; He only had to limit Himself.

It will probably be said that what I have been suggesting, if carried to its logical conclusion, would mean that the only difference between Christ and us is one of degree. But I confess that that criticism does not greatly trouble me. For it seems so theoretical. After all, the difference between Christ and us is a fact, not a theory. It remains that no one ever *has* become another Christ. He still stands utterly in a class by Himself. In some way, God was in Christ as He has never been in any other man. Whether the difference be one of kind or only one of degree does not seem to me to matter much. For even if it be only one of degree, the degree is so tremendous as, for all practical purposes, to amount to one of kind.

Some think it must be one of kind, because Christ came into being in a miraculous way, by the Virgin Birth. But even if you do not believe in the Virgin Birth you do not escape the miracle. Christ is a miracle, however you look at Him. Even if He were nothing more than a perfect man, a perfect man is a miracle. But surely, as soon you get a perfect man, you get a God-filled man. And that is a divine man. You cannot have a man more divine than that. What is the difference between God in the form of man and man filled with God?

There *is* a difference between Christ and us, between the divinity of Christ and our divinity, just as there is a difference, to adapt another of Fosdick's illustrations, between the sea and the pools on the seashore. They are different. And it is not simply that the sea is bigger. The sea 'has deeps, tides, currents, and relationships with the world's life that no pool can ever know.' And yet they are alike. There is a link of essential nature. And Christ is divine. There is no question about that. That is not a theory. It is a fact that speaks for itself. Even such an one as Rousseau found himself compelled to admit, on the historical facts, that 'if the life and death

of Socrates were those of a sage, the life and death of Jesus are those of a God.'

Every one knows that story of Charles Lamb, how that he and his friends were discussing people they would have liked to have met, when Lamb said in his stuttering yet effective way, 'There is only one person I can think of. . . . If Shakespeare were to come into this room we should all rise up to meet him, but if Jesus were to come into it we should all fall down and try to kiss the hem of His garment.' He was different from us. And yet He was like us—bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh. We cannot let that go, or the heart of our gospel is gone.

It is sometimes said that there is an essential difference between Christ and us, in that we are subject to original sin and He was not. But I cannot see that. We do not inherit sin. We only inherit a tendency to sin. And did not Jesus inherit a tendency to sin? If He did not, then the story of the Temptation is only a hollow farce. It isn't real. It becomes what Russell Maltby calls 'a sham fight between an omniscient God and a not very subtle devil.' The sinlessness of Jesus does not consist in that He couldn't sin. It consists in that He could have sinned and didn't—that He wouldn't. And hence His example becomes a real thing. He is a man, a real man.

That is how I see it. Jesus is divine. I worship Him as God. For me He is God. I should not really know anything about God but for Him. I should never be able to visualize God at all, nor see Him as real, except as I see God in Him. But I cannot let His humanity go. And His humanity must remain for me a real thing. You must not tell me He is human, and then explain His humanity away. You must not use the word human, and then define it as something that does not mean humanity. If the humanity of Jesus is to mean anything to me, He must be human in the same sense as I am human. Or else you are only juggling with words, and He is not human at all. And Jesus is human. Make no doubt about that. There is no gospel without that. 'Made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death.' He was hungry and tired. He was disappointed. He was sometimes puzzled and perplexed. There were things which frankly He said He did not know. He was 'in all points tempted like as we are.' And yet He conquered. He was a man, not only in all the senses that I am, but better still, in the sense in which I want to be, in which I know I ought to be.

But He is divine. Through His utter oneness with God, all the resources of God are available in Him for me. Because He is divine, He is not only an example to spur me on, but a power to help me on. And hence, man as He was, man that I never cease to thank God He was, I worship Him as God. He is my All, my Lord, my King, my Saviour.

ARTHUR G. UTTON.

## SYNESIUS OF CYRENE

ALL that the average reader knows about Synesius has probably been learned from Kingsley's lively sketch of him in *Hypatia*. He is not one of the dominating figures in ecclesiastical history. But he is a singularly interesting person, for all that; and, apart from Mr. FitzGerald's volumes, 'there is not a great deal in English that deals expressly with him. The only English books that we can recall at the moment are those of Mr. Nicol and of Miss Alice Gardner. The latter, by the way, is not included in Mr. FitzGerald's bibliography.

Synesius was born at Cyrene, the capital of the Libyan Pentapolis, probably about the year 860. He studied at Alexandria, which was already disputing with Athens the claim to be the intellectual centre of the world. Here he became a disciple of Hypatia. He also paid a brief visit to Athens, but he has little to say of the 'eye of Greece.' He writes, when setting out on his journey there: 'In future I shall be relieved of the duty of bowing to the ground, when I meet men who come from Athens, because of their learning. They are, after all, only simple mortals like ourselves; they understand Plato and Aristotle no whit better than we, and yet when they are in our company they stalk about as demigods might amongst mules.' It looks as if Athens regarded Alexandria as Oxford is supposed to regard all other places of learning!

About the year 897, Synesius headed an embassy from the cities of the Pentapolis to the imperial Court, to request remission of taxation and the adjustment of some other matters. He tells us little of his stay in the imperial city in those stirring years. It was on this visit that he delivered before the Emperor Arcadius his famous speech *On Kingship*. There is a good deal of political discernment in it, and at least one passage which is very remarkable in view of what happened not so long afterward. He appeals for a change in the method of recruiting the Roman army—that there should be raised (in the words of Gibbon), 'in the place of the barbarian mercenaries, an army of men interested in the defence of their laws and their property.' In fact, Synesius said to the Roman Empire what Byron said to enslaved Greece, many centuries later: 'In native swords and native ranks The only hope of courage dwells.' There can be no doubt that Synesius put his finger on one great weakness that helped to bring about the fall of the Empire. But, as Gibbon characteristically remarks, 'the Court of Arcadius indulged the zeal, applauded the eloquence, and neglected the advice of Synesius.'

He returned home in 400. He has described the condition of affairs at the imperial Court in *The Egyptian Tale*. This is a singular allegory, in which Egypt typifies the Empire, and Thebes, Constantinople; and the political intrigue of the age is represented by the doings of Osiris and Typho, who respectively typify Aurelian and (probably) Caesarius. This 'bold political squib,' as it has been

<sup>1</sup> *The Essays and Hymns of Synesius of Cyrene*. Translated, with Introduction and Notes, by Augustine FitzGerald. (Oxford University Press. Two volumes. 42s. net.)

called, is interesting and important in its bearing on the history of the time, but it makes very cryptic reading for all but the historical expert.

For some years after his return from Constantinople, Synesius remained on his estate, farming, hunting, and studying philosophy. He had been bred in paganism, as he tells us himself, but became a Christian in later life, largely through the influence of his friend Theophilus, the Primate of Alexandria. About 410, the people of Ptolemais elected him bishop, and a very unusual and refreshing sort of bishop he must have been. He declared himself willing to give up the chase, though it was evidently a wrench, but he refused to part with his wife, or to forswear philosophy. He also stipulated that he must be free to hold certain opinions of his own that were evidently regarded as less than orthodox, though he declared himself willing to speak on these things with reserve, so as not to give offence to the faithful. These heretical opinions concerned the creation of the soul (as to which he held a curious doctrine which was peculiar to himself, as far as our knowledge extends) and eschatology.

His episcopate was far from being a bed of roses. He fell foul of Andronicus, the prefect of the province, on the question of the Church's right of asylum, and finally excommunicated him. Ptolemais was also attacked by the barbarians, and Synesius played a courageous part in the defence of the city. He died about the year 414, before the murder of Hypatia, which would have distressed him deeply.

Synesius was a Neoplatonist. He had been a philosopher before he was a Christian and he remained a philosopher. So did Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria. But there is much more of evangelical conviction and of religious feeling in Justin and in Clement than there is in Synesius. One cannot resist the feeling that there was no great depth in his mind. He was an amiable and accomplished person, but very much of a dilettante. He betrays no originality even on the philosophical side; indeed, he was, a man interested in philosophy, rather than a philosopher. But his philosophical interests were enough to import a sort of Emersonian vagueness into his religious conceptions and into the language in which they were expressed.

Some of the writings of Synesius have been mentioned already. The other principal writings contained in these volumes are the essays entitled 'Dio' and 'A Eulogy of Baldness,' and the 'Hymns.' The essay called 'Dio' is concerned with Dio Chrysostom of Prusa, the rhetorician, who had an enormous reputation as a stylist in those days—a reputation, moreover, which had lasted for a couple of centuries, though we imagine that he is not very well known even to professed Hellenists to-day. We cannot think that 'Dio' is particularly interesting, except for a few passages where we have the judgement of Synesius upon details of literary criticism.

Dio had written a famous essay entitled 'A Eulogy of Hair.' On the model of this, and as a rejoinder to it, Synesius wrote another

called 'A Eulogy of Baldness.' He had a personal interest in the question, for he was bald himself. It is an amusing performance. Hair, says Synesius, is at best a sort of corpse, for it is a lifeless thing attached to living beings. Man is the most intelligent of all earthly creatures, and it is significant that he is the least hairy. 'It would seem that there is a strife going on between hair and brains, for in no one body do they exist at the same time!' Is not the cosmos a sphere, and are not the moon and the stars shining spheres above, like bald heads below? The whole *jeu d'esprit* is excellent fooling, but it shows how far literature had ceased to be creative and vital, that a skit of this sort should be regarded as a fit medium for all the preciosities of Attic style.

The 'Hymns' of Synesius, despite some fine passages, have always seemed to us pompous and affected in the extreme. It could hardly be otherwise. When a man philosophizes all his religious beliefs to begin with, when there is in his language a large infusion of the philosophical dialect of his particular school, and when, in addition to this, he deliberately tries to write in an archaic poetical style, his religious verse is not likely to be very vital or very effective. It is rather like a man who is a Hegelian first and a Christian afterwards, writing devotional poetry in the style of Spenser. Ridiculous as that sounds, it is something like a fair parallel.

Mr. FitzGerald's book contains excellent translations of all the writings of Synesius that we have mentioned, with an introduction, an apparatus of notes, and a bibliography. The volumes are magnificently produced, and reflect great credit on all concerned.

HENRY BETT.

*The Cambridge Bible: The First and Second Books of Samuel.* Edited by A. F. Kirkpatrick. New edition. (Cambridge University Press. 6s. 6d. each.) The first edition of this Commentary was published in 1880, and has been many times reprinted. The new edition has been completely revised and reset. Aids to the study of Samuel have multiplied in the last fifty years, and the Dean of Ely has made full use of these in the introduction, which is remarkably comprehensive. David's Lament shows that Saul enriched the country by his successful wars. It enjoyed increasing prosperity under his rule, but Saul had 'a hard and narrow heart. He was incapable of wide sympathy or deep contrition. Violent fits of passion distorted his judgement. David's heart was thoroughly human and sympathetic. He fell into gross sin, but sincere repentance restored him to communion with his God; Saul's regret for his sin was prompted by the fear lest he should be degraded in the eyes of his subjects.' The notes are clear, careful, and scholarly.

# Recent Literature

## THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

*The Fullness of Sacrifice : An Essay in Reconciliation.* By F. C. N. Hicks, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. (Macmillan, 15s.)

Dr. Hicks wishes to justify the continuance in Christianity of sacrificial offerings. He believes that such offerings are an essential element in a satisfactory interpretation of the eucharistic worship of the Church. But in the liturgical history of the Church, and in its theological thought, the question of 'sacrifice' has proved divisive. Not even the vexed question of the 'Real Presence' and its definition has been the occasion of so deep a cleavage; for statements of the nature of the 'Presence' depend ultimately upon the conception of sacrifice which prevails in opposing schools. Unity in the Church is impossible unless there can be found a basis of reconciliation between these schools of thought and worship. He is convinced that such a reconciliation can be effected. In this book Dr. Hicks investigates the conception of sacrifice held (i.) in the Jewish Church, (ii.) in the Early Christian Church, (iii.) in the Christian Church of later times. He shows that in this last period, in a world no longer in living contact with Jewish or pagan sacrifices, the conception which was prevalent in the Early Church was profoundly modified in diverse directions. His book is in a sense an 'eirenicon, its thesis being that, if the term "sacrifice" were used in its original and New Testament significance by all the disputants in the eucharistic controversy of to-day, the grounds of difference would largely disappear.' His main contention is that the trouble began when the Church set forth 'sacrifice' solely or chiefly in terms of the *death* of the victim. For such death was not the essential meaning of 'sacrifice.' Death was only the means of releasing the blood. The blood, which is the *life*, is the true sacrificial offering. What is offered to God is not a dead victim, but a life transformed and operative in surrender and service. The true sacrifice is in the life given, used, and shared. This is inevitably a very bald statement of the principle which Dr. Hicks elaborates with great skill and patience, illustrating it in rich detail from historical sources. The origins and historical development of sacrifice in the early history of Israel, in the teaching of the prophets, and in the post-exilic ritual are laid under tribute for evidence to support his thesis, in Part I. In Part II. the place of sacrifice in the life and worship of the New Testament Church, both as providing living principles ruling the religious life and thought of the period, and as modes of interpretation for which technical sacrificial language was current, are carefully set forth. The results of critical study of the sources are taken into account; and the review is carried through with competent scholarship. In Part III., Dr. Hicks presents a constructive outline of the



theories of sacrifice that underlie the sacramental development and eucharistic dogma from sub-apostolic to post-Reformation times. Here he thinks that the acceptance of the death of the victim as the fundamental significance and efficacy of sacrifice became the basis of the Roman doctrine interpreting the 'Sacrifices of the Mass' and at the same time of the protest of the Reformers against 'the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits' involved in the assertion that 'the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt.' This is a protest that Dr. Hicks considers justified. The appeal all through this interesting review of ecclesiastical practice and dogma is to the authority of history. It is the only court to which appeal can legitimately be made. It is, therefore, in regard to his treatment of historical data that the author will naturally expect any line of criticism to be addressed. And here we are bound to say that, in our judgement, Dr. Hicks has not escaped the peril which he several times deprecates of 'pressing given data too far.' The subjective element in construing documentary evidence is obviously present. In estimating, for instance, the prophetic attitude towards sacrifice, he maintains that the only sacrifices which the prophets condemned were those associated with moral failures and ritual abuses in the offerers. The principle of sacrifice itself the prophetic writers sustain and sanction. He is, of course, aware that this judgement is unacceptable to the most competent Old Testament scholarship. But he challenges its findings on the ground that 'we have to remember that, with the exception of a few leading English and American scholars, the great bulk of the modern work on the Old Testament, and indeed the initiative of the whole, is owed to men who would trace, and be proud to trace, their spiritual ancestry to the bodies which sprang in the full sense from the Reformation. Their spiritual homes are founded on a protest, which included, but went farther than, the specific form of protest which belonged to the Church of England.' As an historical method this criterion for determining values can hardly commend itself, when Dr. Hicks confesses that he approaches his historical discussion committed to definite ecclesiastical antecedents—'this essay is written frankly from the Catholic standpoint.' But whilst Dr. Hicks does not satisfy us that his thesis provides historically the reconciliation he desires, we are grateful to him for a fresh and illuminating study of a subject confessedly intricate, and this to such a degree that a distinguished historian remarks, 'Sacrifice was a language used by all men, but understood by none.'

*The Gospel according to St. Luke.* By J. M. Creed, B.D.  
(Macmillan & Co. 15s. net.)

The publication of Canon J. M. Creed's new commentary is an event of first importance in the world of New Testament scholarship. We have waited long for a good British commentary on the Greek text of Luke, and have had to rely on the valuable work of A. Plummer (1896) supplemented by the more recent editions of Wellhausen, Lagrange,

Loisy, Klostermann, Easton, and L. Ragg. The delay, however, has been well worth while, for it has permitted Canon Creed to make abundant use of the immense amount of work that has been devoted to Lukan problems in respect of grammar, history, and exegesis. His commentary, we may say at once, is a brilliant piece of work, in line with the best traditions of British scholarship and fully alive to the developments of present day critical research. On the side of literary criticism the standpoint is conservative; the Lukan authorship is accepted, the Gospel is dated about A.D. 80-5, and the two-document theory is accepted and defended. A valuable chapter is given to the theological ideas of the Gospel, and here Canon Creed holds that 'there is no sufficient reason to suppose that the work was directly "tendacious," or that the writer wished to commend a particular theological attitude' (p. lxxi.). 'In Luke,' he rightly maintains, 'we are appreciably farther from the Pauline spirit than in Mark.' On the side of historical criticism the commentary is more adventurous, and sometimes radical, and it is easy to see that, while preserving an independent attitude, Canon Creed has been deeply influenced by the views of Wellhausen, Bultmann, K. L. Schmidt, and E. Meyer. In the commentary proper the interest is everywhere well maintained: opinions are clearly and forcibly expressed, and, while the pages are not overloaded with critical *impedimenta*, the reader is given a fair opportunity of forming a judgement of the issues discussed. At the same time, we feel bound to call attention to some rather curious omissions in this learned work. J. H. Moulton's *Prolegomena* has been freely used, but Parts I. and II. of Vol. II. of the *Grammar* have been strangely neglected. It is probable that Part III. came into Canon Creed's hands too late, to the distinct loss, we think, of the discussion of language, style, and vocabulary. We cannot understand the failure to refer to B. S. Easton's commentary (1926), except in the bibliography; and, in view of Canon Creed's assertion that 'Luke clearly avoids doublets' (p. lxi.), we think that attention ought to have been given to W. Bussmann's *Synoptische Studien*, Part I. (1925), where the opposite view is effectively maintained. The proto-Luke hypothesis, towards which an unfavourable attitude is taken, is only cursorily discussed, and inadequate attention is given to the views of those who discover signs of a special source in the Passion narrative, especially the American scholar, A. M. Perry. These criticisms, however, in no way diminish our conviction that the new commentary is an invaluable contribution to the study of the Third Gospel. It is of the utmost value that we should have been given a challenging commentary, a work which not only supplies abundant and necessary information, but makes the reader think and think again. The most useful, and certainly the most interesting, sections are the introductory notes to the several narratives, parables, and collections of discourse matter, together with the additional notes at the end of the volume on the Magnificat and Benedictus, Lysanias, the Baptism of John, the Appearances, and St. Luke and St. John. We heartily welcome and commend this brilliant work.

*The Testament of Paul.* By J. Ernest Rattenbury. (Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.)

Dr. Rattenbury here looks on St. Paul as a great apostolic missionary. His own experience as a worker for many years amongst degenerate people, and as one who has witnessed miracles of divine grace wrought in the souls of men and women, gives him special insight into St. Paul's evangelical experience. That is the leading feature of his work. 'Many books have been written about Paul in recent years, but very few from the standpoint of religious experience,' and none, so far as Dr. Rattenbury knows, 'from the standpoint of evangelical experience.' It is interesting to find that justice is done to Matthew Arnold's *St. Paul and Protestantism* as the most valuable modern contribution to the study of the apostle, for the simple reason that it pointed out the necessity of examining his teachings in the light of his experience, though he excluded the deeper mystical facts of his spiritual life which Paul himself considered to be vital. Dr. Rattenbury divides his own work into six parts: Religious Experience; the Christian Experience (Paul and Jesus); the Experiences of Paul; Paul's Experimental Doctrine, Personal; and Social; and the Challenge to the Validity of Experience. The first section shows that an interesting evidence of experience of God and its meaning can be arrived at by an examination of the people who hold the same doctrine and yet vary in life and practice. From this point of view, the personal experience of John and Charles Wesley is amazingly interesting. We do not agree that, 'in the ten years before 1788, John Wesley was a failure; his work was largely fruitless,' though we know that 'when he entered into a definite experience of the grace of God, notwithstanding his continued belief in his old doctrines, he became a flame of fire in England and a happy Christian man.' Paul can only be understood by those who see that to him Christ was all, and in all, and Paul His willing and loving slave. His principal experiences are of communion with Christ. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the words 'in Christ' for an understanding of Paul's inner experience. The experience transformed his life and conduct. What was its effect on his thought? Dr. Rattenbury feels that Paul has been too much quoted in his references to deliverance from actual sin, and too little followed in his inculcation of a higher Christian life, with its positive content of Christian virtue. 'Paul was a practical mystic, never failing to insist on the ethical implications of his deep religious experiences and his heaven-reaching prayer.' Christians were to make Christ as visible to the world as Jesus did in Galilee—not by means of a human body and soul like His, but by means of human fellowship. The closing pages, on the Challenge of the New Psychology, are important. There is nothing in it to be feared. 'Men like Paul, Luther, Wesley, cannot be explained away. Paul's experience of God in Christ did much to change the history of the world; that experience which has been continuously reverified in the lives of Christian people for nearly two thousand years. It works, when tried,

to-day as well as ever. The storms beat upon it, but it is like a house founded upon a rock.'

*Psychology and Religion : A Series of Broadcast Talks.* By E. S. Waterhouse, M.A., D.D. (Elkin Mathews & Marrot. 5s.)

Not long ago, religious people regarded the association of psychology with religion with suspicion. Now teachers of religion claim it as an ally. Dr. Waterhouse has the distinction of going a step farther still. In these talks he reveals how psychological teaching may become a means of grace to multitudes who 'listen in.' In discovering them to themselves, he shows them that they are religious even when they do not own it—religious because they can't help it. Religiousness is natural and constitutional. When they become aware of themselves they are aware of Another. Whilst psychology neither proves nor disproves the truth of religion, it is wonderfully descriptive of universal religious experiences. We are not surprised, therefore, that hundreds of people from all over the country, and from abroad also, have written to Dr. Waterhouse asking him to publish his wireless talks. We think he could do no other. The talks are ideally conceived and constructed for the great opportunity that has come to him. They are frank, fresh, human; they are sensitive to an uneasiness and wistfulness that everybody knows; they respond to instincts and questions common to us all because we are what we are; they quicken hope for 'the soul astray,' and point out 'the mystic way' for the soul that aspires; they suggest the ways of the Spirit of God with the spirit of man, and ingenuities of the divine love working with and for the tempted and bewildered. At the same time, to teachers and preachers the very titles of the talks themselves afford more than a hint of a method of teaching which may easily become truly evangelical without ceasing to be arrestingly popular. We are sure that those who read Dr. Waterhouse's 'Talks' will ask him for more of the same sort.

*The Lotus of the Wonderful Law ; or, The Lotus Gospel.* By W. E. Soothill. (Oxford : Clarendon Press. 15s.)

This Lotus sutra is the most important religious book of the Far East. The Oxford Professor of Chinese has translated it in connexion with Mr. Kato, the Japanese leader of the Nichiren School of Buddhism. That will appeal only to experts, but the aim of the present volume is to make the work better known to the general reader of the Western world. The Mahayanists, or Northern Buddhists, regard it as the final teaching of Buddha; the Hinayanists, or Southern Buddhists, say it is the invention of a much later age. Hinayana means 'small wain'; Mahayana means 'large wain,' and its followers charge the Hinayanists with carrying only few to Nirvana—that is, those who seek salvation by the arduous way of works. Mahayana professes to open the way for the many—indeed, finally, for all. It is another term for universalism or catholicism. In his introduction, Professor

Soothill gives an illuminating account of the difference between the two schools, and epitomizes the various chapters of the Lotus. This is expanded in the body of the volume. In many chapters almost everything is said first in prose and then in verse. The Lotus sutra is a spiritual drama, 'with the universe as its stage, eternity as its period, and Buddha, gods, men, devils, as the dramatis personae. From the most distant worlds and from past aeons, the eternal Buddhas throng the stage to hear the mighty Buddha proclaim his ancient and eternal truth. Bodhisattvas flock to his feet ; gods from the heavens, men from all quarters of the earth, the tortured from the deepest hells, the demons themselves, crowd to hear the tones of the Glorious One.' One chapter describes the Bodhisattva 'Never Despise,' who addressed every one, good and bad, as destined for Buddhahood. His insistence on this stirred people to anger ; but, at the end of his life, those who had despised and hated him became his disciples. 'After his translation he entered the company of myriads of Buddhas in Light.' The Buddha, after telling the story, says, 'I myself was that Buddha "Never Despise."' It is said that, if any one hear a single verse or a single word of the Lotus sutra, and by a single thought delight in it, their perfect enlightenment is secured. To blaspheme the sutra is for the Buddhist what the Christian would call the sin against the Holy Ghost. To recite the sutra is to be clad in the Buddha's mantle. Such an one is worthy of the highest reverence and the richest gifts ; for the Lotus is the secret and mystic doctrine of the Buddha. We are grateful for the insight which this volume gives into one of the most wonderful literary documents of Northern Buddhism.

*The Gospels : A Short Introduction.* By Vincent Taylor, D.D.  
(Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

This book treats questions of sources, date, and authorship, and the mutual relations of one Gospel to another, as only an expert scholar could do. The Gospels speak for themselves, and again and again they have kindled faith and kept it alive. This really makes us more anxious to know how they were written and the sources on which they rest. Dr. Taylor shows how the Gospels were formed, and helps us to realize how much life and worship must have contributed to the formation of oral tradition. Home life, for example, must have been an important factor. Jesus blessing children, and His sayings about divorce and the problems of the time, must all have given prominence to certain of His words and deeds. Dr. Taylor describes 'the Source Q,' and other sayings-collections used by the Synoptists. Then each Gospel is examined and light is poured on its contents and characteristics. The chapter on the Fourth Gospel is of great value and interest. The whole subject is fascinating, and Dr. Taylor opens it up in a way that adds force and meaning to the four most precious books of the world.

*The Good Estate of the Catholic Church.* By Viscount Halifax. (Longmans & Co. 1s. 6d.)

Lord Halifax says in the 'Last Words' of this book that, of all good gifts God has given him, 'the gift of the Holy Sacrament infinitely surpasses them all. Our Lord's presence, as it is vouchsafed to us in that most Holy Sacrament, has been the support, the strength, and joy of my life.' As to the South Indian proposals, he holds that a formula which leaves the necessity of Episcopal Ordination an open question is no step towards reunion, but a direct incentive to fresh divisions. The Indian proposals would be, 'not a blessing to the Church, but its ruin.' He maintains that the duty is laid upon all to strive for 'the spread of Catholic faith and for the reunion of the Church of England as a whole with the Holy See.' He deplores the way in which the Roman Catholic Press takes every opportunity to depreciate and injure the Church of England, as its attitude to the *Malines Conversations* proves. One would have thought that Lord Halifax's eyes would have been opened by such things to the fact that nothing but entire submission will be accepted by Rome. He is willing to make 'full acknowledgement of the claims of the Pope as the successor of St. Peter, and as possessing a Primacy, and a care of all the Churches *jure divino*.' The Viscount is optimistic, and sees good reason for confidence in the future, but, with all respect for his devotion and sincerity, we cannot share his convictions or regard his approach to Rome with anything but dismay.

*The Unveiling.* By H. W. Layclerc. (Stanley Martin & Co., 12s. 6d.) This is a second revised edition of an exhaustive study of the tenth chapter of the Revelation, where the writer interprets the 'mighty angel come down from heaven' as 'the angel of the Reformation.' He says 'the Church of Christ, with a sure instinct, has ever accounted' the Revelation as 'her chief treasure and the key of her destinies.' The three symbolic movements of the angel of the Reformation 'attack the three fundamental positions of the Roman Mass—the Anti-Movement.' It is impossible to do justice to the wealth of information gathered together from theologians and historians to enforce this view. The Vatican Era of the Papacy in the sixteenth century, the Pseudo-Reformation, Rome's Indulgences, and kindred subjects are discussed, and much use is made of Wesley's works and of William Arthur's great work, *The Pope, the Kings, and the People*, 'of which every present-day leader of thought in England should possess a copy.' *The Unveiling* is a book which appeals strongly to Protestants, and the author's research is certainly surprising, whatever one may think of its parallels and its chronological tables.

*Women and Priesthood.* (Longmans & Co. 1s.) This is a Memorandum with Appendices, prepared by members of the Church of England, clerical and lay, who belong to various schools of thought, but are agreed in this, that they cannot see any objection in principle

to the ordination of women to the priesthood. They have prepared their memorandum for the Lambeth Conference. Women are at present admitted to the diaconate in some Anglican Churches, but the duties assigned them are so restricted, and the status accorded them is so subordinate, that it may be doubted whether there is any general recognition that they constitute part of the third order of the ministry. At Lambeth, in 1920, it was resolved that the Order of Deaconesses was the one and only order which had the stamp of apostolic authority for women, and was the only one which the Anglican Church could recognize. That judgement, the memorandum urges, calls for further consideration. The appendices give a full account of the position of women in the Free Church ministry and in Protestant Churches on the Continent. It is claimed that there should be a more explicit recognition that women deacons form part of the threefold ministry, and that their functions should be made identical with those of men called to that ministry. 'Is it not the fact that at present an ordained deaconess is permitted to do only such things as an unordained reader may also do?' The authors of the memorandum 'especially desire an authoritative statement that the exclusion of women hitherto from the office of priest has been a disciplinary rule of the Church, not the assertion of an incapacity inherent in womanhood. Through lack of such an authoritative statement, the loyalty of many women is needlessly strained and the cause of truth suffers.'

*Good News from God.* By the Right Rev. A. F. Winnington-Ingram, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 8s. 6d.) *The Grace of God.* By N. P. Williams, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 4s. and 2s. 6d.) *Fore-showings of Christ.* By A. D. Martin. (S.P.C.K. 5s.) The Bishop of London feels that the gospel is well able to take care of itself, if only it is faithfully preached as 'Good News.' He does that with insight and tenderness in this series of eleven addresses given in a Lenten mission in North London. He begins with 'Repentance as a Change of Mind' and closes with 'The Good News of the Empty Tomb.' The appeal to the heart and conscience is never lost from sight. Professor Williams has a choice subject in 'Grace' and he treats of it before St. Augustine, in his works, in St. Thomas Aquinas and in modern thought. Grace raises the profounder questions of the nature of God, and of His relations to the universe and to man. This is a valuable study of one of the central themes of theology. *Fore-showings of Christ* contains eleven biographical studies of the great names of the Old Testament from Balaam to Job. They are very suggestive and impressive sketches, and will be greatly appreciated by preachers and by those who want a choice book for their leisure hour.

*Prophetic Spokesmen.* By E. I. Lyndon. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.) These studies in the Minor Prophets bring out the chief features of their message as preachers of righteousnesses in an impressive way. They are short and pleasant to read. Hosea shows the

omnipotence of gentleness ; Joel has a gospel that challenges despair ; Amos brings the gospel for the restless heart ; Micah teaches how to make an ideal world. Everything is fresh and stimulating and sends us back to the twelve Prophetic Spokesmen with keener understanding and sympathy.—*From Daniel to St. John the Divine*, by W. J. Ferrar, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 8s. 6d.), gives the substance of four lectures delivered at the Vacation Term for Biblical Study in Cambridge. They are on the Book of Daniel ; From Daniel to the Christian Era ; Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic, A.D. 1–100 ; the Christian Apocalypse and After. It is a singularly clear and interesting survey of the whole subject, and will repay careful study.—*Studies in the Psalms*. Part I. By Samuel Daiches, Ph.D. (Oxford University Press. 5s.) The Lecturer in Biblical Exegesis in the Jews' College read a paper before the Society for Old Testament Study in which he endeavoured to show that 'Adam, son of Adam,' really meant 'man of wealth,' 'man of position,' very often with the connotation of 'wicked.' He here investigates the use of the term in the Psalms. He thinks that Ps. ii. has no trace of world-dominion, but deals only with the land and the people of the Psalmist. The chief contact between Ps. i. and Ps. ii. is that both exalt the law of God and His righteousness. In Ps. i. the righteous man is an ordinary individual ; in Ps. ii. he is the King in Zion. The two psalms are the prologue to the book. 'The ordinary people and the nobles should be good and God-fearing.' The studies of phrases in other psalms are of much scholarly interest.

*The Evangelism for To-day*. By Robert Ferguson. (Holborn Publishing House. 5s.) The Thirtieth Hartley Lecture deals with 'Our New Approach to the Old Task.' The issues which present themselves are forcibly described. 'The stark alternative is a Creative Spiritual Movement or moral and social disintegration.' Mr. Ferguson calls attention to the 'Arrest of Evangelism,' which is the primary function of the Church. 'All progress goes on halting feet, if evangelism does not proceed.' He views it 'in its background in creative experience and in the Christian Community.' Liberal evangelical theology has failed through not realizing that the presence of the Spirit of God is to be found in heat as well as light, and that the Christian revelation is a sublimation of both. In evangelical experience heat is primal. The approach to an audience must be determined by the living questions and the burning interest of its mind. 'What is desperately needed to-day is as reasoned and persuasive and passionate a presentation of Christ as the man in the street is getting of Socialism.' Such a presentation must not be in any sense a counterblast to Socialism, but must recognize sympathetically all that promotes goodwill and fosters fellowship. The Lecture will be read with attention by those who are seeking for an evangelism adapted to the needs of the new age, as Wesley's teaching of forgiveness and fellowship, which led to a willingness to serve and sacrifice—without calling it sacrifice—and transformed the whole outlook of the life of England.



## HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

### *King Edward VII and his Court: Some Reminiscences.*

By Sir Lionel Cust, K.C.V.O. (John Murray. 12s.)

SIR LIONEL CUST served for a time in the Print Room of the British Museum, before Lord Rosebery appointed him Director of the National Portrait Gallery in 1895, and six years later became Surveyor of the King's Pictures and afterwards one of the Gentleman Ushers. He was brought into close relations with His Majesty in the extensive rearrangements of the royal palaces after the death of Queen Victoria, and his *Reminiscences* give an intimate insight into the Court life of the time. The demoralizing effect of the lack of control and the veto on change was evident at Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace, and endless changes and improvements were needed. The room in which the Prince Consort died, in December 1861, was almost unchanged, even the medicine-glass being still upon the table by the bedside. The King became Sir Lionel's hero. 'I knew and learnt the nature of the man and the way he could combat fatigue, annoyance, ill-temper, and the like, arising from public or private reasons.' He would let out his pent-up anger on his devoted personal servant, who knew just when his royal master had finished his explosion, after which the King would set to work with Sir Lionel to arrange the pictures with his usual cheerful cordiality. He loved detail, no matter how small, and, like a highly trained actor, knew the importance of mien and deportment, of entrance and exit. Sir Lionel was brought into close touch with artists, and found in M. Rodin, not only a great sculptor, but a profound thinker and expounder of the basic principles of art. He gives many amusing accounts of the visits of Oriental potentates and the regard that had to be paid to their susceptibilities. The anxieties of the King's illness and the delayed coronation stand out vividly. Sir Lionel was present when the great event took place in the following August. 'Never,' he says, 'have I sat through a performance of such length with such continuous interest and disregard of the lapse of time.' Lord Esher was his Sovereign's principal private adviser. He had many enemies, and did not go out of his way to placate them; but his assistance in the early years of the reign was of great assistance to the King at a critical time, and of benefit to the nation at large. Sir Lionel found that ladies of high rank and in their best attire, could push and struggle for front places to see a procession of royalties. It was difficult sometimes for a Gentleman Usher to keep his temper. The King himself was noted for his vigilant eye in the matter of uniforms and decorations. It was rarely that any omission or mistake escaped his observation. He died in harness, having in a few years 'written his name in firm letters as one of the chief signatories to the history of his country, at home, across the seas, and in foreign countries.' The secret lay in systematic training and daily work. In

every detail of his life his sheer humanity was manifest. He had no private hobbies, no love of books; he could not bear solitude, even for a few moments. 'Thus he was dependent for recreation on social intercourse of an amusing nature: on the theatre, on sport, and the hospitality of a limited number of chosen friends.' Had his mother taken him into partnership in her closing years, 'she would probably have found him zealous for work, loyally deferent to her authority, and a shrewd and useful successor to her husband as a private adviser on general politics.' Sir Lionel finds the key-note of his whole nature in his wish to see others happy, peaceful, and contented. He was 'the best and truest of friends, and there are many who can testify to this, old and young, rich and poor, to whom his friendship has been a substantial help in a life's career.' Sir Lionel died on October 12, 1929, and Lady Cust has edited his *Reminiscences* with taste and skill, and has prefixed to them a brief memoir of her husband's life.

*The Real War, 1914-18.* By B. H. Liddell Hart. (Faber & Faber. 12s. 6d.)

Captain Hart was in command of a company in France before he was twenty, and his invention of new tactical and training methods was recognized by entrusting to him the task of writing General Staff manuals after the war. His military books have won him a high reputation in Europe and America, and his position as military correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* and military editor of the new *Encyclopaedia Britannica* shows what a place he holds as historian and critic. To him, 'the profoundest truth of war is that the issue of battles is usually decided in the minds of the opposing combatants, not in the bodies of their men. The best history would be a register of their thoughts and emotions, with a mere background of events to throw them into relief.' His object has been to provide material for a true judgement of the whole course of the war by sea and land, and, though he criticizes men and actions forcibly, he does not exaggerate the imperfections of individual leaders. The origins of the war are traced, and the opposing forces and plans are clearly set out; then each stage of the struggle is described. The conflict between Ludendorff's strategy of decision and Falkenhayn's strategy of attrition is well brought out, and the causes of the Russian disasters are shown. The Dardanelles expedition had 'to live from hand to mouth, nourishment being always too small and too late, yet, in sum, far exceeding what would originally have sufficed for success.' Twenty-three thousand men were sacrificed in the Somme offensive for the gain, after six weeks, of a tiny tongue of ground just over a mile deep. As an Australian said, 'a raving lunatic could never imagine the horror of the last thirteen days.' The chapter on Jutland strengthens the belief that its worst fault was that it was ever fought. Victory in the Great War was a cumulative effort to which the Western Front, the Balkan Front, the tank, the blockade—which ranks first and began first—and propaganda all contributed. Full recognition is given to

Mr. Churchill's order on August 2, 1914, to mobilize our Navy. That was probably decisive for the outcome of the war. France held the fort while our forces were preparing. Defeat would have been inevitable, save for Britain's command of the sea, her financial support, and her Army. Victory would have been impossible without the economic aid of the United States, the arrival of her troops, and the moral tonic which their coming gave. Nor must we forget 'how many times Russia had sacrificed herself to save her Allies; preparing the way for their ultimate victory as surely as for her own downfall.' These are Captain Hart's conclusions, and they well represent the broad judicial temper of a book which takes rank as the most reliable one-volume record of a world-shaking event.

*An Hundred Years of Publishing: Being the Story of Chapman & Hall, Ltd.* By Arthur Waugh. (Chapman & Hall. 15s.)

In the early months of 1880, two young men began business as booksellers at 186 Strand. Edward Chapman was one of the six sons of a solicitor at Richmond, Surrey. William Hall was the commercial partner, a brisk, bright man whose death in 1847 was a great loss to the young firm. They were bent on becoming publishers in a large way as soon as they had found their feet; but were for the time content to be retail booksellers. One night in December 1888, Mr. Hall was thinking that it was time to put up the shutters, when a young man walked in and asked for the new number of the *Monthly Magazine*. As he went out, the eyes of the youth of twenty-one 'were so dimmed with joy and pride that they could not bear the street.' It was not till he reached Westminster Hall that he looked at the magazine and found there his first story, 'A Dinner at Poplar's Walk,' which he had 'dropped stealthily one evening at twilight, with fear and trembling, into a dark letter-box, in a dark office, up a dark court in Fleet Street.' Three years later, Mr. Hall found himself in the young man's chambers at Furnival's Inn, with the proposal that he should write the letter-press for a series of Cockney sporting plates drawn by Robert Seymour. The young man recognized Hall at once as the bookseller from whom he had bought the magazine containing his first story. Both agreed that this was 'a good omen, and so fell to business.' Dickens objected to provide the notes, as he was not a sportsman; nor did he wish to write up to an artist's plates. He wanted to take his own way with a freer range of English scenes and people. Mr. Hall agreed, and it was arranged that the publication should be in monthly parts of sixteen pages, for which fourteen guineas were to be paid. Before the week was out, 'Pickwick the immortal was on the anvil of the gods.' *Sketches by Box* had already appeared and were selling well, but it was not till Sam Weller made his bow in the fifth number that *The Posthumous Papers of the Pickwick Club* began to reach forty thousand an issue. Chapman & Hall paid Malone £2,000 for the copyright of the *Sketches*, and gave Bentley £2,500 for the stock and

copyright of *Oliver Twist*. They were then able to look on Dickens as their literary property. His father found his way to their offices as the true Micawber, with his requests for help. If he did not get £15 by two o'clock, he wrote, 'I am lost.' Then he needed £55 5s. by one o'clock to-morrow, 'to prevent the most awful consequences.'

Dickens left the firm in 1844 for Bradbury & Evans, but returned to them fifteen years later, and is still one of the vital assets of the firm. Thomas Carlyle came to them in 1848, and was faithful to them to the end of his life. He became a classic 'without whom no gentleman's library could be considered complete.' The business of the house was now expanding rapidly. Harrison Ainsworth and Lever were selling well; Anthony Trollope came to them in 1858. He would tramp into the office as soon as the doors were open, in his pink coat, with a sheaf of proofs in his side pocket, and bang on the table with his hunting-crop, 'and swear like a sergeant-major because there was no one in authority yet arrived to receive his hectic instructions.'

Some of Mr. Waugh's most interesting pages centre round George Meredith, who for more than thirty years was their trusted literary adviser. Not a few of his shrewd estimates of books and authors are cited: 'According to the dates given, this was done in a month. It has no other merit.' 'Must be accused of every defect that goes to make a work of fiction unreadable . . . it is cursed with an itch at times to try the rhetorical swell upon the lowest vernacular.'

*The Fortnightly Review*, with John Morley and W. L. Courtney as editors, was one of the great successes of the house, and their scientific and technical publications are to-day as extensive as the general publishing. Mr. Waugh became managing director in 1902, and chairman of the Board in 1926. He has just given up the managership, but is still chairman and literary adviser for his old firm. His glimpses of authors and of the varied life of a publishing house are delightfully frank and good-natured, and form a record of extraordinary interest, with illustrations of original wrappers, facsimiles, advertisements and portraits which add greatly to that interest.

*The Making of an Editor: W. L. Courtney, 1850-1928.*  
(Macmillan & Co. 6s.)

Mrs. Courtney was her husband's pupil as a girl of twenty at Oxford, and was closely associated with him during his editorship of the *Fortnightly Review*, where she became his reader and literary assistant. In 1911 they were married, and she came into still closer association with his daily tasks and trials as an editor. Her brother, David Hogarth, was the famous Eastern archaeologist, and she was a student of philosophy to whom Courtney was guide, philosopher, and friend. He was the son of an Indian Civil Servant, and gained a high position at Oxford as tutorial Fellow at New College, but in 1889 he left the university to become leader-writer and literary editor for the *Daily Telegraph*. Some interesting glimpses are given of his work and his colleagues. He was also for many years dramatic critic, and was the intimate friend of the leading

actors of the time. In 1894 he added to his newspaper-work the editorship of the *Fortnightly*, and its history under G. H. Lewes, John Morley, T. H. S. Escott, Frank Harris, and himself gives an insight into the conduct of a great Review which is illuminating. Mrs. Courtney tells how she discovered J. L. Garvin as she was looking through the bundle of Review MSS. whilst she superintended her girl clerks who were sorting bank-notes at the Bank of England. Garvin was then a young journalist at Newcastle, and four years later joined the staff of the *Daily Telegraph* on his way to the editorial chair of the *Observer*. The book brings us into touch with a host of famous contributors. Mrs. Courtney allows us also to see how she shared her husband's toils and triumphs. She is a skilled writer, and has given us a book which is a vivid account of the literary life of a brilliant journalist and editor.

*The Tragedy of Kirk o' Field.* By Major-General R. H. Mahon, C.B., C.S.I. (Cambridge University Press. 16s.)

This is the concluding part of the author's trilogy on the tragedy of Kirk o' Field, where Darnley lost his life, by the connivance, it has been thought, of Mary Queen of Scots, who was tired of her worthless husband. Major-General Mahon reconstructs the site of the plot, points out the physical impossibilities of the official narrative, and draws together the facts and reasons which he regards as the rationale of the plot. In Part II. he reviews the whole matter and considers the cause. His explanation is that Kirk o' Field was deliberately chosen by the conspirators, led by Sir James Balfour, as the place to which Darnley should return. Darnley and his father, the Earl of Lennox, both connived in the plot whose object was to destroy the Queen, who had refused to adopt the measures put before her to effect the Counter-Reformation; the regency, possibly the kingship, would then be assumed by Darnley. The plot leaked out; Mary was warned not to return from Holyrood after the wedding-party. The conspirators carried out the programme in the belief that the moment had arrived. Darnley was met in the south garden, escaping, and was there strangled. Major-General Mahon supports his view with much detail. On Darnley had been 'heaped the goodwill and forbearance of a woman anxious to give him a leading part and to display a happy union; but in him there was no response, nor any compunction.' The modern term 'degenerate' seems to describe him aptly. The notion that Darnley's death was due to the infatuation of Mary for Bothwell is 'a grotesque fiction, a reflection of sixteenth-century animalism. Nor can it be admitted that any scheme of Bothwell to attain power through the Queen was the cause of the tragedy; at that time, his power was insignificant, and his personal following and influence too small for such an idea.' The Counter-Reformation plot aimed at the Queen and the Protestant lords failed, and Darnley himself was the totally unexpected victim of those nobles whom he had insulted, and who were determined to prevent his attaining the crown. 'The two plots coincided in time and place, and the result was the mystery of

Kirk o'Field.' That is the author's conclusion, and he has lavished much research and ingenuity on working it out.

*Northcliffe: An Intimate Biography.* By Hamilton Fyfe. (George Allen & Unwin. 16s.)

Few men had closer relations with Lord Northcliffe than Mr. Fyfe, who went with him in 1917 on the British War Mission to the United States, and for twenty years was in his service as editor and special correspondent. He has certainly drawn a vivid picture of a man of extraordinary energy and indomitable will. The story opens in 1885, when Alfred Harmsworth and a friend waited on George Newnes in quest of employment as writers. Harmsworth's eyes were opened, by that visit, to the possibilities of a new public and a new journalism. He was then twenty years old, a capable young writer of conventional type, who had not yet done more than produce articles and light social paragraphs for various papers. Gradually he found his feet, and was joined by his brother Harold, the present Lord Rothermere, who had a gift for finance equal to that of Alfred's capacity to gauge the requirements of the new public. The way they founded papers, developed their Newfoundland pulp-making colony, turned the *Daily Mail* into a tremendous success, and gained control of *The Times* makes an enthralling record. Mr. Fyfe shows that Northcliffe was an impetuous and masterful ruler, yet full of generous impulses, and a true friend to those who served him well, though far from an easy man to serve. His success in the War Mission to America, his relations to Lloyd George, and his refusals of the Air Ministry and the War Office are described with much interesting detail. He did notable service in organizing propaganda in enemy countries. The mental disease which darkened the last days of his life was a painful close to an extraordinary career. Mr. Fyfe says he had no religion in the ordinary sense, but felt a simple, genuine respect for any belief sincerely held. He had a great admiration for Father Dolling and told him, 'You can come or send to me whenever you want money for any of your charities.' Lord Northcliffe was always himself, but he had the art of finding out what the mass of people were thinking, and shaping his proceedings and his policy to meet the situation. He believed in control by newspaper men, and was devoted to journalism for its own sake.

*Lord Balfour: A Memory.* By Sir Ian Malcolm. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d.) This is a personal impression from a friend and private secretary who first met his future chief in 1890, when he was carrying his life in his hands in Ireland and establishing his reputation as a hero in this country. In 1895, as assistant private secretary to Lord Salisbury, Sir Ian was brought into closer contact with Mr. Balfour, and had ample opportunity of observing and admiring his powers of concentration, his urbane dexterity in debate, his tenacity of purpose, and his charm. He 'seldom or never reaped anything but victory from his encounters with his opponents across the floor of the

House; his only defeats—and they were heavy ones—were engineered by members of his own party.' They went twice together in a party to Bayreuth for the Wagner Festivals, and took many long bicycle rides in the forest before the performances. As Leader in the House of Commons he made alarming lapses in statistics, and would add, when this was pointed out: 'But that makes no difference to my argument.' These things were all forgotten and forgiven 'in the joy of watching the grace and lightning rapidity of his thrust and parry in debate, or the skill with which he would suddenly change the whole disposition of his argument and travel across a quite unexpected line of country, knowing that the enemy guns had been carefully trained and manned to meet a more usual avenue of approach.' Lloyd George, Sir Ian says, was the only possessor of 'guns of sufficiently light calibre to give him battle on his own grounds of debate.' He made a great impression when on his missions to the United States, and his visit to Mr. Roosevelt was a real delight to both the statesmen. They talked of the war and politics, philosophy and religion, farming and forestry, with lightning sketches of leading personalities on both sides of the Atlantic, and innumerable reminiscences. In Paris, Clemenceau introduced him as the Richelieu of the Peace Conference, and gave him his warm friendship. The charge of indolence is brushed aside, but his uncorrected speeches were constantly open to misinterpretation. 'I am more or less happy,' he once said, 'when being praised; not very uncomfortable when being abused; but I have moments of uneasiness when being explained.' His library and bedroom were always littered with open books, from the latest work on philosophy to the best detective story. He thoroughly enjoyed dining out, was an enthusiastic lover of Handel and other great musicians. The stories of his calm courage amid air raids, and the fearless way in which he sauntered through the parks after his day's work was done, best witness to his heroic nature. Sir Ian has drawn a picture of his friend which adds new charm to a man of noble gifts and enduring national reputation.

*The Life of John Travers Lewis, D.D.* By his Wife. (Skeffington & Son. 5s.) Dr. Lewis, the first Archbishop of Ontario, was born in Ireland in 1825, and in 1862 he was made Bishop of Ontario. Sir Gilbert Parker says he was big and deep and broadminded; acute of intellect, modest of mind, spiritually patriotic; temperate, yet strenuous; gentle, yet strong. He had a marvellous faculty of reaching a satisfactory settlement with the fewest words and least friction. His natural humour saved many a situation and softened many a dispute. Mrs. Lewis tells the story of his work with many interesting details. On one of his visitations, which occupied about 120 days, he slept in over a hundred different beds, which were often wooden enclosures at the stations, intended for people waiting for the one train per day. In the fifteen years before 1877, a hundred new churches were built. He died on his way to England in 1901, and is buried at Hawkhurst in Kent.

*The Story of Civilization through the Ages.* By Charles Richet. (Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.) Sir Oliver Lodge describes his friend, the Professor of Physiology in the University of Paris, as the lifelong friend of peace and goodwill among the nations. Dr. Richet's last word is: 'If science is to hold sway, there must be unity amongst men, that is to say, Peace.' He appeals to the school-children of all countries to think of the greater homeland, that of humanity itself, which claims their love and affection; and his bright, brief survey, stretching from pre-historic times down to the Great War, will enlarge their sympathies and make them feel that they are citizens of the world. The salient features of the history of Egypt, Greece, and Rome are well brought out, and the pages given to Christianity, Islam, the Renaissance, and the Reformation are excellent. Mr. Rothwell has translated the work with his usual care and skill, and it was well worth doing.

*Rudyard Kipling : The Story of a Genius.* By R. Thurston Hopkins. (Cecil Palmer. 5s.) Mr. Hopkins has already written on *The Kipling Country* and *The Lure of Sussex*, and his story of Kipling is full of facts and anecdotes about the man and his books. They lose nothing in the telling and send one back to the stories and ballads with keener interest. One secret of Kipling's power is the ubiquitous zest with which he enters into every phase of life in India and in his own country. He has cultivated the art of seeing. Mr. Hopkins quotes a letter to a motoring friend in which Kipling describes rural England as a land of stupefying marvels and mysteries, and a day in a car in an English county as 'a day in some fairy museum where all the exhibits are alive and real, and yet none the less delightfully mixed up with books.' He finds more of the Puritan strain in Kipling's blood than anything else. In the 'Recessional' he strikes with an unerring hand the lyre of the Hebrew bard. He 'remains Methodist in soul, spite of his years in India, spite of his immersion in the great sea of imperialism, spite even of the profane language of the barrack-room.' Mr. Hopkins warns us that some of the tales about Kipling are apocryphal but they raise many a merry laugh, and we are grateful to him for telling them. Some good illustrations add to the value of a racy record.

---

*Seventy Miles around London.* (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d.) The new Blue Guide will have warm welcome from a growing constituency. Mr. Findlay Muirhead has made it a guide to the road, with an atlas of forty-eight pages and ten town plans. Motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians will find themselves conducted through charming country and encouraged to explore tracks comparatively little known. The seacoast from Felixstowe to Southampton, Oxford and Cambridge, six great cathedrals, the lovely scenery of the Home Counties and of the Downs and Chilterns is divided into four main sections, with forty routes and cross-country routes which link them together. It is an admirable idea, and is carried out in a way that makes this Guide singularly helpful to the tourist.



## GENERAL

*Studies in Literature.* Third Series. By Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.)

It is no slight education in literature to read this book. Sir Arthur lights up every subject that he discusses, and many a pleasant stroke of humour adds to the interest of his lectures. Those on 'The English Elegy' discuss its decorative and direct forms, and show that it renders a permanent service to human life, with its questions and meditations on its own transience. Derived from Theocritus through Virgil, it came into our literature as an exotic. Spenser took it in hand, but it long retained its classical form. Donne opened a new channel in the seventeenth century by his elegies, 'in places so grandly impressive, in others so dark and fuliginous.' Gray's masterpiece, Johnson's elegy on Robert Levet, Shelley's *Adonais*, and Dr. Bridges 'On a Lady whom Grief for her Betrothed Killed' are used to trace the course of English elegy. The two studies of 'The Journals of Dorothy Wordsworth' are a fitting tribute to one who missed no flower or bird and unloosed the tied spirit of her brother. 'She touched his lips; and through him she has left her benign influence upon all later Romantic poets to this day.' The lecture on 'Shakespeare's Comedies' brings out their 'courtly-polite' character, and has some illuminating notes on the way in which the poet seems to have used music to help out the poverty of his scenic theatre. The paper on Coventry Patmore shows that some of his *Odes* 'pierce and shake as few others in our whole range of song since Wordsworth declined from his best.' The 'Note of Longinus' brings out Burke's debt to the great treatise *On the Sublime*. 'Reading for the English Tripos' lays stress on a certain intellectual capacity rather than reams of memorized facts and dates, and 'On the New Reading Public' expounds a set of axioms beginning with 'silent reading' as 'the master key to literature, as indeed to almost all realms of knowledge.' 'W. S. Gilbert' describes the marriage of verse and music in a delightful way, whilst the addresses on Keats and Sir Walter Scott make a fitting close to a stimulating set of studies. Of Sir Walter he says, 'No writer of this island has left at once so much of his genius abiding in the world for its clear delight, so much invention to entrance so many young and old, so gallant and good an example of good living, as has this exemplar of a great Scottish gentleman.'

*The Social Teaching of the Church.* By W. R. Inge, D.D. (Epworth Press. 1s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.)

Dean Inge lights up every subject on which he writes, and this

Beckly Lecture deals with an important subject of practical concern—the attitude which Christians ought to take up towards social and economic questions.' He begins with 'Steps towards Social Betterment.' Christ's teaching was fundamentally ethical. Sins against love and against that simplicity and single-heartedness which He regarded as essential to a good life roused Him to anger. His attitude towards worldly affairs is determined by a quite distinctive standard of values, which it is not hard to understand, though it is terribly difficult to make it the principle of our daily lives. The idea of laying down a system of socialism never occurred to Him. The Gospels give principles of conduct, and we are meant to use common sense in interpreting them. Dr. Inge thinks that the way we spend our money is more important, as a public duty, than the way we acquire it. The prodigious expenditure on play in the United States is referred to—'Two years of American play would pay off our entire war debt.' Dr. Inge thinks that, of all Christian bodies the Quakers have perhaps kept nearest to the real principles of the Gospel. The sect-type of Christianity has rejected the double standard of morality which the Church-type had been driven to accept as a necessary concession. The Dean says 'there is a mass of literature, of which the books by Mr. and Mrs. Hammond are a type, which, under an appearance of impartiality, are intended to excite our indignation against the industrial revolution and all its works. . . . The conditions in the mines and factories were bad enough without being exaggerated. But let us remember this: we had to beat Napoleon, and we had to recover from the tremendous losses of the war. We did both, but we saved England for the remainder of the century by the rather grim labour conditions which we now condemn so virtuously.' In conclusion, the Dean points out that, as a race, we have nearly all our life before us; and, as Christians, our business is the building up of character, not the improvement of external conditions. 'An externalized and secularized Christianity has neither savour nor salt; it has no dynamic to regenerate the world.'

*That Next War?* By Major K. A. Bratt. Translated by Ernest Classen. With a Foreword by Wickham Steed. (Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.)

This is the work of a Swedish staff-officer who is convinced that modern fighting is unworthy, and feels that the strategy which aims at defeating war must unite forces as great as those of war. 'The abolition of war between civilized peoples is the greatest change history has ever known.' Major Bratt seeks to show that, in spite of certain brighter signs evident in the political field, the weapons of a new war are being forged, and that a new world-war would be the downfall of civilization and a real Armageddon of the nations. He describes the 'Six Danger Points.' Greater Serbia and Greater Italy look at each other furiously across the intervening Adriatic. Europe

is the dynamite magazine of the world, and Franco-German relations are at the centre of it. If war is to be averted, the organization of the solidarity of the peoples is the path to be followed, and a World Executive created as the general federal organ. 'The revolt of the masses against war is a revolt of crossed arms, of millions of crossed arms . . . versus the discipline of bayonets.' Major Bratt's book has stirred much controversy in Sweden, and it is to be hoped that it will, as Mr. Steed suggests, promote thought throughout the English-speaking world.

*Kant und Herder als Deuter der geistigen Welt.* Von Theodor Litt. (Leipzig: Quelle u. Meyer. 10 M.)

There are authors in every language who are more important for their influence upon others than for their own writings. We have always thought that this is the position with regard to Herder. Every student of German literature knows that Herder held a prominent place in the circle of Goethe, and that he was one of the principal pioneers of Romanticism in Germany. But we imagine that his own writings have been comparatively little read of late years, except by those who are expressly students of his period. Certainly that is true of England, and we should suppose that it is true, in a less degree, of Germany. The lack of form and style in Herder's works has doubtless had a good deal to do with this.

But there appears to be at present a revival of interest in Herder, and we think that it is justified. He was a thinker, and in some respects he was ahead of the thought of his age. In this volume we have a careful study of the teachings of Herder and of Kant as contrasted and complementary to each other. Herder had been a pupil of Kant at Königsberg and developed into an acute critic of the great philosopher. He attacked the critical philosophy generally in his *Metakritik*, and Kant's aesthetic particularly in his *Kalligone*. His principal work, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte*, influenced Kant's philosophy of history, mainly in a contrary direction.

The difference between the two men may be said to be largely this, that Herder's way of thought was opposed to Kant's analytical method, and that generally Herder had a much stronger hold upon the historical and what we should call to-day the evolutionary conception than Kant. It is scarcely to be doubted that, in these directions, Herder's thought is a corrective of Kant's, and that, so far as it is merely corrective, it has a special appeal to the mind of to-day.

It is impossible to give any adequate review of this volume in a small space. It is a detailed and thorough consideration of the relations and contrasts between the doctrine of the two writers. The book is marked throughout by the elaboration and the subtlety that we expect in German philosophical studies. It should be read by all students of Kant, and especially those who are interested in the relations between his philosophy and the thought of his own time.

*Indian States and British India: Their Future Relations.*

By Gurmukh Nihal Singh. (Benares : Nand Kishore & Bros.)

The writer of this volume is the brother of St Nihal Singh, and is Professor of Economics and Political Science in Benares Hindu University. His subject is one that fills a large place in the public mind, for it deals, not only with the future, but with the past and present relations between the Indian States and British India. It is both brief and comprehensive, scientific and practical, and argues strongly for a federation between British India and the Indian States. A detailed description is given of the conditions in Mysore and in the majority of the Rajputana States. The relations with the Indian States are conducted by the Government of India through the Political Department and its officers in the States. The Viceroy pays occasional visits, and meets the Indian princes as often as practicable. The princes fear that a grant of dominion status and the existence of a democratic government in British India may prejudicially affect their powers, and even result in the total disappearance of their Order. 'And who can say with perfect frankness that their fears are altogether groundless?' Mr. Singh discusses the claims of the princes that their treaty rights should be secured to them; that they ought to be treated as sovereign rulers; and have a share of the revenue from sea customs, salt, railways, currency and mines, income-tax, and excise; and should also have a voice in shaping the policy in regard to matters of common concern to British India and the Indian States. Professor Singh suggests that new machinery is necessary for consultation, co-operation, and settlement of disputes, and urges that every effort should be made to bring the two Indias together, so that in the not distant future it may be possible to have a real federation between British India and the Indian States. The book is an important contribution to the Indian question.

*The Knowledge of Reality.* By Wincenty Lutoslawski. (Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.) This is the outline of a striking course of metaphysics given by the Polish scholar at various universities in Poland and at the Sorbonne. It surveys the whole field of philosophy, and gives suggestive notes on exponents of materialism. Chapters on the Scientific Theory of Matter and the Matter of Art regard the work of the artist as a fit supplement to the investigations of the Scientist. Both help us towards the final solution of the mystery of matter, and in the world of business both are used for the creation of wealth. These are some of the seven methods by which we gather experience of matter. The resurrection of Poland in 1918, a hundred and twenty-three years after its destruction by three powerful States, shows that material oppression cannot destroy a nation. 'National life acts independently of arbitrary violence, and offers a sublime example of the supremacy of spirit over matter.' The final chapter, on Polish Messianism, describes it as 'a very peculiar intellectual, spiritual,

literary, and religious movement, created in Poland by several great men between 1880 and 1880.' It is the spontaneous expression of a national spirit, and seeks to reconcile Protestants and Catholics and to reunite all Christians in one truly Universal Church, in order to convert all pagans and to establish the religious unity of mankind. The author regards it as a synthesis of conflicting features in previous systems of philosophy, and a practical plan of campaign for the development of humanity. That is a large claim, and it is well set forth in this very readable book.

*Little Brother Goes Soldiering.* By R. H. Kiernan. (Constable & Co. 4s. 6d.) Stephen Gwynn says in his introduction that, of all the books he has read about the war, this seems to him the most vivid and the most truthful. It is put in the form of a diary, though no diary could be kept under such conditions as this boy of eighteen had to face, hurried out to the front after the great break through of March 21, 1918. He was under legal age when he joined up in emulation of his elder brothers, and, though he had been well educated, he bore all the privations and hardships of a private soldier. The growth of fear in the boy's mind is the outstanding feature of the diary. It was not the fear of death, but the fear of being killed, which, he says, 'is leaning on me, pressing me down, like a big, brown, shapeless shadow that I can't hold off.' He ascribes it to the influence of the platoon sergeant, who showed his fear in his face. 'I would feel a wave of fear pass from him to me, though I hated the sight of him.' The brief vision of the French nurse who seemed to know all his thoughts and was 'the only woman who has ever really spoken to me, except mother and my sisters, I mean since I was a man,' makes us wish for more. The boy's confessions to the priest and the help he found in his rosary—'like having some one strong and brave and comforting and powerful by you'—interest us. The way comrades fell on every side makes one marvel at his escape and feel relieved when Mr. Gwynn tells us that he came through his six months' active service with a wound that ended soldiering, but did not end life. The selfishness of the man who refused him a drink of water, though he offered him five francs for it; the gentleness of the little Black Watch sergeant when he woke the men to go on sentry duty, and many other little pictures of these days live in one's memory, and make us echo Mr. Gwynn's tribute to a vivid and manifestly truthful record of days such as we pray the world may never know again.

*Love the Law of Life.* By Toyohiko Kagawa. (Student Christian Movement Press. 7s. 6d.) Dr. Rufus Jones in a foreword to this volume describes Kagawa as one of the striking phenomena of the Christian world. He exhibits Christianity as 'soul-force, creative energy, redemptive might.' That is borne out by the biography prepared by Eleanor M. Hinder and Helen F. Topping. He was born of a well-to-do Japanese family, in 1888, and had every educational advantage. When a moral lapse on the part of his elder brother

brought financial ruin to the house, Dr. Myers of Kobe, the boy's English Bible-teacher, led him to realize the power of Christianity as a personal religion. 'I discovered,' says Kagawa, 'my Father in heaven, who was also in myself.' Verses memorized from the Sermon on the Mount were the means of this transformation. He studied theology in the Presbyterian seminary at Kobe, and for four years and a half lived in one of the worst slums of that city, where he began his life of love and service. He then went to Princeton to attend classes, and on his return from the United States took up his work in the slums. After his marriage he and his wife remained there till the birth of their first child compelled them to move away. Kagawa's only weapon for fighting evil is love. He is a vivid teacher and makes skilful use of the blackboard to represent spiritual truths. His personal faith is contagious, and the multiplicity of his interests and the commanding sweep of his influence are almost incredible. His work among university students and the Youth Movement, which now embraces 1,800 young people all over the country, are only part of his activities. He has written more than forty-five books, from which Mr. Gressitt gives translations. 'Where love is, there is God. Love is my all in all.' That is the burden of his message. His views on marriage are fully given. Monogamy he regards as the foundation for a true social system. In 1916 he visited Miss Addams's settlement in Chicago and saw the value of such work as hers and that of Barnett and Toynbee in London. He gives details of his own labours in the slums which are of great interest and make one thankful that such unselfish and enlightened effort is being brought to bear on the life of Japan.

*The Mystic Will.* By Howard H. Brinton, Ph.D. (Macmillan Co. \$2.50.) Professor Brinton's work is based on a study of the philosophy of Jacob Boehme, and he is introduced by Dr. Rufus Jones as an interpreter who can both understand and interpret Boehme's vital message. For three hundred years Boehme has been 'lying in the lanes of intellectual traffic like a mighty boulder which every traveller had at least to recognize.' Dr. Brinton presents him in his true historical setting, traces his spiritual ancestry, and notes his peculiar debts to both the near and the far past. Boehme grappled manfully with the problems of life and thought, and seized every opportunity to quicken his mind and prepare it to be an organ of the divine Spirit. Professor Brinton divides his work into eight chapters which describe Boehme's life and influence and open up the various aspects of his teaching. Boehme's theory of evolution portrays a unique mystical ladder of genuine practical value to modern religious seekers and of real theoretical significance to students of the psychology and philosophy of mysticism. 'It does not reach straight up into heaven. The pilgrim's progress of the soul, like the creative process, proceeds in ascending and descending curves.' His interpretation of the universe presents some close parallels to that of more than one contemporary philosopher. In his mystic philosophy of

life he is not far from Bergson and Eucken. Professor Brinton has made all students of mysticism his debtors by this important examination of one of its outstanding teachers.

*The County Anthologies* : *Cumberland*, by Walter and Clare Jerrold ; *Lancashire*, by R. H. Case ; *Middlesex*, by T. Michael Pope. (Elkin Mathews & Marrot. 8s. 6d. School Edition, 2s. 6d.) This is a very happy appeal to that local patriotism which is described on the wrappers as 'a fire that may smoulder, but is never extinguished.' Each anthology, in prose and verse, has an introduction calling attention to the distinctive features of the county and the writers included in the book. The volumes set Camden's *Britannia* in the forefront, and gather treasures from local poets and from travellers who have been impressed by the beauties or outstanding features of the county. Middlesex cannot boast a strong local accent, but Cumberland and Lancashire still set many a puzzle to those who listen to their strong dialect. Each volume has a list of its contributors, an index, and notes on the chief selections. The anthologies make racy and pleasant reading, and lovers and residents will find them teeming with interest. The binding, type, and paper are well chosen, and the cheaper school-edition will form an attractive 'reader' for class use and will strongly appeal to the local patriotism of the boys and girls.

*Lancashire Local History: The Vill, Manor, and Township of Knowsley*. By James Hoult, F.R.H.S. There is a wealth of information in this local history, and it is put in a very pleasant way, with many striking illustrations. Knowsley was a manor in the Hundred of West Derby in the days of Edward the Confessor, and some of the old deeds are of great interest. One Adam de Knowsley is charged at Lancaster Assizes with setting fire to his mother's house. She was found dead. A thirteenth-century charter mentions that six oxgangs of land were granted to William the Prophet. The Son of the same Prophet was granted three acres of waste land for a rent of twelve pence. Many details are given as to charities, old churches, church bells, and fire-backs. Two fire-backs are illustrated: one with the arms of Margaret of Richmond, Countess of Derby, of whom a special account is given; and another with the two spies bearing the cluster of grapes of Eshcol. Gambling and cock-fighting played a large part in the past. Lawrence Davies, a drunkard and gambler, was lodged in Lancaster Jail for a gambling debt to Lord Derby, and his wife's diary tells how she sold thirteen cows and a bull to pay the debt. The present earl 'spends his time in helping on good national and philanthropic movements. No other public man has such a varied, and at the same time useful, list of activities. Behind it all is the conviction of an honest man that the position of wealth and honour which has come to him is but a responsibility, and that it is for him to be as a faithful steward in the midst of it all.' The Methodists were established at Knowsley in 1806, and the local

preachers travelled long distances on horseback, or more frequently on foot, to serve the pulpits. They had a rule that 'every local preacher on the plan shall meet every other Monday to inquire into the state of their minds, also to help one another in the study of Christian holiness.' Mr. Hoult says all the religious agencies were needed, for the days were hard and men were rough. 'Dog fighting, cockfighting, and men fighting one another were the most popular amusements. . . . They fought without gloves and would at times keep at it for half an hour.' The history is beautifully got up on good paper and in bold print. It can be had for two shillings from Mr. Hoult at 19 Brookland Road, Stoneycroft, Liverpool, and it is well worth having.

*Miss America*, by W. J. Turner (Mandrake Press, 6s.), is a poetic satire on woman—delicately veiled, but laying its finger on the sensual side of many marriages. It pictures the American woman who feels that she has been defrauded of life, and shoots many a dart at the 'hard-hearted' but 'soft-headed' men, and also the woman whose success has been her undoing till

*She radiates away to mere world-clatter.*

It is clever and pungent criticism, which lays bare many unwholesome things in modern American life.

*New England Essays*. By E. H. Packard. (Harvard: New England Publishing Co. \$1.50.) These are papers with a strong humanitarian note. They begin with a powerful protest against vivisection and degrading motion pictures. They denounce the use of tobacco and plead strongly for fair play for hogs and fowl. Pleasant sketches are given of Dr. Eliot, the first citizen of America; Charles Wagner, the Boston poet; and leaders in science and industry. Mr. Packard says 'the religious forces are defeated; the humane forces are, and also the civic. Modern advertising, Press publicity, motion pictures, radio, and soon television, used by the materialistic and exploiting forces, have broken down resistance to evil through their persistent and powerful appeal.' That seems a pessimistic view, but Mr. Packard has not a little to say in defence of it, and he says it with emphasis. The essays are copiously illustrated.

*Symbiosis, the Cure of Cancer and of 'Selectionitis.'* By H. Reinheimer. (C. W. Daniel Company. 7s. 6d.) Mr. Reinheimer has now for many years been pleading for a higher and truer conception of biological principles than that which is specially known as Darwinian. He maintains that 'symbiosis,' which means systematic partnership, is the secret of all evolutionary progress—rather than natural selection, whose main operation is through sheer self-assertion. He believes that self-restraint and mutual give-and-take are the first laws of organic life. So 'the "Ought"' has to be reckoned with in biology



throughout,' and 'morality is the one fixed star amidst the welter of changes, and its categorical imperative reigns supreme.' More and more the importance of this fundamental principle is coming to be recognized in science. The special application of the principle to the problem of cancer is that cancer is just a flagrant case of organic lawlessness, a departure from and defiance of symbiosis, a sort of parasitism. 'It may be that there is a biological principle that cells which are not with the body are against it.' This is an idea, at once simple and profound, which may easily be missed even when half a million pounds are expended on 'research.' The remedy for cancer is therefore to be found in a system of nutrition which makes for integrity and balance and harmony amongst all the cells of the body. Now, according to Reinheimer, the chief cause of disharmony in the body is to be found in our carnivorous habits, which work a steadily increasing havoc owing to the very sheltered, sedentary lives, and over-rich feeding, characteristic of our times. Thus the way of escape is mainly in a vegetarian diet. We very much dislike the idea of any such revolutionary change in our habits of feeding; but we may be forced by the grim extension of cancer to give the vegetarian way a fair trial. At the same time, we must not hope for complete deliverance till it has been tried out, not merely in a few individual cases, but through some generations of living more in accordance with the truest laws of nature. Mr. Reinheimer's views are winning increasing acceptance, and the book here noticed is worthy of full consideration.

Mr. Muirhead has prepared a second edition of the *Blue Guide to Switzerland*. (Macmillan & Co. 15s.) The matter is arranged in a series of routes carefully planned to show how to reach the chief points of interest and to indicate how they may be conveniently grouped together. Everything that the tourist needs to know is put in the best way, and the seventy-eight maps and plans are well chosen and clearly produced. The handy size adds to the attractiveness of a delightful companion for the Swiss traveller.

Ethel M. Dell's stories have a great circulation, and no one will wonder at it who turns over 'six of the best' just published in a volume of 1920 pages by Ernest Benn. It is a wonder how it could be produced for 7s. 9d., in strong boards, thin paper, and clear print. *The Way of an Eagle* has 'a sustained record of popular approval surpassed by no other novel of the twentieth century,' and we can feel its thrill in its very first pages. The volume will have a host of admirers on both sides of the Atlantic.

# Periodical Literature

## BRITISH

**The Nineteenth Century** (July).—Canon's Quick's 'Religion and the Modern World' deals with 'the most fundamental and critical subject' considered at the Lambeth Conference, the doctrine of God. 'Modern secularism occupies itself with the things of space and time, with the means of man's livelihood and his control of his material environment; it reckes little of an eternal world, acknowledges no obedience to any spiritual authority, and regards the notion of divine government as an exploded myth.' Religion is no longer assumed to be the supreme activity of the human soul. How has this changed attitude to religion affected our thought of God? The besetting temptation of our age is to fashion a religion for naturally religious people, and to let the secular departments of life look after themselves. But such a religion is neither truly Catholic nor fully Christian. The Bible is concerned from cover to cover with God, and He is to be found, 'not merely in any specifically religious department of knowledge or action, but in everything in the world which expresses, adumbrates, or reflects the ministry and the Cross of Jesus Christ.' This is an article of great value.

**Hibbert Journal** (July).—The Rev. F. M. Lloyd Thomas thinks it impossible to over stress the importance of the Lambeth Conference for all Christian people throughout the world. Free Churchmen are vitally identified with many of the problems that confront it. The South India scheme is not likely to be approved in its present form. If it were, there would almost certainly be another Non-juror revolt, headed by Bishop Gore and other, 'by no means extreme, Anglo-Catholic leaders of outstanding scholarship and distinction. Nor would they be left without a formidable following.' If the Lambeth Conference should recommend 'drastic alterations to the scheme in the interests of a stricter Catholicism that has eyes only for Rome and the East, and not also for the great Protestant Evangelical world, then it is quite probable that the existing South India United Church, with the local Wesleyan Methodists and the four southern Anglican dioceses, may break away and become a separate South India United Episcopal Church.' Muriel Kent writes on 'Toyohiko Hagawa,' the Japanese philanthropist and evangelist. Dr. Moffatt's 'Survey of Recent Theological Literature' is valuable.

**Expository Times** (June).—Mr. Pope writes on 'Faith and Knowledge in Pauline and Johannine Thought.' The Johannine writings are a rich complement of St. Paul's views. With St. Paul, faith and

knowledge tend to merge into one as gifts of God, and as the product of inspiration; the whole setting of St. John's Christology is philosophical and has a metaphysical basis lacking in St. Paul. The Fourth Gospel reconciles faith and reason in a full-orbed Christian experience. Dr. Yates's beautiful exposition of the Last Word from the Cross, and Dr. Gray's paper on 'Marriage' should not be overlooked.—(July.)—The Bishop of Ripon writes on the 'Mind of Christ on "War."' He thinks that it is the duty of the Christian community 'to refuse to fall below the existing high-water mark of political theory, and to satisfy themselves, before joining in any conflict, that the country really did use all provided means of avoiding it. 'Then, having got the existing high-water mark really respected, we shall have to go on to force it higher.'

**The Congregational Quarterly** (July).—The Editorial Notes are varied. H. H. Farmer discusses 'The Permanent Element in Apocalyptic'; Dr. Cave writes on 'The Person of Christ'; Rendel Harris on 'Hymn-Book Reform.' Dr. Harris pointed out to a leading Methodist teacher that the section on 'Believers Seeking Full Redemption' in his hymn-book 'was Methodism, and that there was nothing like it anywhere else!' He nodded assent, and said, 'If that section were removed, the reason for our separate existence as a Christian community is gone.' Dr. Harris adds, 'It is only sparingly that other Churches have nibbled at this body of beliefs and aspirations, and when they have nibbled they have also frequently mutilated; it was the theology that they were disposed to turn away from, the music of the theology which they were unable to resist.'

**Church Quarterly** (July).—Tribute is paid to Lord Davidson, by whose death 'the world has lost one of its most impressive personalities,' who at the centre of the world's affairs exercised an influence which is incalculable. Bishops Gore and Palmer write on Reunion in South India. Dr. Gore says 'there must be an unambiguous declaration that episcopal Confirmation is to be the rule of the united Church, whatever gradual approach to this may be acquiesced in during the thirty years interim.' The views of Bishop Palmer are broad and truly catholic. The Dean of Winchester writes on 'Dante and Jerusalem.'

**Science Progress** (July).—'Concerning the Study of Plants' is an inaugural address by Dr. Salisbury, Quain Professor of Botany, who sees that botany cannot continue to fulfil its many-sided functions, still less to meet the increasing demands made upon it by forestry, agriculture, horticulture, and numerous important industries, unless botanical departments are provided in intimate contact with allied subjects. 'The Mechanism of Bird Migration,' 'Progress in Colour Photography,' 'Can Fish Hear?' and many other subjects of special interest are included in this important number.

**The Rylands Library Bulletin** (July).—Dr. Mingana has found in the Peshitta New Testament of the Nestorian Church two notes as to the Fourth Gospel. At the beginning it is described as 'the Gospel according to the preaching of John the younger,' and at its close is written: 'Here ends the writing of the Holy Gospel (according to) the preaching of John, who spoke in Greek in Bithynia.' The MS. is dated A.D. 1749, but is a copy of an original ascribed to about A.D. 750. Notes refer to the permanent memorials proposed to Professor Tout and Dr. Peake; and to the appointment of Mr. Masfield as Poet Laureate. The list of works acquired by the Library since the last *Bulletin* appeared gives some impression of its growing riches.

### AMERICAN

**Harvard Theological Review**.—In the April number Professor Maurice Goguel of the Faculté de Théologie Protestante, Paris, writes on 'The Problem of Jesus,' viewing the subject solely in its historical aspect. A detailed and critical account is given of representative theories. Until the beginning of the present century 'the problem of the life of Jesus was merely one aspect of the literary problem of the Gospels.' But Professor Goguel is of opinion that a new method is required, and that it must be 'more broadly historical and less exclusively critical than the old one.' The sketch given of the picture of Jesus cannot be said to include all its main features, but the conviction is expressed that it is possible to possess a picture of the Master and His teaching 'so definite and so substantial that we shall feel assured of its reality in the full sense of the word . . . and that it will henceforth be futile to attempt to base Christianity on anything else than this Person.' Dr. Walter Eugene Clark, in an article on 'Some Problems in the Criticism of the Sources for Early Buddhist History,' distinguishes between the common tradition of Buddhism and the later developments of the monks. Descriptions of early Buddhism must be regarded as premature until the old Sanskrit Canon has been reconstructed as far as possible; there must also be 'a more rigorous critique of the Pali texts, with constant reference to all non-Pali parallels.'

**Journal of Religion** (July).—Dr. Ross Collins writes on 'The Parish Priest and his 'Flock' as seen in the councils of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The lives of both clergy and people fell far short of the ideals for which the mediaeval Church stood. All romantic pictures must be laid aside if we are to understand the age and the people. Dr. Dougherty, in 'The Scope of Biblical Archaeology,' shows that direct and indirect corroboration of the Scriptures predominates in these discoveries.

**The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought** (May—June).—Dr. Moffatt's 'Puzzled Lady in the Early Church' is Flora, to whom Ptolemaeus, the Gnostic leader, sent a letter. It is a discussion of the ethics of the New Testament and the Christian life. Richard Robert

writes on 'Lamennais'; V. T. Mooney on 'The Preacher as Artist,' 'For our very salvation, as preachers, we need to find time, not only to study and understand, but to company with the seers, to dream dreams, to see visions, to pray.' The Canadian School of Missions in Toronto has numerous and extensive ramifications. 'Its cost to the co-operating Churches is almost negligible, and the returns beyond computation.'

**Methodist Review** (July—August).—Rufus Jones, in 'The Eternal Gospel,' urges that it is time for the Church to take Pentecost seriously, to believe greatly in the power of the Spirit, and to expect the Spirit to operate, not only through the emotions of man, but through the whole man as well. The Pentecostal Symposium is continued. 'Washington, as Bishop Asbury saw him,' the Minutes of the Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church held at Baltimore, January 1785, and Ruth Elliott's 'Felicite de Lamennais' are interesting features of a rich number.

**Methodist Quarterly Review** (July).—Dr. King, the editor, describes 'The Failure of the Rationalistic Radicalism.' 'There is certainly no justification for the mistaken impression on the part of some that the leading scientists are atheistic.' The article on Phillips Brooks claims him to be 'the greatest preacher of his generation in many respects.'

### FOREIGN

**The Moslem World** (July).—Dr. Zwemer, in 'The Holy Spirit and Islam,' finds no true place for the Holy Spirit in its rigid monotheism. Yet the witness to Christ in the Koran, the spiritual poetry and prayers of the mystics, the present-day admiration for the character of Jesus, the desire to search the Scriptures, the friendliness and sympathy where formerly there was hostility and fanaticism—all these surely are the work of the Holy Spirit. Anne Bruce writes from Teheran on 'Moslem Women in the Capital of Persia.' Late in the summer of 1928, the Chief of Police appeared with his wife at a café in one of the crowded summer resorts a few miles north of Teheran. In a few weeks it was a common thing to see men and women walking side by side on the street, or driving together in public carriages. There are now seventy-six more schools for girls in Persia than there were three years ago.

**The Calcutta Review** (June).—'The Social Atmosphere of Present Jainism' throws light on one of the oldest religions of India, which has lost a great deal of its power, but whose tenets are clung to by far more people than the outsider could possibly guess. It is carried from place to place by highly learned, refined, and enthusiastic Jaina ascetics. Its social atmosphere is very unwholesome, 'with its regrettable tendency of sacrificing religious ideals to material advantages, and the incomprehensible want of courage of the less prejudiced amongst its followers. For the future of Jainism, it seems to admit of prospects little short of distressing.'