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

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

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW

EDITOR: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

JULY 1949 Price 4s.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL COMMENTS, by Leslie F. Church, B.A., Ph.D.

ARTICLES

The Body and the Church, William F. Lofthouse, M.A., D.D.

The Holy Spirit in the World, Maldwyn L. Edwards, M.A., Ph.D.

Cranmer's First Prayer Book, Harold S. Darby, M.A.

John Galsworthy and the Dilemma of Liberalism, W. S. Handley Jones

The Golden Age, J. Minto Robertson, M.A., LL.D., F.E.I.S.

The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism, Frank Baker, B.A., B.D.

The Place of James Thomson in the Poetry of Nature, W. Lamplough Doughty, B.A., B.D.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

G. K. Chesterton—Reconsidered, E M. Dodd.

Apropos Thomas Mann's *Doctor Faustus,* Stanley Bayliss

RECENT LITERATURE, Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

FROM MY NEW SHELF, C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

LONDON
THE EPWORTH PRESS
FRANK · H · CUMBERS
25 - 35 · CITY ROAD · E·C·1

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

LITERATURE HISTORY SOCIOLOGY
RELIGION THEOLOGY PHILOSOPHY

Editor: LESLIE F. CHURCH, B.A., Ph.D.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review is published on the 25th of March, June, September, and December by the Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1. It may be obtained from the publishers or any bookseller at 4*s*. a copy (postage 3*d*.) or 15*s*. per annum, post free.

All contributions (typewritten, if possible), should be addressed to The Editor, 'The London Quarterly and Holborn Review', 25-35 City Road, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Editorial Comments

REUNION—AN INTERIM REPORT

THE Interim Report drawn up by the Joint Conference of representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches contained no new proposals but it did something to clarify the issues.[1] It recognized the vital importance of 'the visible unity of the Church of Christ as the final objective'. Nothing short of that goal would justify the long investigations which demand a patience born of deep concern. At High Leigh the approach to the whole subject was along the lines of suggestions made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Cambridge sermon preached on 3rd November 1946. 'My longing is,' he said, 'not yet that we should be *united* with other Churches in this country, but that we should grow to *full communion* with them. . . . Full communion between Churches means not that they are identical in all ways, but that there is no barrier to exchange of their ministers and ministries.' He went on to say that he presupposed agreement on 'the essential principles of the Church, the Scripture, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and of the Ministry itself as "a gift of God through Christ to His Church, essential to its being and well-being, perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit" '.

The Interim Report declares that the Conference examined 'the doctrinal formulations of the Christian faith as held by the Churches represented'. In doing this they discovered agreement on many points—so many that one wishes the man in the street could realize how nearly identical is the message proclaimed. To quote the exact statement: 'On the doctrines of God the Father, the Person and work of Christ, the Person and mission of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Life Everlasting, we have found nothing which separates any one of these Communions from another. All acknowledge the apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.'

Is it not possible with so large a measure of agreement to intensify the Christian crusade against the evil which so sorely besets our world today? Must a full and unbroken Christian front be delayed until the other points at issue are finally settled?

Even on the doctrine of the Church unanimous approval was given to certain major principles amongst which were the following: 'The Church is not a voluntary association of individual believers; it rests not on the will of men, whether as individuals or societies, but on the creative will of God. The visible unity of the Church is the divine will for it. . . . The unity and continuity of the faith should be preserved; that is, the order of the Church should be such as to symbolize, safeguard, and mediate the apostolic message and mission. An essential element in continuity is the maintenance of the apostolic faith, worship, and witness as set out in the New Testament. It is recognized that the intention of existing Ministries, both episcopal and non-episcopal, is to

[1] *An Interim Report of Conversations between Representatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury and Representatives of the Evangelical Free Churches, March 1949* (S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.1; 4*d*.).

preserve the unity, continuity, and universality of the Church.' These clauses indicate that on many doctrinal questions there was general agreement, on the doctrine of the Church there was a measure of agreement but a recognized need for further information and investigation.

The Anglican delegates were concerned about the following questions: What functions, other than that of ordination, would be regarded as so essential to the episcopate that they must be safeguarded by a Free Church 'taking episcopacy into its system'? How far would the admission of women to the presbyterate and the lay administration of Holy Communion involve a theological issue? Would the whole Anglican Church admit Free Churchmen to communion without previous confirmation?—Such questions could not be answered without further serious and detailed consideration.

The Free Church delegates also had certain points which, they felt, needed more detailed discussion. Amongst these were the meaning of 'the continuity of the Church', the questions as to whether episcopacy was 'a part of the Gospel' and whether 'the Anglican interpretation of the function of the episcopate was reconcilable with the high place assigned to the laity in the Free Churches'. They were concerned to know whether 'Anglicans could have intercommunion with Churches where methods of admission to full membership were different from their own', and whether it was possible 'to establish full communion (as defined in the Archbishop's sermon) between the Church of England and the Free Churches in this country, and yet leave each denomination to continue its identity'.

One may read such a Report and grow impatient because it has raised so many questions and left them, for the present, unanswered. It has, however, considerable value in that it has made clear the obstacles which hinder intercommunion and delay or prevent any immediate idea of organic union. On the other hand it has stated quite plainly that this representative gathering found itself in complete agreement on so many major doctrinal points. If the people of Britain could be convinced that the Churches represented in the Conference at High Leigh believed and preached 'the apostolic faith as contained in the Scriptures and expressed in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds' they would be more prepared to consider their common message. Unfortunately it is the differences which are too often stressed—differences which, on examination, are not vitally concerned with man's salvation.

Important and urgent as one feels the cause of reunion to be, it is a tragedy that the man in the street, the factory, or the Services, should still be convinced that the *Gospel* is the cause of the divisions amongst us. The present menace to civilization and to the Christian faith cannot be overcome by guerilla warfare. Whilst one may believe that it is wisdom to 'make haste slowly' in the matter of organic reunion, there is neither time nor logical reason for hesitation in proclaiming *together* that the Christian Churches are under one supreme command. To use Professor Adolf Keller's phrase—it is 'five minutes to twelve' and there is no longer time to delay our common challenge and the proclamation of the only Gospel for man's salvation. We are not rival hucksters shouting our wares in the market-place. We are servants of one Lord and Master and we must make it plain to bewildered men that, on the great doctrines of salvation, we are one. There is increasing evidence of co-operative effort

amongst Christian people in minor matters, but there is desperate need for us to combine in the proclamation of our common faith.

The Fatherhood of God, the Person and work of Christ, the Person and mission of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, and the Life Everlasting! On these great doctrines we are agreed, says the Report. Then, in this critical hour, let us carry the flaming torch from parish church to wayside chapel, from the great cathedrals to the mission hall in the still crowded slum. If it be true that on these great Christian verities we are agreed, we can still win the world for Christ.

The Report concludes with the statement: 'It is essential that there should be a growing together. . . . There is no surer way of growing together than by sharing in the evangelization of the world'.

A DEAN—AND VICTORIAN OXFORD

The Master of the Temple, Harold Anson, has done a great service in writing the biography of T. B. Strong,[2] whom he describes as Bishop, Musician, Dean, Vice-chancellor. The order in which the titles are given is in itself intriguing, for it is quite clear that the Musician and the Dean were more important than the Bishop! It is a book about a remarkable personality, and it is the more valuable because its setting is Victorian Oxford, at a time when the old clerical Dons were vanishing, and a new type emerging. Though Thomas Strong became successively Bishop of Ripon and Oxford, it was as Dean of Christ Church that he will be best remembered. He saw the end of the old clerical domination over the University and the widening of the gulf between science and traditional religion. His biographer says quite frankly that he was neither a scholar of the foremost rank nor a Churchman conspicuous among contemporary religious leaders. On the other hand, because of his remarkable personal gifts, he was able to play a great part in preserving the tradition of 'our typically English universities during a grave crisis. He transmitted what is of value in that tradition of Christian learning into a new age—an age in which the unexampled progress in the physical sciences and in highly specialized developments in technical inventions has tended to obliterate, or at least to overshadow, the interest in the ultimate problems of human life, which had hitherto been considered to be the proper interest of a university.'

Could an ancient ecclesiastical corporation and a college in which modern intellectual interests increasingly predominated live together in closest proximity, with joint possession of a great medieval church and joint responsibility for the care of a great estate and the education of a new generation? That was the problem which Thomas Strong, as Dean and Vice-chancellor helped to solve.

He went up to Christ Church in 1879 when lay government had succeeded the Church as controller of University education. In 1882 he took a First Class in Classical Moderations, and the following year a Second Class in *Litteræ Humaniores*. His subsequent career is described in close detail by the Master of the Temple. An unusual personality, decisive but also gracious and amusing, emerges against the colourful background of Oxford.

The book has many good stories, for Harold Anson is as good a raconteur as

[2] Harold Anson, *T. B. Strong* (S.P.C.K., 8*s*. 6*d*.).

was Thomas Strong, and his careful selection from ample material helps one to recapture the people and problems of a fascinating period. He reminds us, for example, that Jowett of Balliol was sometimes criticized for subordinating Christianity to academic efficiency. In a sermon to 'freshers' in 1886, on the text, 'Mark well her bulwarks, set up her houses', he said: 'Balliol is our Zion, and this College has progressed and become famous owing to three principal causes. In the first place, the diligence of its tutors; in the second place, a series of fortunate accidents; and in the third place, the blessing of God; and if any of you younger men should ever get into trouble, remember the text, "Casting all your care upon Him", and don't forget to come to me.'

There are shrewd comments on personalities and policies which may provoke or enlighten! In speaking of the Broad Church party, he says: 'There was a tendency to preach Christ as the perfect English gentleman with a firm loyalty to the Liberal party. The perfect Christian was pictured as the pure product of the English Public School, especially Rugby under Dr. Arnold. The preaching of Christianity seemed to be the inculcation of English Liberal ideas to subject nations.' Severe though this picture may be it helps to explain some of the criticism of Victorian England, which is responsible for modern attitudes.

There are many 'snap-shots' of the leaders of the Tractarian party and of such interesting figures as Dean Liddell, Canon Liddon, Bishop King, and Dr. Macan. A letter from Henry Scott Holland to Thomas Strong, written in intimate language, closes with this benediction: 'The grace of God go far beyond even what my love would desire for you.'

As Censer, Strong served under Francis Paget, who succeeded Dean Liddell at Christ Church. When Paget followed William Stubbs as Bishop of Oxford, Thomas Strong was appointed Dean, to the delight of Charles Gore, then the Master of Trinity. 'His chief aim as Dean was to restore the college to the great position which it held in the eighteenth century, and to do away with the snobbery which had led the House to dissociate itself from the ordinary activities of the University.'

How he accomplished this, and proved his strength of character and versatility during the First World War, is a story of unusual interest. We feel that few people could have written this biography so concisely and vividly, showing us so many of the cast whilst leaving Thomas Strong always in the centre of the stage.

Some of the Dean's epigrams are unforgettable. Of an undergraduate he said tersely: 'Gives little trouble, and takes none.' To an importunate parson who wrote to him, as Bishop of Oxford, asking for a certain desirable and populous living, he replied: 'Dear Mr. X, it is indeed a very important living. Yours truly, Thomas Oxon.' In describing a certain person, he said: 'One of those people who has merely got a face.' The Musician mastered the Dean, when he wrote to an undergraduate who insisted on playing the piano all the morning in Peckover Quad: 'I must draw your attention to the rule prohibiting music between 10 a.m. and 12.30. For the purposes of this rule I shall be obliged to count your piano-playing as music.'

Though his life was given to Oxford and to Christ Church in particular, and though he wrote no great book, and proved incapable of dealing with detailed parish problems, he was a great friendly soul, always 'botherable' and always

holding that Christian ethics were not 'a series of disjointed virtues considered separately and judged by their contribution to man's happiness'. They were the outcome of 'a new revelation of God's relationship to man' and the consequence of 'man's surrender to the indwelling life of Christianity'. 'If you doubt this,' he wrote, 'go into any of our large towns, and follow some parish priest whose heart is in his work in his rounds among his people. There you will see displayed in plain, prosaic life, the power of Christ's risen life, in the subjection of inveterate habits of sin, and the gradual conforming of characters of every kind, strong and weak, lettered and ignorant, laborious and leisured, to the type of moral action which Christ presented upon earth and the Spirit still interprets.'

Here is the servant of God looking beyond the Deanery and the Bishopric, beyond what seemed to be merely academic problems, to the goal toward which he strove. The work of Thomas Strong was something more than establishing a policy or preserving a tradition; it was, in the last analysis, the shaping of men whom God had commissioned to high endeavour in a quick-changing but needy world.

Though the Master of the Temple has shown us Victorian Oxford and a great Dean of Christ Church, he has shown us even more plainly the 'unbounding love' of a man for his fellow men, and the devotion of a servant of God to his Lord and Master. 'Those who knew him in his last days, and who came under the influence of his lambent, coruscating personality, will never cease to be thankful to have known and loved him.' Those who were born too late will be grateful to Harold Anson for giving them so vivid a picture—and so clear a pattern of a Christian man.

BEAUTY AND THE BEAST

In the utilitarian world of today it is high time that man again began to think of God as the 'First Author of Beauty'. Nature has not abandoned the curve for the straight line, although the latter is certainly the shortest distance between two given points! Whatever may be one's private opinion about the strictures of Sir Alfred Munnings, the fundamental issue is much more than a disagreement between the President of the Royal Academy and the friends of Picasso.

The realization of beauty—to say nothing of its enjoyment, its interpretation, and its expression in the awakened spirit—is of vital importance, if man is to rise from the slough of despond into which he has stumbled.

Thirty years ago Maude Royden felt moved to deliver a series of addresses on Beauty in Religion because she felt we should not have 'great art again until we realize its Divine source' and that 'no great artist would have liberty of utterance until we common people were little artists ourselves'. It is certainly true that in continually planning what we think ought to be, we are apt to forget the eternal beauty that *is* in the world. Endless evening-classes in vocational subjects may help to step up production but, if the wider and deeper cultural side of education be forgotten, they will produce a race of robots to whom God is, at best, a stranger.

'The beauty of the rainbow has no utilitarian end,' said Dr. Maude Royden,

'it is so beautiful, nevertheless, so startling, so unearthly in its perfect arch and glorious colour, that by a sure instinct our spiritual forefathers took it to be a sign of the presence of God in a world of trouble.' Grim, indeed, will be man's future if he grows more and more knowing in the laboratory and the factory but less and less conscious of the beauty of the hills or of the smile of welcome on a child's face.

The scale of material values by which so much is weighed and measured, today, is itself found wanting. There is so much that is outside and beyond it. Man still recognizes beauty and, at times, realizes, as by a sudden revelation, that even what he sees or hears is prophetic of the Ultimate and Eternal Glory which is of God. As Maude Royden put it one memorable summer Sunday evening in the Guildhouse: 'When we are most convinced by suffering and disappointment that God is not, beauty comes and forbids us to be atheists.'

It is good to know that there is to be a new English translation of the Bible, but it is to be hoped that the wise men with their increasing knowledge of ancient manuscripts and their exactitude in the use of words will have mind and heart open to the beauty which is divine. The rhythm and music of the Authorized Version had its own peculiar value. It is surely possible that the most modern and correct rendering may be inspired with a beauty of language that is the only fit vehicle of the word of God.

Some of the most valuable of the recent translations have been strangely unequal in their phrasing. It was interesting, for example, that Dr. Moffatt should decide to substitute 'barge' for 'ark' and 'compact' for 'covenant' in Genesis 6^{14}-8^{19}. But how much more happy and inspiring was his rendering of Psalm 68^{6}: 'the God who brings the lonely home . . . only the rebels have to live forlorn.' It would be churlish, indeed, for one who owes so much to so great a work, to carp at this word or that, but, like many of his fellows, he prays that any new revision may be made by men who are alive to the sacramental beauty of words and phrases. We hope that there may be given to the next generation a version as musical and beautiful as was our heritage from 1611.

Nor is the unutterable Beauty best seen in the rainbow or the written word! Rather is it to be found in the transfigured life. How ugly parenthood may be—how divinely beautiful! 'Eternal, immortal, invisible' are high-sounding terms for God, but they do not move us so intimately and immediately as the simple words, 'Our Father'. It has been said that God gave His character into the hands of the fathers and mothers of the world, when He told men He was like a Father, in His pity and His love. In that moment He handed to us the interpretation of the name to our children. Through our personality and our kinship the trust may be discharged, for in us may lie their first understanding of the love of God.

With the writer of *The Book of Wisdom* we must know God as the 'First Author of Beauty' if we are to reveal the full wonder of His love in a world that has made its gods so ugly and grown deaf and blind to so much of His creation.

IN A GARDEN

The children of London's East End have always loved flowers. In the past they have been blamed for a certain wantonness in plucking and destroying

them. They have stolen roses from favoured gardens because roses, to them, were so rare, yet they have picked half-withered flowers from dust-bins and tried hard to nurse them back to life. A wise woman once said: 'They would not steal roses if there were flowers for everyone.'

Because of childhood without gardens, and maturity without understanding, one is grateful to all good gardeners who have been interpreters of the beauty of the lilies of the field and the mystery of their ordered life. Amongst the most enthusiastic and sincere of such guides is Hilda M. Coley, who has for so many years tended her garden and written her books. She writes not in a laboratory with her eyes on Covent Garden Market, but in her little, well-tilled plot with her mind and heart wide open to receive the gifts of God. In her latest and most extensive book she shares with us her enthusiasm and her knowledge. It is a hopeful sign that so elaborate a book, with a wealth of original pictures painted by the author, should be produced at a time when cabbages and turnips are still a first priority. We believe that a man will not grow fewer or less vegetables because he is thrilled by his roses.

Unlike most horticulturists she is not content with Latin terminology: 'I wish it were possible to insist on decent English names being given to plants when they are officially named in Latin. I should suggest', says Miss Coley, 'that the Royal Horticultural Society have a committee of three, an artist, a poet, and a botanist, and see if between them they could evolve a nomenclature that would have meaning *and beauty* for the average person.'[3]

One of the most fascinating features of her book is its revival of old names, and its account of their origin.

Honesty, or as it is still called in Norfolk, *White Satin*, was known in the sixteenth century as *Pricksong-wort*. 'Pricks were notes in the hand-written music of Elizabethan days, so that a sheet of music was called a "prick song". The shape of Honesty's seed-vessels would remind them of the shape of the notes and pricks made in this way.'

Columbines have the country name of 'Granny bonnets', 'which suits them exactly for they look frilled and quilled in quite a Victorian style'.

Night Scented Stock was described by Joseph Jacob as 'a veritable active volcano of the most delicious perfume'. To this quotation Hilda Coley adds her own modest comment which is, as so often in her book, itself a minor parable: 'Its flowers, of a rather faded pinky mauve, only open at night, so it stores up its fragrance by day and releases it in the evening. I plant this little annual in and out amongst Wallflowers, Sweet Williams, Nemesias, and Snapdragons, or whatever may be occupying the bed under my windows at the season. There it can lean its weak and straggly stems against sturdier plants and hide its diminished head by day, and "come into its kingdom" at sunset.' How eagerly W. L. Watkinson would have snatched that paragraph for use in a sermon!

Carefully one is led from the little garden in Reigate to Tibetan mountains in search of certain poppies or to Turkey to find the first tulips. It is a fascinating experience to look at even the humblest flowers with one who has watched them so closely and learnt their most intimate secrets.

She has ransacked the medieval herbals, and rescued more than one passage

[3] Hilda M. Coley, *The Romance of Garden Flowers* (Collingridge, 30s.).

from undeserved oblivion. Here, for example, is a description of the pansy, *Heart's Ease*, from *Bullein's Bulwarke of Defence*, 1562: 'I read in an old Monkish written Herball, wherein the Aucthour writeth, that this herb did signify the holy Trinitie: and therefore was called the Herbe of the Trinitie, and thus he made his allegorie. This flower is but one in which said he, are three sondry colours, and yet but one sweet savour. So God is three distinct persones, in one Undivided Trinity. United in one eternal glory and divine Maesty. . . . God send thee hartes ease. For it is mutch better with poverty to have the same, than to be a kyng, with a miserable mynde. . . . Pray God give thee but one handfull of heavenly hearts ease, which passeth al the pleasaunt flowers that grow in this Worlde.'

Almost unconsciously one finds oneself passing from the colour and fragrance of a Surrey garden into the heavenly places. The colours, in spite of the poets, were not painted by God in some original creative act, but 'it makes it no less the handiwork of the Divine Creator to know that certain coloured grains or colouring matters dissolved in various proportions in the cells of the plant determine its colour. It is a continuous creation of His hands.'

The scientific gardener 'is not making any pretensions to doing better than the Creator'. He is merely an agent 'using God-given materials and selecting, testing, and aiding plants to new beauty of form and colour.'

'Flowers, if we will let them, may be most poignant pleasures', says Hilda Coley, and in her unassuming way she has helped them to stab our spirits broad awake. This is an unusual book, free from technicalities, and convincing us that she who teaches is still rejoicing in learning a little more of the beauty which is the garment of God.

Articles

THE BODY AND THE CHURCH

I

THE UNIQUE gathering at Amsterdam has impressed all the Churches who were represented there, as well as those who were absent. It has made, as we say, history. In the future, the relations of the Churches to one another will never be merely what they have been. Some may comment that not much was said that had not been said before, and that no definite step to unity was taken. But what made the assembly remarkable was that it actually took place. There has been nothing like it in the history of the Church, not even in the fourth century.

Yet, properly speaking, it was not an event in the history of the Church, but of the Churches. It was the Churches of the world that were meeting, as Mr. H. G. C. Herklots expresses it in his useful little account.[1] It was a World Council of Churches, one hundred and fifty of them, which was brought into being. But, as the most loyal members of any of those Churches will be ready to admit, it is not the separated Churches which are important, but the Church. What is the unity of the Churches if it does not bring us in sight of the unity of the Church?

Hence, Amsterdam leaves us, as the other Ecumenical gatherings, at Lausanne and Edinburgh, have left us, with hope and yet with perplexity. For we cannot be said to have caught sight of the Church which is one. Chosen and influential leaders of the Churches have agreed on a number of propositions; on others they have agreed that agreement is not yet in sight. They have pronounced a reverent and eager Amen to our Lord's prayer for His disciples, that they may all be one—'one thing'; but the meaning of that oneness they have either taken for granted or left unconsidered. And those who are the most anxious to profit by their decisions are left to complain: 'the Churches we know, all too well; but what is the Church?'

II

Now, the unity of the Church, the nature of the One Church, is something that cannot be taken for granted. Yet no one has set himself to define it. Usually, the Church, when it is discussed, is simply set by the side of the Churches. So, for instance, the Church of England, as by the Bishop of Derby in his recent *Charles Gore Memorial Lecture*, is set by the side of 'the Churches of the Anglican family', just as its reformation is distinguished from that of 'Churches more characteristically Protestant', though these are not to be therefore 'un-churched'. 'Our Lord', the Bishop concludes, 'means and desires that His Church should be one'—here it may be that he gives the words a somewhat more definitely ecclesiastical colouring than they were intended to bear; but all he can add is that 'the guilt of schism rests upon those (if any such there be) who deliberately remain content that the schisms which at present divide and rend Christendom should continue unhealed'.

[1] *Amsterdam* (1948).

'If any such there be'! But what is the nature of the schisms, and what will be the appearance of the robe when it is seamless once more? Mr. Oliver Tomkins, in the *Bulletin of the British Council of Churches* for February 1949, reminds us that we cannot take Christian unity seriously without realizing that 'it is in the common proclamation of the Gospel and in our common responsibility for mankind that we discover depths of unity which long separation had led us to ignore'. Yet that is to leave us with agreements between Churches rather than with the unity of the prayer in the Upper Room.

The Methodist Conference statement on *The Nature of the Christian Church* (1937) has gone farther. 'The Church is an institution, pervaded by the Holy Spirit, whose members are enabled and inspired by His presence to share with one another all that they have received from God.' Perhaps that is as far as one can go. But the words are more easily intelligible when they are referred to the members of a single religious society than to the blessed company of all Christ's faithful followers.

III

One of the most serious results of the prevailing uncertainty is the divided loyalty that perplexes and paralyses those who take their churchmanship in earnest. We recognize, and we are constantly exhorted to recognize, our duties to *our* Church, by which is meant our denomination or even our own local religious community; the Anglican or one of the Free Churches; St. Barnabas over the way, or Brunswick or Bethesda Chapel.

The only Christians who are not perplexed in this way are the Roman Catholics; and they, heaven knows, when they start thinking, have perplexities enough of their own. 'Do not talk of uniting Churches', they say: 'all the unity you need or can enjoy is here already, under the mantle of the successor of St. Peter; outside the shelter of that mantle there are no Churches to be united.' And those who identify the mantle with the claim of apostolical succession have complained that to draw divided Churches or sections of Churches together, as in South India, is only to add to the list of separate Churches yet one more.

IV

Unhappily, the New Testament, to which we naturally turn in this predicament, gives us little assistance. For it knows nothing of our ecclesiastical straits. To us the problem of sundered Churches is the problem of independent and rival denominations, each regarding itself as entrusted with some special deposit of truth, each mortally afraid of surrendering some special right or privilege, and each inclined to mutter 'stand aside, for I am holier than thou'. This has defeated every attempt, at Lausanne, at Edinburgh, or at Amsterdam, to exhibit the One Church to the world by a gathering at the one Table of the Lord, and has forced on us all the sad or the scornful question: Has any progress along the road been made since Lambeth in 1920?

In the days of the New Testament, our predicament would have been unintelligible. The various Christian communities were by no means centres of unbroken harmony. They appear to have quarrelled as bitterly, on matters both of faith and order, as ever Lutherans and Calvinists have done, or Presby-

terians and Independents, or the Established and the Free. It may even be true, as C. H. Dodd suggests in his commentary on St. John's Epistles, that bodies of dissentients 'hived off' from the main company. But we read nothing of rival religious organizations. There were no denominations with different ministries and Church orders. There were only local societies, which enjoyed to the full all that we could desire by way of inter-celebration and inter-communion. When in later centuries the organized heresies appeared, with bishops and church buildings of their own, the Arians, the Pelagians, the Nestorians, and the rest, the 'Catholics' were chiefly anxious to keep them out, not to bring them in; and it would today take some courage to maintain that Paul or John would have approved the policies either of Cyril or Augustine.

V

It would be a mistake, however, to despair of aid from the New Testament. The Saviour indeed has Himself warned us against an over-valuation of the written Word. And it will be wise to remember that warning when we search the apostolic writings for explicit directions as to ecclesiastical organizations of perpetual obligation or, what is often unhappily regarded as the same thing, for confirmation of what we ourselves have been brought up to accept.

But we cannot deny that if we are to find anywhere a picture of the *Una Sancta*, the one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, it is to the pages of the New Testament that we must turn. Even those who hold that it is for the Church to teach and the Bible to prove, base what they take to be the teaching of the Church on Scripture. Around the Dome of St. Peter's at Rome run the dominical words: *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram . . .*; 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock will I build my Church.'

VI

On the first approach, as all will admit, that search for unity is disappointing. From the first years—even, it would seem, from the first weeks—the harmony of the Church was drowned in discord. Those who regard the writer of the Acts as the biased apologist of the infant Church seem never to have reflected on the ruthless outspokenness which leads him from the wilful dissidence of Ananias and Sapphira to the quarrels of Hebrews and Hellenists over the distribution of the Poor Fund, to the criticisms of Peter's cautious advances to the Gentiles, and to the succession of acrimonious disputes of which Paul was the centre from his conversion to the Council of Jerusalem. The same picture is presented, we may say, in Church after Church for which Paul, that stormy petrel of adventurous evangelism, regarded himself as responsible; with the senseless Galatians, or the inflated Corinthians. If Timothy had to be reminded of his Phygelus, John had to face his Diotrephes. And of the seven Churches of Asia, only one was free from a grievous falling away from the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace.

Yet it would be equally foolish to forget the genuine pride that Paul took in his Churches. Their faith and zeal filled him with thankfulness. He could use one and another to provoke the rest to fresh obedience and devotion. He could address them as consecrated, holy; ready to endure constant tribulation;

rejoicing in their heavenly inheritance; the temple of the Holy Spirit; the members or organs of the body of Christ. If all this is to be set down to the idealism of an affectionate father in God, it did not blind him to the existence of the grossest faults; and a similar combination of warm praise with warnings that at least imply rebukes is found in 1 Peter and still more markedly in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

VII

The paradox, such as it is, finds its solution in the history of the actual rise of the Christian communities; the rise, that is to say, of societies which almost from the day of Pentecost sprang up, speaking humanly, through agencies of which for the most part we can guess but little and know still less. If the apostles themselves founded some Churches, they were quite content that others should owe their existence to humbler disciples. Paul was well aware of Churches which had not seen his face, and of others where he did not wish to intrude. We know as little of the origin of the Church at Rome as of that of the Church at Antioch or Damascus.

Nor can we guess as to the extent to which such Churches would be homogeneous or uniform with one another, or influenced, in the earlier days of their faith, by the pre-Christian associations of their first members. What we do discover, to our surprise, is that they all share a common language, a common experience, a common code of conduct, and a common though doubtless elementary ministry and Church organization. What was true of one of these youthful communities was true of the rest. A member of any one of them would find himself at home in every other which he might visit. A letter written to one community would be listened to with warm appreciation by its neighbours. Indeed, the amount of intercommunication, of which we have clear evidence in the early chapters of the Acts, was remarkable; and nothing else, again speaking humanly, better enables us to understand how the members of the different local societies felt themselves, like the followers of Wesley, to belong to one Society. The Christians avowed their allegiance to the Churches in the towns and cities where they lived; yet they felt themselves bound to one and the same Church throughout the world, the *oecumene.*

VIII

These considerations will throw light on the uses of the word 'Church' in the New Testament. In the four Gospels, as is well known, the word does not appear except in the two familiar passages in Matthew. In the majority of occurrences in the rest of the New Testament, over eighty in number, the word refers to the local society; in about ten it is used collectively, of 'the Society' (e.g., 'I persecuted the Church of God', Galatians 1^{13}; but contrast 1^{22}); and in some ten more, all of them in Colossians and Ephesians, in the 'mystical' sense, as the body of Christ, united to Him like wife to husband.

Which of these uses came first? Not, certainly, the 'mystical' one. But did the Christians talk about the One Church before they talked about the individual Churches? Was it their membership in the Church as a whole which made them conscious of their relation to the companies of the saints in Iconium or Thessalonica; or did they pass from the local to the general? The question

is really irrelevant; as irrelevant as the question of the priority of the individual or the society. Some of the converts would assuredly have more of a communal consciousness than others; all would be intensely conscious of their dependence on the smaller gatherings, even in the house of a Chloe or a Gaius; none could miss the support and the significance of the sister Churches, growing up around them, and reproducing, as by the will of some heavenly artificer, all that was most characteristic in their new experience.

The use of the collective, as compared with our modern usage, is surprisingly rare in the New Testament. Each little Church was hard put to it, as the Acts shows clearly, to hold its own; and it had to think and pray for itself. But, as we have seen, the Christian was at home in every Church; all formed one family. Paul would be passed on from one Church to another. Moreover, all Christians expected to be assembled into one at the Coming of the Lord; and the notes or characteristics of membership in the Churches were the same everywhere; one Lord, one faith, one Baptism; one conflict, one inheritance, one hope.

IX

There is indeed but little explicit or formal teaching about the nature of the Church, even where we should most have expected it. Not to dwell on our Lord's reticence, we miss any reference to the Church in the Epistle to the Romans, other than in the personal messages in the last chapter. Peter never uses the word; nor does John save in his third brief letter; while, apart from a quotation from the Psalms, the author to the Hebrews confines himself to one majestic reference to the celestial Church of the firstborn.

The modern commentator, who can hardly write a page without the word, must needs wonder how the authors managed to do without it. For their silence is not like their silence on the threefold ministry and its sacerdotal character. The conception of the priestly succession was, at the best, only on the way to its appearance in New Testament times. The intimate fellowship of the Church was more to the converts than either apostle or presbyter. Yet the sacred writers, like so many of our present-day theologians, appear to assume its significance. Everyone, seemingly, understood it; so why trouble to refer to its nature?

In the greater part of the New Testament, then, we look in vain for a formulated doctrine of the Church. But there are two passages in which Paul has given us more than is always realized; in 1 Corinthians 12 (we must also bear in mind $6^{15, 19}$), where he is dealing with membership in the body of Christ, and in Ephesians 5, the 'mystical' passage which carries on Colossians $1^{18, 24}$, Ephesians 1^{22} and 3^{10}, and in which he is identifying the Church with Christ's body and developing the relation of Christ to his body and the Church on the lines of the (idealized) relation of a man to his wife.

X

Taken by themselves, these references to the Church in Colossians and Ephesians cannot but startle us. They seem 'shot out of a pistol'. There is nothing like them in Paul's previous writings. Yet the very casualness with which they are introduced suggests that the ideas which they are intended to

convey were familiar to the readers. Perhaps that is why we ourselves are left in such doubt as to the meaning of *pleroma* or 'fullness' ('The Church is His body, the full content of Him who fills all things in all things'), and the extent to which, in expounding the 'mystery' of marriage, Paul is 'mythologizing' in his portraiture of Christ and the Church.

On the other hand, in 1 Corinthians 12, where the word Church is not used save once, in verse 28, we are on smoother ground. Nothing is there that can be called 'mythologizing' or 'mystical'; only the clear and matter-of-fact working out of an analogy between the interrelations of the human body, its limbs and its head, and the interrelations of the Christian community, its members, and Christ. Nothing is there said of any distinction between ministry and laity, or of two sorts of membership; the whole analogy rests on the acknowledged existence of the functions of the different parts, and of the gifts bestowed on the members of the Christian society. It is by the words *body* and *head* that we can connect the puzzling passage in Ephesians with the more straightforward 1 Corinthians, and so hope to discover their meaning. And if we cannot decide when Paul first formed his conception of the Church as the body of Christ, we can see how he was led up to it.

XI

Let us then turn to 1 Corinthians. The young community is hard pressed by serious moral confusion and profound administrative uncertainties. There is no doctrine of the Church as such, nor a trace of any organized hierarchy; but it is clear that Paul appeals to the widespread presence of 'gifts' in the members. The pressure of a concrete question leads, as so often, to a reference to a doctrine rather than to its categorical formulation. In this instance it is the puzzling manifestations and rivalries of these gifts. The four principles laid down by Paul for dealing with them are—each individual has his own gift; all gifts are 'through' or 'according to' the Spirit; each gift is for the service, the edification, or building up, of the whole community; and the exercise of each needs the exercise of all the rest. The gifts may not be equally spectacular; all are equally essential to the activity and life of the whole.

In all this we observe what we observe in the human body. Every limb and organ, however humble (the modern biologist might add, every hormone and cell), is essential to the life of the body as a whole; each fulfils itself, lives its life, in co-operation with the others, under the direction of the head. Very well. Each believer has his gift, his heaven-allotted function, his responsibility to the whole community. Each shares in the experience of all the rest. Together the 'limbs' make one 'body', of which the 'head', the governing authority, is Christ. You, therefore, Paul urges, belong in this sense to Christ; together you are his body; individually, its organs, whether the functions or gifts are of the apostolate, or prophesying, or healing, or administration, or ecstatic and unintelligible utterance.

But the chief gift of all is love. This is to be granted to each. Had Paul some memory here of the Upper Room and the 'new commandment'? Yes, surely, when we observe that love is the attitude of the members of a society to one another. 1 Corinthians 13, the coping stone of 1 Corinthians 12, looks to John 15 rather than to Luke 10. If a Church begins with John 15, Luke 10 will not be

forgotten. The body is composed of the members; it is ruled by the head. This does not imply that Paul had forgotten what he had previously said about Baptism. But Baptism is not merely the submission to a rite, as when a child is carried to the font. It is the entrance into a new and risen life of consecration. The essence of membership is the exercise of the function in the service of the body and obedience to the head. On the other hand, the vitality of the Church, in any sense of the word, wider or narrower, depends on the vitality, the functioning of the whole membership. When the limbs are atrophied, what of the health of the body?

XII

We are now ready to turn to Ephesians. We need not stay to discuss the relation of Ephesians to Colossians; we need only notice that in Colossians the identification of the Church and the body of Christ is made in two brief sentences, and that the 'myth' of Ephesians 5 does not appear. Nor does it concern us here whether Ephesians is Paul's or Pauline. If the latter, 'Pauline' must mean drenched and saturated with Paul's characteristic teaching. The identification of Church and body is now explicit. The identification of Christ and the head is further developed. The Church, as Christ's body, is His *pleroma*, the full content of Him who is the *pleroma* of the universe. As such, it proclaims to the universe His glory. But there is still more to be said. The identification almost sinks beneath the weight of its suggestiveness. The head is no longer simply either the ruler or the ruling part of the organism. It is, so to speak, the form or essence of the body; its final perfection. The body receives from the head its power of organic life and growth. It grows up into its head.

But Paul has not here overlooked the harmonious co-operation of individual gifts. It is the doctrine of 1 Corinthians which leads directly to this larger doctrine of the head. It is the co-operation, both of and within the body, which is guided by the head. And after this daring formulation, Paul turns aside, as it were, from the rapt contemplation of Mary to the humbler preoccupations of Martha; to warnings, which, however elementary, were as necessary in the first age of the Church's life as in our own. Then, as he goes on to apply himself to the homely duties of wives and husbands, the now familiar analogy sweeps back on him with a new vigour. Wives and husbands! Why, is not the husband the head of the wife, and must he not therefore love his wife as he loves his own body—just as Christ, the head, has loved His body, the Church? Yes, He loves her, redeems her, has died for her, to set her spotless before the throne. That indeed is the real meaning of the great marriage axiom, the 'mystery', of Genesis. Here and here alone does the Apostle dramatize the relation between the Redeemer and the Church. His language is vivid enough to remind us of medieval paintings of the Coronation of the Virgin. Mystical indeed, or ideal; but far removed from the realm of history, or experience, or ecclesiastical disputation. It is not amiss to notice, however, that all the benefits which Christ here is said to confer on the Church have been elsewhere described as conferred on the individual believer. But for the heart of it all, the reader is taken back to the doctrine formulated ten years before to the Corinthians; we are members of the body which is His (Ephesians 5^{30}).

XIII

Such is the final presentation of the Pauline, and, we must add, of the New Testament doctrine of the Church. The Pastorals make no addition to it. There, the duties of the shepherd are already beginning gently to edge the responsibilities of the shepherded into the shade. Further, Paul's teaching is all his own. He is in debt neither to Menenius Agrippa and the fable of the belly and the members, nor to the erotics of the Song of Songs. Perhaps he was not unmindful of Hosea's sombre romance, though only an unbridled imagination could dream of a parallel in his own youthful experience. He keeps to the language of simile, not of metaphor. He refrains from speaking of the wife or the bride of Christ, and if one should murmur 'he need not have been ashamed of the speech of the Apocalypse', that enigmatic book never refers to the Church save in the concrete; the 'bride' there is not the Church but the analogue of the holy city which comes down from heaven to men.

We may well admit that in the Pauline exposition which we have been studying we do not find materials for a full and comprehensive doctrine of the Church as it spreads throughout the world today. Both exegesis and history are used by the Spirit to lead men into further truth. But, however extended its evolution, the organism remains what it is in the New Testament, with the sharing of the gifts of the Spirit as its life-blood and consecrated co-operation as its instrument.

XIV

We can now see why the New Testament is reluctant to answer our insistent questions: What is the true Church? Is the three-fold ministry of the *esse* or even the *bene esse* of the Church? What is the connexion between the Church and the Sacraments? We can, if we are daring enough, go beyond the written word, and surmise, 'the writer must have meant the Church though he did not say so'. But we lay ourselves open, if we do this, to various unscholarly practices, like confusing the Church with the Kingdom, the visible with the invisible, the part with the whole, or metaphor with simile and with definition.

It is useless to begin by asking the New Testament what is the true Church, when we are thinking of denominations and ecclesiastical traditions of which the New Testament knows nothing. We should probably meet, from Paul, with the kind of response which temptingly speculative 'posers' used to receive from Jesus. To such, His only answers were other questions, that went home. 'Have *you* repented?' 'Are *you* watching?' 'Do *you* care for your indigent neighbours?' The first and, perhaps, considering its implications, the only question to ask is, not—What is the Church? but—However we understand the Church, what constitutes *our* membership therein?

We have already heard the answer; an answer which would, if we heeded it, demand a purge as drastic as any effected by Wesley. Every movement which brings Christian people nearer to one another, or enables them to speak the message of the Lord with a clearer voice or, as Mr. Oliver Tomkins pleaded, to combine more effectively in the work of world evangelization, is all to the good. And we may rejoice whenever we succeed in rising above our ecclesiastical dissensions and finding an ally where we had feared a rival, or in harmonizing the teasing differences of three polities in one agreed constitution. But the gift of

Christ is not a code, but a Spirit; and the membership of the body of Christ is a community of persons each of whom uses his powers therein as if on him alone hung the issue of the day.

Whenever there is such use, there will be the mutual love without which membership is but a farce, and any Church a make-believe. The discovery that every true member of the body will long to make is of those whom he can love and be loved by; whom he can serve, as they serve him, in the name of the Saviour who loved and served and saved them all. The unity of the Church is not a matter of arithmetic. We have not to wait till all the multitudinous and variegated Christian and semi-Christian denominations 'join up'. Amsterdam surely understood this. But when Christian societies, larger or smaller, and the individuals composing them, are growing up into Christ in mutual devotion, a process which a distracted world will not fail to observe, they are on the way to the fulfilment of Christ's intense desire, to make them one thing with Himself. But what if we neither possess the gifts, nor the power or will to use them?

WILLIAM F. LOFTHOUSE

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE WORLD

THE TEACHING of the Church on the Holy Spirit is a necessity of dogma though it can never in the nature of things be a fact of experience. Paul himself was not able to distinguish in his experience between the spirit of Christ and the Holy Spirit. *Exeunt in mysterium.* Nevertheless he gave us the Apostolic Benediction and what he could not separate in his consciousness he separated in the necessity of his thought.

And whilst except as dogma we cannot know the Person of the Holy Spirit we can experimentally know what He does. That is why nothing is more natural than to speak in the one breath of the Person and work of the Holy Spirit.

But in order to understand His operation in the Church it is necessary to know His whole activity. It is not perhaps too unwise to represent this by three circles, of which the largest is the world, the next one is the Church and the smallest circle is the individual. The Holy Spirit works in all these circles at the same time. Nevertheless each circle depends on the other. For the success of His work in the world depends upon the success of His work in the Church, and that depends finally upon the success of His work in the individual.

What, then, is the activity of the Holy Spirit in the world? It is surely not idle imagining to say that He plans to bring men into the Kingdom of God. In a true sense the Kingdom of God is supra temporal. It was not begun by man nor can it be finished by him. It has its origin in God and in God it will achieve its consummation. That is why, when we have done all we can we still pray to God: 'Thy Kingdom come.' The last word lies with Him.

Nevertheless if the term is to have any real significance, the Kingdom must in part be fulfilled in time, and the earthly ministry of Jesus was given to the emphasis of this very fact. 'He came into Galilee preaching the Kingdom of God.' This was indeed the unifying idea behind all His teaching. At the

very opening of His ministry in his own synagogue at Nazareth he read Isaiah's account of that coming Kingdom when the blind would see, the captives would be released, and the poor would have the Gospel preached to them. And then, to the astonished people He declared that the prophecy had been fulfilled. The signs of the Kingdom were present for all who had eyes to see.

There was one unforgettable occasion when He flung a terrific challenge to his enemies: 'If I, by the power of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you.' And on another occasion He said to them that the Kingdom would not come by looking for it. It is foolish to say, 'Lo here! or Lo there!', for 'Behold', said Jesus, 'the Kingdom of God is in your midst'. And so He said to men that at any time they could enter into the Kingdom of God. All they needed was to repent and become as a little child. The young ruler was not far from the Kingdom of God, said Jesus. Indeed he had only to sell what he had and as a child to come and follow Christ.

But if the Kingdom of God is present, then certain exhilarating truths follow in consequence. It means God is already on the Throne. He does not wait to be lifted on to it by our feeble endeavours. The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth, He is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. From this it follows that ugliness cannot finally cast out beauty, evil cannot overcome goodness, nor can falsehood triumph over truth. In the words of Dr. H. H. Farmer:[1] 'We may be confident that if anything is of real value in this present world, it will never pass into nothingness, and that if anything passes into nothingness it will not be of real value, and need cause no regrets.'

A second corollary of belief in the present Kingdom of God is that His laws are already in operation. We have not to wait until men finally realize the validity of God's laws and adopt them as the constitution of the world. As the scientist, starting from the assumption that the universe is an intelligible unity, discovers more and more the unwritten laws in his own particular sphere of activity, so all workers discover that we live in a law-abiding universe. If this is true in the world of nature, it is just as true in the world of man. We are discovering that as there are laws which govern our bodily and mental health, so there are laws which govern our spiritual health. Those laws are set out in the teaching of Jesus Christ, lit up and interpreted by His life and death and rising again. If we defy these laws, or even if we quietly ignore them, we are running counter to the universe, and we shall find as Paul found that it is hard to kick against the goad. In the words of James Russell Lowell

An' you've gut to git up airly
Ef you want to take in God.

When men and nations suffer pain and frustration, it is because they break the laws of the Kingdom of God; and when they find satisfaction and well-being it is because they are obedient to those laws. If the stars in their courses fight against Sisera the same stars are leagued on the side of those who are in line with God's purposes.

But if the Kingdom is present, it means that there is a present Judgement. The New Testament use of the phrase 'Wrath of God' to express His judgement, is strangely significant and awe-inspiring, if we remember that it does

[1] *The World and God*, p. 306.

not portray God as the angry Jove, hurling down His thunderbolts, but as that suffering which inevitably occurs when man defies the spiritual constitution of the world. For whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. According to the manner of sowing shall be the manner of reaping, and whether therefore he reaps in tears or in joy. God does not willingly see His children afflicted, but if they choose evil and not good they must abide by the consequences. St. Paul said, writing to the Romans, that before the Law came and man had no true idea of right and wrong, they had no guilt. But once the Law came and men did wrong, they had no excuse; they condemned themselves. Jesus said that those who did not believe on Him had judged themselves already, because light had come into the world, and they had preferred darkness rather than light. If God has revealed to us in Christ the Way and the Truth and the Life, and we prefer to go our own way and fashion our own truth and live our own life, we come under a present judgement. We condemn ourselves.

We do not say that God is the author of sin. Since He gave man a free will, He took the risk of it, without directly willing it. But since God is not actively responsible for man's sin, neither is He actively responsible for its punishment. Sin carries its own suffering, and if in a moral universe individual men or societies act in an immoral way, they must suffer the consequences.

Samson allowed himself to be tricked, and his eyes were put out by the Philistines. Then he was chained to a pillar in their temple and made a laughing-stock. In his rage and despair he struggled in his chains, until at last the pillar gave way and the building fell and Samson and the Philistines were involved in a common destruction. We have seen in our own day what happens when men have power but no vision, and strength but no eyes. They have tugged at the pillars of civilization and involved us all in a common destruction. In the dazzling light of the Kingdom of God two courses are open to us. We can either walk in the light as He is in the light, or we can reject that light and choose an outer darkness. In the first case, our judgement is unto life, but in the second case, it is unto death.

And lastly, if the Kingdom be present, there is a present victory. We do not have patiently to await this long-expected triumph. It has already been achieved. He has conquered sin and death and all their powers. In the Cross and Resurrection there is the declaration that as sin could not vanquish, so death could not hold Him. And as He rose triumphant, so, sharing His risen Life we share His victory.

He breaks the power of cancelled sin,
He sets the prisoner free;
His blood can make the foulest clean,
His blood availed for me.[2]

In very truth the future life is present, for in the great words of John: 'This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom Thou has sent.' In so many of Charles Wesley's great hymns this truth is perfectly expressed:

O believe the record true:
God to you His Son hath given.

[2] *M.H.B.*, No. 1.

Ye may now be happy too,
Find on earth the life of heaven,
Live the life of heaven above,
All the life of glorious love.[3]

The work of the Holy Spirit in the world is therefore to bring men to become members of the Kingdom. For whilst the Kingdom is here, it comes ever more fully as more and more come into it. That is why we ever need to pray that the Kingdom having come, will still come.

It is the task, then, of the Holy Spirit, to make men conscious that God is on the Throne and that their wisdom lies in subjecting their lives to Him. He also brings men to know that the laws of God are in present operation and that they can only live by obedience to them. And making them aware of God's sovereignty and of His laws He makes them realize that there is a present judgement and a present victory.

If such be indeed the goal of God the Holy Spirit, it might conceivably be argued that He has not, as yet, had resounding success. But certain considerations must ever be borne in mind. Since God has made us men, not automata, and has given to us freedom of choice, He has to wait until we are ready to co-operate with Him. There is a poignant exclamation in the prophecy of Ezekiel: 'I sought for a man among them, that should make up the hedge, and stand in the gap before me for the land, that I should not destroy it; but I found none' (22[30]). God in His dealings with men has to use the most intractable material, and yet with exquisite restraint He will not force our wills.

But there is a weightier argument. We are creatures of a moment, but He is from everlasting to everlasting. Because our little circle of days is so quickly ended, we have limited perspective. We see only a part of the whole battle-front, and we see it only for a short time. The range of the Holy Spirit is throughout all space and all time. John Mason sang—

How great a being, Lord, is Thine,
Which doth all beings keep!
Thy knowledge is the only line
To sound so vast a deep,
Thou art a sea without a shore,
A sun without a sphere;
Thy time is now and evermore,
Thy place is everywhere.[4]

The divine strategy can only in part be known to us. As we do not know its beginning, so we cannot know its end.

And yet, if we will, we can see the great design, even if we see it through a glass darkly. It is possible to see history in its largest sweep and to trace a pattern. Dr. Arnold Toynbee in his monumental *Study of History* has spoken of the twenty-one civilizations which have risen and fallen. But his record of man's failure is in another aspect the presence of the Holy Spirit bringing men slowly and as a result of their numberless unsuccessful experiments to a point at which they can see where their true destiny lies. For in the Holy Spirit's

[3] *M.H.B.*, No. 319. [4] ibid., No. 78.

activity, as reward is associated with goodness, so pain and frustration are associated with the wrong ways which man persists in taking. And so by trial and error men are brought to see that there is really only one way which they can take without loss or injury—and that is God's way.

Viewed in this light we can see how man has been brought through the stages of tribal organization to that of city states or petty kingdoms. Thence they have reached the stage of independent nationhood. But with the growing complexity of national rivalries, increased communications, expanding trade and economic competition, they passed to a stage of alliances in which an uneasy balance of power was maintained. Further scientific discovery and technological advance made the world one. Cycles of economic prosperity and depression involved the whole world. Even whilst nations were striving for their own particular place in the sun, science and economics were making it impossible for them to live apart.

In 1914 two great alliances of nations fought each other and by 1918 it was obvious that the only alliance sufficiently large to be safe was an alliance of all the nations. The League of Nations was a just outcome of events. It was a logical necessity in the development of history. It was a further step in the divine strategy.

But another stage was still necessary. It had to be shown by the hard facts of bitter experience that a society of nations which was founded on the selfish aggressive instincts of mutually suspicious powers could not hope to endure. It hastened to its inevitable breakdown in 1939. But the failure of the organization does not mean the failure of the idea. The conception is imperishable. It merely needs a new setting.

If wars, even more deadly, are not to be recurrent, we must break the vicious circle. We must not begin with ourselves, we must begin with God. However much we try to avoid past failures by a skilful refashioning of world organization, if we hope by agreement and discussion alone to maintain peace, we are lost.

If a company of well-intentional burglars met to discuss how mutually they might surrender their tools of trade, what would be the inevitable result? Or to use a more pleasant metaphor, if a number of highly civilized business men met to discuss how they could drastically limit their profits in the interests of society, what would be the outcome of such a gathering? The plain fact is that if egocentric men, representing egocentric nations meet with the best of intentions to discuss the common good, there will spring up again the demons of greed, self-interest, fear and pride, and the rest of the hellish brood, to frustrate their best endeavours. It is not just an axiom of theology, but of life, that natural man is unable to save himself. That fatal twist of the will and corruption of nature which theologians call original sin can never be resolved by the highest intentions and the best laid schemes. The inner tension, the incessant tug-of-war leads always to the despairing cry: 'Oh, wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death.'

It is for this sufficient reason that we cannot organize our own security nor plan our own deliverance. All the logic of events has brought us to that last stage in which, if we are prepared to acknowledge God as King, we shall discover we are fellow subjects; and, since the King is also Father, that we are

brethren. The Shepherds and the Wise Men did not find fellowship by discussion and argument. They came to the same manger and worshipped the same Babe and found that they were kneeling side by side. The answer to our present distress is in the Kingdom of God. It is to the entrance of this Kingdom that the Holy Spirit by the march of history has brought us. For that Kingdom is a Kingdom of right relationships. If we are willing to live with God we shall be able to live with each other and, what is more difficult, to live with ourselves. In the worship of God and in obedience to His laws we shall know those principles by which alone the full life for man and nations may be lived. When by the pressure of the Holy Spirit men seek first the Kingdom of God, everything else becomes their own.

MALDWYN L. EDWARDS

CRANMER'S FIRST PRAYER BOOK

TWO BOOKS have influenced English religious life more than any others—the Bible and *The Book of Common Prayer*. It is no wonder that the ordinary man regards them as though they were fixed features, unchanged through the last four centuries as the cliffs of Dover. He thinks instinctively of the Bible as being the Authorized Version, and is surprised to learn that Shakespeare, worshipping as a boy in Stratford parish church, did not hear it read, and that he had been buried there forty-five years before the *General Thanksgiving* appeared.

Cranmer's first prayer-book came into general use in England four hundred summers ago. To be precise, the first copies were issued in March 1549[1] over the name of Edward Whitchurch, London, and they could be used immediately in the churches of the realm. The intention of the promoters of the *Act of Uniformity* (21st January 1549) was to ensure that the new services should be in use everywhere by Whitsunday, 9th June. The boy King Edward the Sixth had therefore been on the throne a little more than two years when Englishmen first heard Divine worship expressed in the unique diction of *The Booke of the Common Prayer, and Administracion of the Sacramentes, and other rites and ceremonies of the Churche after the use of the Churche of England.*

From 1549 until the present time, with two notable interruptions—the first when the Roman Catholic, Queen Mary, succeeded her brother, Edward the Sixth, the second when the Independent, Oliver Cromwell, was 'protecting' the realm, no day has passed on which an Englishman might not step into the quiet dimness of cathedral or parish church and hear the cadences which his great-grandfather had heard before him. In all that time comfort and correction, enlightenment and wholesome awe of God and His ways have come home to men's minds through this medium. The old words become new repeatedly, especially in days of crisis, personal or national. It happened that the present

[1] Vide Messrs. Dent's reprint of *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward the Sixth* (Everyman).

writer was speaking the versicles in Morning Prayer in a Methodist Church at precisely the minute at which we passed into a state of war with Germany in September 1939. The wind stirred in the limes—as old Didsbury men may remember who loved their College Chapel—and the response of the congregation grew intense:

Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only Thou, O God.

On the eve of our young men's assault upon the beaches of France, 6th June 1944, Mr. Charles Morgan published in *The Times Literary Supplement* an essay on 'The Village Church'[2] which strangely touched the memories and longings of his readers. There are two sentences which would surely please Cranmer himself. 'The miracle of the Prayer-Book, if allowed to speak in its own order plainly, is that it speaks both timelessly and to the occasion.' And further: 'That the English look again to their Church in their hour of stress is, even if it be as yet no more than this, a looking for their continuity, their peace of mind, the very pivot of the wheel on which their fortune revolves. And the centre of a wheel is still.'

The words, now so familiar and closely interwoven in the fabric of English life, were, however, once new and strange with little to commend them to the mass of the people. Certainly it was only in the comparatively backward and rural parts of the kingdom that protest went so far as to involve physical resistance. There were local troubles, and one may hazard the opinion that the North might have risen had it not been for the fact that memory was still vivid of Henry the Eighth's treatment of the rebels in the Pilgrimage of Grace just after the dissolution of the monasteries in 1536. In the matter of actual rebellion following the issue of the 1549 book, the Cornishmen were the most resentful, and marched eastwards defiantly. The language of the medieval Mass might not be their own tongue—but neither, for that matter, was English. To this day the Cornishman can make a Londoner painfully aware that he is 'a foreigner'. His opinion of the 1549 book was that it 'was like a Christmas game'.

The *First Act of Uniformity* (*21st January 1549*) was actually much more tolerant than any similar legislation passed in Tudor times. We find it hard to believe that the idea of toleration in religious practice was for many generations of our forebears inconceivable. The Protector Somerset was a curious compound—but he, more than any of the Tudor monarchs, did believe moderately in the possibility of being tolerant.[3] By the Act all ministers throughout the realm 'shall, from and after the feast of Pentecost next coming, be bound to say and use the Matins, Evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, commonly called the Mass, and administration of each of the sacraments, and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book, and none other or otherwise'.

In the universities, at service in college chapels which were not also parish churches, the prayers of Matins, Evensong, and the Litany, could be said in Greek, Latin, or Hebrew—and anyone using prayers in Matins and Evensong

[2] Reprinted in *Reflections in a Mirror*, Second Series (Macmillan).

[3] Vide Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, LXIX.

at his private devotions could translate them. No real hindrance to the flow of reform could be offered by such permission. It would have been very different if the Lord's Supper had been permitted in a tongue other than English. There need have been no rebellion in Cornwall if the Latin celebration had been allowed—but that service, so long associated with Transubstantiation, could never anywhere be permitted.

The old service books were called in and destroyed—missals, breviaries, processionals (litanies), ordinals, grayles (graduals), and legends (of the Saints). Hitherto in England there had been several 'uses'. A Northerner coming South would—if he were a priest or educated man—note the differences in the words of the services. More obviously anyone could see unfamiliar details of ceremonial. Easily the most widely established ordering of worship followed the venerable *Use of Sarum*[4] of which many editions had been printed. The uses of *York* and *Hereford* were also printed, though their vogue was much less extensive, but those of *Bangor* and *Lincoln* had not gained print at all. Four years before the death of Henry the Eighth Convocation had legislated for the *Sarum Breviary* to be used in the whole province of Canterbury, so that the way had been prepared for uniformity of worship—at least in the more populous South.

It was intended that all the material for worship should be found in the *Prayer Book* and the Bible. In the 1549 book the Proper Psalms and Lessons for feast days were printed with the Collects, Epistles, and Gospels; there was an Order of the Psalms for the month, and a calendar of Lessons for the year. Psalms and Lessons alike were to be taken from the Bible (the Great Bible of 1538) which had become familiar during the previous decade.

> Furthermore, by this ordre, the curates shal nede none other bookes for their publique seruice, but this boke and the Bible; by the meanes whereof, the people shal not be at so great charge for bookes, as in tyme past they haue been (The Preface).

The most familiar public acts of worship to the majority of Englishmen are those of Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Communion Service. Traditionally associated with the former is the Litany. It was printed in the 1549 book immediately after the Communion Service. The Litany had been issued five years earlier, and was, therefore, the first great English liturgical act to become well known, and is the oldest composition in the 1549 book. This may be a fitting place to pay tribute to it. It has remained substantially the same to this day.

Nothing that Cranmer ever composed more completely revealed his unique liturgical sense. He drew upon many sources. Litanies were commonly used in the Middle Ages, sung in processions, and the opportunity provided for Cranmer came when Henry the Eighth was going to war against the Scots and the French. His faithful archbishop furnished him with an exhortation to prayer, a litany, and suffrages, for use in processions. For this Cranmer turned not only to the *Sarum Processional* but incorporated material (chiefly intercessions) from Luther's Litany (itself a fine piece of reformed liturgy).[5] He also

[4] Codified by Richd. Le Poor, Bishop of Salisbury, 1217.

[5] Vide *Luther's Works*, Vol. VI, p. 249 (Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia).

used the Orthodox Greek Liturgy, whence he brought into English worship the now familiar prayer of St. Chrysostom which modern choirboys recognize so swiftly as marking the end of Morning and Evening Prayer as well as concluding the Litany. In its 1549 edition there are, naturally, no invocations of the Saints. The *Prayer Book* as a whole was by no means strong enough in its Protestantism to please all Cranmer's friends, but they must have relished the deprecation for deliverance

From all sedicion and priuye conspiracie, from the tyrannye of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities.

Familiar as the Litany is, however, Morning and Evening Prayer are the services best known in this land. They are known and cherished not only by members of the Anglican Communion; many Free Churchmen think of them as available for their devotional use in public and in private. Both Dr. Orchard's *Divine Service*[6] and the *Free Church Book of Common Prayer*[7] establish that fact quite plainly. Among Methodists the slightly adapted 'Morning Prayer' is still to be found as the first of the authorized Offices and, with further alterations, as the second order of service in *Divine Worship*.[8] But the Litany, which remained in the Wesleyan *Book of Offices*, was inexplicably dropped in 1936. Thus the stream of praise and intercession from Cranmer's 'well of English undefiled' has flowed far and wide to be respected and used by thousands of men in traditions never compassed by the successive *Acts of Uniformity* which were inevitably doomed to failure through the virile independence of Puritans.

The Methodist, deriving as he does from the Brothers Wesley, can scarcely prevent himself from being a lover of these orders of service, even though the use of John Wesley's slight abridgement of Morning Prayer may be found in fewer churches today than fifty years ago, and one never hears of its being formally tied to the regular worship of newly built churches. But if the whole service is not often used, extracts from it are increasingly embodied in the 'free' ordering of worship, and pastoral experience shows that broadcasting has made the prayers well-loved by hosts of folk who never in their youth went to the parish church because they 'belonged to the chapel'.

In framing his orders for *Mattins* and *Evensong* (so they were entitled in the book of 1549) Cranmer and his friends were following a long-established precedent by which various offices were combined, so that, instead of eight separate occasions for worship in the day, two would suffice, one in the morning, the other in the evening. The *Use of Sarum* was followed fairly closely, and *Mattins* came from the older *Mattins*, *Lauds*, and *Prime*. When we sing the *Venite* or *Te Deum* we are using chants which traditionally belonged to *Mattins* in pre-Reformation days, while the *Benedictus* and the Collect for the Day come from *Lauds*. The *Quicunque Vult*, used at great festivals, is borrowed from *Prime*, the *Preces* are from *Lauds* and *Prime*, the second collect (for peace—'O God, which art author of peace, and lover of concorde') is Gelasian in origin, coming to the book through the *Lauds* of the Blessed Virgin. The well-loved 'Thyrde Collecte: for grace' ('O Lorde oure heavenly father, almightye and everlivyng God, whiche haste safelye brought us to the beginning of this day')

[6] Oxford (1919). [7] Dent (1929). [8] The Epworth Press (1935).

was a ferial collect from the *Sarum Prime*, going farther back for its origins in Alcuin's *Sacramentary*).

This service ends with the three collects, and so did *Evensong* which would be used chiefly in the afternoon. Neither had the opening sentences, exhortation, general confession, and absolution, now so well known. These came in with Cranmer's more Protestant book in 1552. *Magnificat* and the Collect for the day came from Vespers, and *Nunc Dimittis*, the Creed and Third Collect ('for ayde agaynste all perils'), 'Lyghten our darkness', were brought in from *Compline*. That glorious Third Collect is from the Gelasian *Sacramentary*, as is the Second Collect ('O God, from whom all holy desyres, all good counsayles, and all iuste workes do procede') and came, with the *Preces*, from Vespers.

It is, as we would expect, in the service used for Holy Communion that we notice the most conspicuous differences between the 1549 book and that which is in use today. Until the death of Henry the Eighth no marked change had been made in the celebration of the Mass. It would have been more than a man's life was worth to tempt Henry away from the traditional ceremonies and doctrines of which he counted himself the defender. If Henry was sincere on any point at all it was on this, that he adhered to the Catholic faith. The Pope was another matter altogether. But Henry was never blind to anything that was stirring about him, and he knew well enough that Cranmer was more of a Protestant than his king would let him be. He was well aware of the Archbishop's acute discomfort under the constraint imposed by the *Six Articles* —and those articles were unrepealed at his death.

The book of 1549 represents an intermediate position. Modern Anglo-Catholics much prefer it to the book they are supposed by law to venerate because it is never definitely Protestant, and in many respects can be reckoned close to the older tradition. If this were not so it is hard to appreciate why another book should have been issued, within three years. The truth is that the 1549 book fell far short of the pressing demands of the Protestant party, and it could not, in the nature of things, ever satisfy a conservative Catholic. We are fond, in these days, of imagining the existence of people then who were somewhat similar in their views to modern Anglo-Catholics: it is very doubtful whether such a religious position would have been taken up voluntarily. Men did believe in uniformity, and even in compelling others to worship as they did. The only brake upon their full design was the actual or potential resistance of people more powerful than themselves. The difference between the 1549 book and that which followed in 1552 is both a revelation of the Protestant party's dissatisfaction and of the lengths to which they were prepared to go. It is universally acknowledged that the 1552 book marks the extreme limit of definite Protestantism in official liturgy—and the famous Black Rubric marks the full reach of the tide of reform. When Elizabeth came to the throne she continued the use of almost all the contents and practices of the 1552 book—but not the Black Rubric, which had been added after Parliament had sanctioned the book, and denied

that any adoracion is doone or oughte to be doone eyther unto the Sacramentall bread or wyne there bodily receyved, or unto anye reall and essencial presence there beeying of Christ's naturall fleshe and bloude.

She and Archbishop Matthew Parker knew well enough that a rubric of that sort would scarcely enable them successfully to bring the nation down a broad and convenient *via media.*

The first conspicuous difference that would catch the attention of a modern Anglican or Methodist (whose order holds very close to the *Book of Common Prayer*) would be the repetition of the *Gloria* almost at the beginning of the service, as in the Mass. Thereafter he would wonder vaguely what had happened, for many acts and words would be familiar to him, but not the order of their appearing. Cranmer was following the Canon of the Mass much more definitely in 1549 than later and there can be no doubt that he was ill at ease with this 'Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse'. A comparison of the rubrics in the two books is interesting. Salient points show the major differences in permitted ceremonial as well as the more obvious Protestantism of the 1552 book.

So far as apparel is concerned the first *Prayer Book* directs that 'the Priest that shal execute the holy ministery, shal put upon him the vesture appoincted for that ministracion, that is to saye; a white Albe plain, with a vestement or Cope'. But what is 'a vestement'? This is the kind of rubric which leaves open the two possibilities of holding that it was intended to continue in general the practice of celebrating the Communion in the old traditional Catholic vestments, 'vestment' being taken to represent 'chasuble, stole, and maniple'; but it might convey the Lutheran meaning of chasuble without stole or maniple.[9] There is no rubric giving details as to the dress of the celebrant in the 1552 order, but whereas in 1549 we visualize 'The Priest standing humbly afore the middes of the Altar', by 1552 he is 'standing at the North syde of the Table'—the table, moreover, is placed either in the body of the church or in the chancel where Morning and Evening Prayer are said.

It is at the heart of the Liturgy that we see how greatly the 1549 book was nearer the older practices and beliefs. After the Creed comes the exhortation, much of which remains with us, the Offertory, *Sursum Corda* and *Sanctus.* Much of the later prayer for the Church Militant merges into the prayer of consecration—but the reference to 'the glorious and moste blessed virgin Mary, mother of thy sonne Jesu Christe' strikes strangely upon a modern worshipper as well as the prescribed crossing at the blessing of the elements. Then comes the prayer of self-offering ('Here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves') now used after the Communion. In this instance one cannot help regretting that the prayer was not retained in its 1549 position—the aptness of the words and the spiritual action implied by them are so fitting to that point of advance in the worship.

A comparison between the words of administration and rubrics of 1549 with those of 1552 bares the heart of the whole matter and shows how Cranmer and his friends, or Cranmer, because of his friends, had moved for the establishment of a definitely Protestant rite. The phrase 'Goddes bord' is in both books just before the Prayer of Humble Access. The differences leap to the eye if the sentences are set out thus:

[9] Brightman and Mackenzie, *Liturgy and Worship* (S.P.C.K.), p. 157.

1549	1552
Then shall the Prieste first receive the Communion in both kindes himself . . . and after to the people. *And when he delivereth the Sacramente of the body of Christe he shall say to every one these woordes.*	*Then shall the minister first receyve the Communion in both kindes hymselfe . . . and after to the people in their handes kneling.* *And when he delyvereth the bread, he shall saye,*
The body of our Lord Jesus Christe whiche was geven for thee, preserve thy bodye and soul unto everlasting lyfe.	Take and eate this, in remembraunce that Christ dyed for thee, and feede on him in thy hearte by faythe, with thankesgeving.
And the Minister delivering the Sacrament of the bloud, and geving every one to drinke once and no more, shall say,	*And the Minister that delyvereth the cup, shall saye,*
The bloud of our Lord Jesus Christe which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soule unto everlastyng lyfe.	Drinke this in remembraunce that Christ's bloude was shed for thee, and be thankefull.

Catholic doctrine is not advocated but is allowable in connexion with the 1549 celebration. The bread is to be 'unleauened, and rounde' (wafer) '*and menne must not thynke lesse to be receyued in parte than in the whole, but in eache of them the whole body of our saviour Jesus Christ*'. This consorts completely with the holding of the doctrine of transubstantiation by the celebrant or the communicant. Moreover, this possibility—but with an implied hope that it may be otherwise—is implicit in the following half-comment, half-direction: '*It is thought convenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christes body, in their mouthes, at the Priestes hande.*'

Froude[10] commented on the move toward a more completely reformed rite. 'In a few sentences only, inserted apparently under the influence of Ridley, doctrinal theories were pressed beyond the point to which opinion was legitimately gravitating. The priest was converted absolutely into a minister, the altar into a table, the eucharist into a commemoration, and a commemoration only.' According to the instructions of 1552 the bread was to be similar to that in domestic use, provided that it were 'the best and purest wheate bread, that conveniently maye be gotten'. If any bread or wine remained, the Curate should have it for his own use. Add to these the Black Rubric already noticed and we have evidence of the distance travelled between 1549 and 1552. Elizabeth in 1559 would leave possible a wide range of interpretations by adding the 1552 words of administration to those of 1549, as they still appear:

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul to everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

Theologians have a happy hunting-ground for discovery and debate in the services which are appointed for use in the worship of any branch of the Church: but in hard fact theologians never obtained the grip upon the worship

[10] *Edward the Sixth*, Chapter 5.

of Englishmen comparable with that of Knox in Scotland. The word 'liturgy' today signifies in the more Catholic schools of thought the service of the Sacrament of the Altar. But for many generations, and still obtaining among lay worshippers and evangelical ministers, the term applies equally to the services associated with morning and evening worship. It may be questioned seriously whether in the towns and countryside of England the majority in any of the non-Roman communions instinctively think of the Eucharist as the central and distinctive service of Christian worship. The celebration of the Holy Communion swiftly fell away into occasional use and emphasis lay upon the services derived from the Choir Offices with the addendum of preaching. We have to thank the Methodist revival of the eighteenth century and the Oxford Movement in the nineteenth century for the reawakening of men to the value of frequent Holy Communion. Methodists, as well as Anglicans, think of the words of that service instinctively in the forms of prayer that began to be used in 1549. It is well known that the early Dissenters broke away from the use of the *Prayer Book*. It was otherwise with the early Methodists, and Wesley's famous abridgement and revision of the order for Morning Prayer was the only possible alternative, in his view, to the service of the parish church. Not that he was in full assent to every jot and tittle. His letter to Samuel Walker, 20th November 1755, contains the words:

> Those ministers who truly feared God near an hundred years ago had undoubtedly much the same objections to the Liturgy which some (who never read their Works) have now. And I myself so far allow the force of several of those objections that I should not dare to declare my assent and consent to that book in the terms prescribed. Indeed, they are so strong that I think they cannot safely be used with regard to any book but the Bible. Neither dare I confine myself wholly to forms of prayer, not even in the church. I use, indeed, all the forms; but I frequently add extemporary prayer either before or after sermon.[11]

John Wesley was contending for a sound principle there, even though we may marvel at the fullness of the diet of worship which was implied, for the Office of Mattins, 1549, is a lot shorter than Morning Prayer in the 1662 book which Wesley used. His followers, however, did not everywhere hold to his wishes, and for several generations a typical Methodist service has not followed his, or any subsequent revision, of Morning Prayer. The reading of full Morning Prayer is a diminishing practice among us, but the loyalty to the liturgy for Holy Communion is assured, and today there is a true revival of interest among our younger ministers in the prayers which had been traditional for two hundred years when Wesley was in the prime of his ministry. Moreover, while the practice of using the full order for Holy Communion, with sermon, is growing in Methodist churches, there is also an increased use of collects and responsive worship in other services. The daily devotions and weekly services broadcast by the B.B.C. widen the influence of the language and forms which were first spoken in Tudor England.

Quite separate from the regular rhythm of the Church's public worship are those occasions of joy and grief when men gather for a wedding or a funeral. The mind is never more susceptible to the beauty of language or more retentive

[11] *The Letters of John Wesley*, III. 152 (Standard edition, The Epworth Press).

of what is offered from man to God, or in advice and comfort conveyed from God to man. It is in these offices of deepest significance for personal experience that Cranmer has reached his widest audience. The phrases mingle down the ages in the memories of all sorts and conditions of men. The questions are still put: 'Wilt thou have this woman to thy wedded wife . . . and forsaking all other keep thee only to her, so long as ye both shall live?' Shakespeare of Stratford, a boy of eighteen, and the Duke of Edinburgh in Westminster Abbey, marrying Princess Elizabeth, both said, with slightly different pronunciation: 'With this ring I thee wed . . . with my body I thee worship; and with all my worldly goods I thee endow.' The words keep their music for all who have gone out from cottage or castle to come home the richer with human love and the hopes that throng about the threshold of youth. And similarly the iron bell tolls unforgettably through the funeral service. With long-tried, realistic words, realistic in the fullest sense, which take account of spirituality, we make our earthly farewells—committing our loved ones 'to the grounde, earth to earth, asshes to asshes, dust to dust, in sure and certayne hope of resurreccion to eternal lyfe, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall chaunge our vile body that it may be lyke to his glorious body'. The words are Cranmer's, or, if not his own, touched and approved, given their final superb setting by him—and if we quarrel with the archaic 'vile body', do we honestly not understand what is meant?

Our language was moving toward its greatest fashion and ability in 1549. More than fifty years would pass before the twin glories of Shakespeare's greatest tragedies and the Authorized Version would put the seal of perfection upon it. By chance one day Cranmer, as a Cambridge don, spoke words to a court official concerning the possibility of the divorce of Katherine. That was in a country house, and his opinion was reported to Henry the Eighth. From that time until his weary body was burned by Katherine's daughter, he was destined to be incessantly troubled with the problems of his dangerous and convulsed period. But yet, in matters of proper approach to God for the mass of his fellowmen in all their moods and needs, he possessed, as no one else has done, the gifts and diligence which could impart serenity, dignity, and adequate expression. There never has been anyone to equal Cranmer in making articulate the range of the English religious spirit in its public worship and family rites. Whatever his failures, as man or prelate, in that realm of achievement he reigns supreme.

HAROLD S. DARBY

JOHN GALSWORTHY AND THE DILEMMA OF LIBERALISM

IT WAS the misfortune of John Galsworthy that he was born about a hundred years too late. In the world of Thackeray and Trollope he would have been at home, for there you had an audience that took the general set-up of society pretty much for granted, and no questions asked. As the contemporary of Shaw and H. G. Wells he was out of step with the march of ideas. It was no longer possible to take anything for granted. People came at you brandishing marks of interrogation like scimitars, and demanding an answer—yes or no—on the spot; whereas the only possible answer, as you saw the matter, was—yes, *and* no. That was the infirmity of John Galsworthy; he saw that there are two sides to every question, and he could not make up his mind to come down on either.

And yet, was it an infirmity? It is possible to trace in his writings indications that he himself was uneasy about it. To play fair and hold the balance even between contending forces was all very well, but a sensitive and self-critical man, as Galsworthy was, could not help suspecting at times that it was only a way of rationalizing irresolution and finding excuses for doing nothing. A man gives himself away in his favourite phrases, and there is one phrase that crops up with some frequency in Galsworthy's writings; he speaks of people who 'want to make omelets without breaking eggs'. Galsworthy was uneasily conscious that the national omelet is not big enough to go round. He was genuinely troubled about it, all the more so because the share that had fallen to himself was a generous one; but he was not convinced that the drastic remedies that were confidently put forward would do more good than harm. Socialism promised fair shares all round, but some of the eggs that would have to be broken in the process were golden ones, and it would moreover involve the killing of the goose that laid them. Although he was a severe critic of the middle and upper classes, he could not doubt that their liquidation would be a loss to the national life; he would probably have said that, with all their faults, they were worth what they cost. The professional class, of which he himself was a member, has certainly put more into the common stock than it has taken out. He was not sure that the same could be said for the aristocracy, but he knew the value of breeding, in men as in horses, and was as loth to say farewell to the English gentleman as the Arab to his steed. His birth, his training, and every instinct of his nature, made root-and-branch solutions of the social problem repugnant to him.

He tried hard to see the other side, but he had no first-hand knowledge of what the struggle for existence means to those who bear the brunt of it, and he was too shy a man to get past the established social barriers. As far as that goes, he had enough social tact to realize that any attempt to force yourself in where you do not belong would be resented; the 'lower classes' have their pride, and expect you to know your place. With the best will in the world therefore he remained a sympathetic outsider. His attitude to the poor was kindly but slightly Olympian. His servants were servants—worthy creatures, often enough, like Mrs. Jones, the charwoman in *The Silver Box*—but inferiors, naturally.

That is not stressed, it is just taken for granted. He did not make fun of them as Thackeray did, yet somehow one has the feeling that there was more humanity in Thackeray's rather heavy guying than in Galsworthy's flickers of well-bred amusement. As for the working-classes, he was conscious that they had a case against society, and in one of the best of his plays, *Strife*, he laid himself out to state it for them. He had been trained for the Bar and was willing to place his skill in advocacy at their disposal. But it alarmed him to find that they did not welcome such well-meant attempts to act on their behalf; they were determined to conduct their own case. That was foolish of them, to say the least; they did not understand the rules of procedure, and ran the risk of spoiling a good case by unseemly behaviour in court. At heart he distrusted popular movements; he saw, looming up behind them, the menace of mob rule. The rise of the Labour Party was a disturbing fact, and the General Strike of 1926 filled him with alarm. Long before that time however he had read the omens with dismay. In *The Patrician*, written in 1910, he makes Miltoun exclaim: 'The mob! how I loathe it! I hate its mean stupidities, I hate the sound of its voice, and the look on its face—it's so ugly, it's so little!' It would of course be wrong to ascribe to a novelist the sentiments he puts into the mouths of his characters, but he cannot altogether conceal his own opinions, and there is no doubt that Galsworthy dreaded the consequences of any social upheaval that would put power into the hands of men whose politics were poisoned by a sense of grievance. To put it on no higher ground, the ruling classes would do well to make concessions in their own interests; reform is the price that must be paid to buy off revolution. Let sleeping dogs lie as long as possible, but when they do wake up give them a biscuit and take them for a run on the lead, lest they snap at you. Galsworthy would never have put it as cynically as that, but at bottom it is what his social philosophy comes to.

It must be admitted that one is sometimes inclined to lose patience with him. This gingerly approach, this tentative flicking at the ball without ever hitting it, gets you nowhere. His intentions are amiable, but he has no nerve, and his social sympathies too often vaporize into do-nothing sentimentality. That was the point of Max Beerbohm's cruel little skit in *A Christmas Garland*, a parody which exactly catches the spirit and style of Galsworthy at his weakest—in *The Island Pharisees*, for example. But a case may still be a good one, even when it is feebly stated. Since Galsworthy's time we have had enough experience of desperate measures, revolutions of the Right and revolutions of the Left, to make us see that when politics goes berserk nothing but ruin can come of it. Reformers in a hurry are impatient of counsels of caution; moderation is regarded as time-serving, the nice balancing of pros and cons is taken for mental cowardice, to distrust theories and to suggest that cleverness is not necessarily wisdom is to declare yourself bankrupt of ideas. Galsworthy lays himself open to all these charges, but that is not to say that he can be dismissed without a hearing.

It is in fact the dilemma in which Liberalism always finds itself in an age of crisis and revolution. Not that Galsworthy was a Liberal in the party sense—he does not seem to have taken much interest in organized politics. In the broad sense however he must be classed as a liberal, with an instinctive distaste for extreme opinions and violent measures, combining a forward outlook with

a sense of the past, conceiving of society as an organism, capable of adapting itself in response to new demands and a changing environment, but proceeding on a sense of what is possible rather than on theory. In normal times this is a view for which there is much to be said, but when the world has been shaken to its foundations, as it has been in our own catastrophic century, it seems a little unreal. When the continuity of history has been ruptured it is beside the mark to talk about building on the past. We have lost contact with the past. We are castaways marooned in a sea of desolation. Neither the old Liberalism nor the old Toryism has any relevance to the new situation; they are anachronistic. The Conservative has nothing to conserve. He has become a figure of fantasy, like the old nurse in Miss Rose Macaulay's *Orphan Island*, living in a trance of Victorian memories and blissfully unaware that Queen Victoria is as dead as Queen Anne. And the Liberal, still trying to carry on in his special line of business—improvements on the instalment system—is equally blind to the facts of the case. You cannot improve that which has ceased to exist. We have to begin all over again; at the end of the second Christian millennium we find ourselves in the Year One.

But when you have said all this, one thing remains, and it is the thing on which Galsworthy chiefly insisted. At bottom society is held together not by legal and political institutions, not by economic devices or any other form of organization, important though these are, but by the moral cohesion of the common virtues. The things that are indispensable to any community are quite simple—sympathy, charity, fair play, tolerance, the consideration that one man owes to another. Almost any system will hold together as long as these binding-forces are at work, but when these fail a moral dry rot sets in that eats at the foundations of society. It is no use designing a new superstructure, as the theorists love to do, if this root trouble is ignored. Not a very profound or original message, it will be said, but fundamental truths always seem a little trite. It is not because he had nothing new to say that Galsworthy gives an impression of ineffectiveness, but because he was deficient in moral passion and therefore unable to drive it home. His friend Joseph Conrad put his finger on the spot; in a letter to Galsworthy about one of his books he wrote: 'For that is, my dear Jack, what you are—a humanitarian moralist. This fact . . . may prevent the concentration of effort in one single direction, because your art will always be trying to assert itself against the impulse of your moral feelings. . . . A moralist must present us with a gospel—he must give counsel, not to our reason or sentiment, but to our very soul. Do you feel in yourself the stature for that task? That you must meditate over with great seriousness—because, my dear Jack, because it is in you to be a great novelist.'

There, exactly, Galsworthy's weakness lies. He was a humane and serious man whose moral interests were too lively to be suppressed, but he was no prophet. He was, to use a phrase of his own, a skin short—too fastidious by nature and too much protected by the easy circumstances of his life to throw himself into the hurly-burly where blows are given and received. He never got over the initial handicap of Harrow and Oxford; he had no fire in his belly. If he had been roused by a strong religious conviction—if there had been anything that he believed in passionately—he might have kindled; as it was, he had nothing much beyond the morality of good taste. He deprecated bad

conduct because it was barbarous; civilized people do not behave in that way. It hurt him to see people at loggerheads—all this rancour, these slanging-matches, this trying to do one another down—it is all so low, so *common*. The members of his own class especially ought to have known better, and it moved him as nearly to anger as he ever got to perceive that they, with all their advantages, were often as thick-skinned, as inconsiderate, as deficient in essential good manners—in spite of their observance of the social rules—as the vulgarians who tried to push their way in where they were not wanted. That he dealt faithfully with them is to his credit, but the argument is never lifted high enough.

In the end he gave it up altogether. That is the significance of his treatment of Soames Forsyte, 'the man of property'. He set out to hold him up as the embodiment of the possessive instinct, clutching at everything without knowing that there are some things that can never be *possessed*, only served and hallowed —clutching at beauty, that elusive visitant of the waiting soul, in the person of Irene his wife—but in the end losing it, because beauty was not valued for its own sake, as a thing that is precious and holy, but only as something which it was gratifying to own. He had profaned the shrine, as the inordinate man always does, and the conclusion should have been fearlessly enforced—that, like Esau, he was rejected, and found no place of repentance, though he sought it diligently with tears. That is indeed what Galsworthy intended that we should learn when he wrote the first part of *The Forsyte Saga*. But when, years later, he took up his parable again, his attitude to Soames had undergone a change. The man of property has become a sympathetic character, and we are made to feel that we must not be too hard on him. If he could not keep the best thing that ever came into his life, property, good solid money and money's worth, has proved a great consoler, and Soames goes on his way mellowing in the sunshine of prosperity. We on our part find that we cannot keep up our moral disapprobation and begin to think that it was all a bit highfalutin', after all. One suspects that this is just how Galsworthy himself came to feel about his early attempts at moral crusading. They petered out in the end; there was no sustaining force of conviction to keep them alive.

What had happened, in short, was just what Conrad had foreseen; the artist got the better of the moralist in Galsworthy. He had attempted a role for which he had not the moral stature. He appealed to the better sentiments of his audience, supposing that the wild sea of human passions could be contained by a dyke of reeds; and because he saw the problem only as a question of sentiment he did not, could not, speak to their very souls. That is where he falls below some of his contemporaries. He had things to say that went nearer to the heart of the social problem than Wells or Shaw ever quite came, but he was not fired as they were by apostolic faith and zeal. It is what Chesterton was always saying; nothing but a fixed belief sets a man at liberty and enables him to act with all the energies of his soul.

Any lasting significance that Galsworthy may have therefore will not be that of a man with a message, but that of an artist. He has left behind him a sensitive record of certain aspects of English society in a period of rapid and agitating change. For this task, the very qualities that inhibited him as a leader of thought were his chief asset. In particular, the balance of his mind

and his instinctive sense of form stood him in good stead, for they served to impose a shape on all his work, and notably on his work for the theatre. When he first came to the theatre in 1906 he had been writing fiction for nine years and had six volumes—short stories and novels—to his credit. It was in 1905 that it was suggested to him by Edward Garnett—that assiduous midwife of emerging men of letters—that he should write a play for the Vedrenne-Barker management at the Court Theatre which was doing so much to place serious drama before the public. Galsworthy at first refused. He felt that the novel was his *métier*; having enjoyed the freedom of its loose and flexible technique, he thought that he would be unable to express himself within the more exacting limitations of the stage. But the next year he decided after all to try his hand, and in six weeks he produced a play, *The Silver Box*, which is a model of dramatic construction.

Miss Sheila Kaye-Smith, in a short but penetrating study of Galsworthy written as long ago as 1916, expressed the opinion that he was a better playwright than novelist. At that time it was probably a correct estimate, for so far he had produced nothing in fiction, apart from *The Man of Property*, which made it seem at all likely that he would eventually win a place among the major English novelists. It was only gradually that he attained his mastery in the art of fiction, but he came to the drama as to the manner born. In her essay Miss Kaye-Smith calls attention to two dramatic qualities in which Galsworthy was pre-eminent: a sense of situation, and a sense of balance. The plays are constructed, as it were, round a central idea. A certain situation is placed before the audience, and that situation states and defines a problem—usually a moral problem; it is then worked out in the unfolding of the plot. It is not brought up in the dialogue, so that the action of the play is not held up by endless discussion, as it too often is in the 'static' drama of Shaw—in *Getting Married* for example—where over-conscious people argue for argument's sake. We see the problem in terms of life and action, as a struggle of human wills or a blind conflict of passions. His moral emerges clearly enough in the minds of the spectators, though it is possible to believe that the persons chiefly concerned, the protagonists who have fought the matter out, suffer and strive without seeing any meaning whatever in the struggle. No one for example could possibly miss the point of *The Silver Box*, to take that again; it is, that there is one law for the rich and another for the poor. But it emerges purely from the action of the play; the idea is embodied in the situation.

The second dramatic quality which Miss Kaye-Smith distinguishes is his sense of balance. In one respect this is only a particular aspect of his mastery of dramatic situation. The two sides of the question are presented by people, or groups of people, who divide our sympathies pretty equally, for each has a case and each is right from his own point of view. To say that Galsworthy does not deal in simple contrasts of good and evil is merely to say that he was a serious dramatist and not a purveyor of melodrama for the million. But it often means that the play is inconclusive. When all is said and done the question is still left open; the impression that is left with us is that well-meaning people waste themselves to no purpose, that strife is barren and passion a beating of the air. A little reasonableness, an effort to see the other point of view, a concession on one side and a point yielded on the other, and men might

live together on tolerable terms. But life is not like that; and though as a moralist Galsworthy wishes to show how wrong and deplorable this is, as a playwright he could hardly wish it otherwise. In human affairs the springs of action lie deeper than reason. It is not until the passions are assuaged or have spent themselves that men find peace, and then only for a little while. It is by the balancing of passions, by swinging our sympathies first to one side and then to the other, that he gets his dramatic effects, and for this purpose he has to make us see that motives are always mixed, and good and evil are to be found in both scales of the balance.

It is of the essence of drama that it is concerned less with individual character than with personal relationships, with the way that men and women act and react one upon another. The attention of the spectator is directed to what they *do* rather than to what they *are*. Character and psychology, while they have their place, are subordinate to action, and we only get such glimpses of them as the action of the play may serve to bring out. In drama, that is to say, everything is seen from the outside. It is the business of the playwright to place a set of persons and a series of events before an audience, and he must therefore write strictly from their point of view; his desk must, so to speak, be in the stalls. He too is in the position of an observer, carefully recording what takes place, but with no more access to the underlying springs of action than any other interested onlooker. If, disregarding the limitations of the theatre, he attempts to probe more deeply, to analyse motives or explore the hidden workings of the mind, he can only do so by resorting, as Shakespeare did, to the doubtful expedient of the soliloquy. But it is very difficult to dramatize a train of thought; there is only one *Hamlet*, and it is unlikely that there will ever be another.

These limitations suited Galsworthy very well. His main interest was in human relationships. He was always an interested spectator of the human scene, but he was not gifted with the psychological penetration that sees deeply into the minds of men. One has the feeling that his short-sightedness was not only physical but mental; he did not see people distinctly, as individuals, but as social types, as members of a class or of a family. We recognize them by certain outward marks, of dress, of manner, of accent; we can tell whether they come out of the top drawer or some lower one, but beyond such general impressions we do not seem to know them very well. In the theatre this does not greatly matter, for the missing dimension, the quality of depth and solidity, is supplied by the actors. But in a novel something more is expected. The characters ought to be endowed with *character*, they should exist as individuals, with an inward as well as an outward life. Galsworthy's principal weakness lies here; he does not seem to know his people from the inside. A reviewer once described him as the half-brother of Sargent, and predicted that he would last about as long. In fact, he has lasted longer, but all the same it was an apt comparison; he often succeeds in producing a striking likeness, but the evocative touch which turns a portrait into a revelation is beyond him. Even Soames, the most completely realized of all Galsworthy's people, exists chiefly in relation to other people. He is the son of James, the husband of Irene and of Annette, the father of Fleur. *The Forsyte Saga* is well named; a saga is more concerned with events than with character.

It is then as the chronicler of the Forsyte clan that he is most likely to be remembered. Here he was on his own ground. This was the sort of stock from which he himself had come, and in fact the family history of the Galsworthys supplied many hints which he was able to work up into the *Saga*. Indeed, when *A Man of Property* was first published, his sister was shocked to recognize unmistakable portraits of the numerous uncles and aunts of the family. Like the Forsytes, their roots were in the West Country, where they lived for generations as obscure yeomen until Galsworthy's grandfather, the founder of the family fortunes, broke away and became a merchant and shipowner in Devonport, afterwards moving to London where, following a Forsytean instinct for security and permanence, he invested his money soundly in house property. Of his ten children, all but one lived to be well over eighty—the famous Forsyte 'tenacity'; all of them had the Victorian solidity of character which made for success in business and the professions, and all seem to have held the simple philosophy that prosperity was clear evidence of sound principles of conduct. It goes without saying that respectability was a religion with them. Galsworthy's father (the original of 'old Jolyon') was the principal of a legal firm with a respectable and lucrative practice, and it was intended that the son should carry on the family tradition, but in the higher branch of the profession. Accordingly, after Harrow (where he made his mark both in work and play) and Oxford (where he took things easy), he read for the Bar, and was called at Lincoln's Inn in 1890.

It not infrequently happens that out of such a soil as this, rich, but stiff and clayey, an exotic plant unaccountably emerges. Two events deflected Galsworthy from the course marked out for him. Before settling down to practise law he made a voyage to Australia, and it happened that the chief mate of one of the ships in which he sailed was Joseph Conrad, who not only became his life-long friend, but turned his thoughts for the first time toward literature. Then, some time after his return, he fell passionately in love with the lady who became his wife. Their first meeting was on the occasion of her marriage with Galsworthy's cousin. The attraction was instantaneous on both sides, and it was followed by a long unhappy period of struggle and yielding, which was ended at last by her divorce from her husband. The Bosinney of *The Forsyte Saga* was in fact the Galsworthy of real life.

A leading theme in Galsworthy's novels is the incursion of some alien influence into the life of a stolid family. In *The Forsyte Saga* it is Bosinney the artist and Irene the wraith-like pagan nymph. In *The Freelands* it is the flaming idealism of the Highland woman brought into the family by one of the brothers, and of the children with the blood of the Jacobites in their veins—the Celts in their everlasting feud with the Saxons. In other stories—notably *Beyond* and *Saint's Progress*—it is young love throwing its cap over the windmill. They suffer and are defeated, of course—those who fling themselves against the world are bound to fall back bruised. The compact middle-class is too well entrenched to be visibly unsettled by such lonely forays. But in fact it is not so impervious as it seems, for as often as not the rebellion is from within. The mere fact that it claims to be the backbone of society ought to serve as a reminder that it is not solid bone all through. It is the nerve-centre of the whole system—of all sections of society the most perceptive, the quickest to feel

the stimulus of pain or of joy. It organizes experience and shapes it into ideas, so that it is chiefly through the mouth of members of the middle-class that the wrongs and aspirations of the dumb masses find expression. Galsworthy was very conscious of this paradox. His own act of defiance had perhaps served to bring it home to him; and though it was a solitary act, and afterwards he was always a pattern of correctness, he never forgot it. He tried to be a Philistine, but idealism would keep breaking in.

It was these warring strains in his make-up that gave him the material on which he worked. He had the instincts of a gentleman, but the protective callousness which insulates them against disturbing thoughts was denied him. In particular, he had a sense of beauty which he was unable to suppress. It was rather like the furtive love that led Soames to collect pictures which he did not hang, for fear, as it seems, of giving himself away, but stacked with their faces to the wall. When he does turn it to the light, however, he writes with a tremulous emotion quite unlike his usual deliberately low-pitched style. It is notable that it is often to just those of his people who are least idealistic that the sudden revelations of beauty come—to old Jolyon musing in his garden, to Stanley Freeland motoring along the Worcestershire lanes, to Soames himself. However a man may blanket himself with material comfort, he is never quite secure. Something strange and visionary, something not altogether of this world, visits his dreams, and for a moment, if only for a moment, his soul stirs in its sleep. Closely associated with this is his sympathy with the young—so pathetically inexperienced, their nerves all on the surface, responding with rapture to the first breath of passion that sweeps across them, but no less exposed to suffering. As a rule some older person is at hand, a father usually, who is too wise to try to save them from themselves, but waits for the time to come when they will bring him their broken lives to mend. His pictures of the bond that may exist between a father and daughter are all done tenderly, but also with a certain wistfulness. A childless man himself, these fine-natured, generous girls were, one feels, his dream-children. But it is to be noted once more that he takes care that, when the crash comes, they are well provided for; and in this also he seems unconsciously to betray the division in his own mind. It is no doubt a fine thing to be reckless and uncalculating, as lovers and all children of the light are impelled to be, but a way of retreat should always be provided. Security is a good thing too, as you discover when you want something to break your fall. It is all very well to pour scorn on the Forsytes, but they are the people who hold the blanket. So, first to one side and then to the other, the mind of Galsworthy swings between idealism and prudence; he wants to eat his cake, but he cannot bring himself to part with it.

Another impulse that disturbs the complacency of the Forsyte world is an uneasy social conscience which, try as they will, they cannot put to sleep. This has been touched upon already. They cannot but be aware that, though it is a very good world for them, it is not the best of all possible worlds. In the Preface to *A Country House* he wrote: 'To think that birth, property, position—general superiority in sum—is anything but good luck, is, of course, ridiculous. But to see this too keenly, too introspectively, is to risk making a pet of self-distrust.' This was very much his own trouble, as he seems to admit when in the same place he says: 'In writing a preface one goes into the confessional.' He

warmly rejected the charge made by some of his critics that he was an advocate of revolution—and at this time of day it seems preposterous enough; but he could not conceal the misgivings which troubled not only his own mind, but those of many others who, however much they tried, could no longer take their privileges for granted. *Fiat justitia*—yes, but the rest of the quotation stuck in his throat; he was not prepared to push matters to extremes. He was only too much afraid that, if the foundations of society were at all seriously disturbed, the heavens would indeed fall!

In every way he was inhibited by his fastidious moderation. If it made it impossible for him to countenance revolution, it also caused him to shrink from religion. In a letter to Edward Garnett he says that he always had at the back of his mind 'the feeling of the utter disharmony of the Christian religion with the English character'. One might have supposed that Christianity in the Anglican version (the only one he was acquainted with) is moderate enough to suit the nicest taste, but he is always a bit querulous in his attitude to clergymen. They are either too worldly or too unworldly, and one is left wondering what he *did* want. The Reverend Hussell Barter will not do because his moral opinions are purely conventional, but neither will Michael Strangeways, a Christian *à outrance*, nor Edward Pierson, who is too innocent for words. It is a hard world for clergymen! He had the Englishman's dislike of dogma and religious institutions. God is 'a Something not ourselves', unknowable, yet felt at times when a man's defences are down and he yields himself up to the spirit of the universe. His strongest religious sentiment seems to have been a vague nature—mysticism, always mingled however with disturbing thoughts—a troubled sense of the indifference of nature, and of whatever may lie beyond nature, to the sufferings of men and of all sentient things, a suspicion that man too is but a part of nature and in the grip of necessity like the rest, a bleak foreboding of extinction. At the end of *Saint's Progress* there is a significant touch of symbolism. Noel, the clergyman's beloved daughter, has decided on a course of action which means that their ways must part. In the garden there is a goat chained to an iron stake, and her last act before leaving the house is to go out and set it free. It was Galsworthy's own choice; he was 'the good pagan', but it was to the god Pan that his heart went out.

Take it altogether, what Galsworthy has given us is a record of the twilight of the middle classes. He has traced the turn of the wheel from the time of their greatest ascendency in the last quarter of the nineteenth century to the time when it began to seem that they may yet suffer extinction. He died in 1933, when the revolution was still gradual and it was possible to believe that it could be braked by concession and adjustment, in the spirit of compromise that has so often saved England in the past. We were still self-contained, the English Channel was still a *cordon sanitaire* against the feverish politics of the Continent; and Mr. Baldwin would surely see us through.

But he was aware that the middle classes themselves were no longer to be relied on. They had a bad social conscience; numbers of them were going over to the attacking forces, and once they had crossed the lines they took charge of the revolution. Those who remained were careless of their defences. They were half convinced that their day was nearly over, and all they could do was to make the most of the short time left to them. That was the spirit of the

nineteen-twenties, when Galsworthy wrote *The White Monkey*. 'Eat the fruits of life, scatter the rinds, and get copped out doing it.' Galsworthy did not live to see them 'copped', but the year he died was the year when Hitler came to power.

W. S. HANDLEY JONES

THE GOLDEN AGE

THE GOLDEN AGE is a phrase of classical origin, describing an ideal state of man, on which the human race has always cast longing eyes.

The phrase, of course, is purely metaphorical, gold being taken symbolically as our popular standard of perfection in a world which is admittedly far from perfect, while even philosophers, both ancient and modern, finding the highest good in moderation, speak of a 'mean' which is 'golden'. Material gold, indeed, figures little, if at all, in the ideal set forth. It is definitely ruled out in the ideal states even of pagan writers, as stirring man's appetite and leading, with that other metal, iron, to all the strife and misery of mankind. There is indeed the remarkable exception of the New Jerusalem as described in the Apocalypse—'the city was of pure gold, like unto clear glass'—but even in this instance the language is the hyperbole of an imaginary vision.

Not that we can or should ignore the popular view of gold or its equivalent. That view is well expressed by Mr. Jacobs's Night Watchman. 'Speaking o' money,' said that philosopher of the wharf, as he sat on an empty soapbox, 'the whole world would be different, if we all 'ad more of it. It would be a brighter and a 'appier place for everybody.' But, of course, it is only what gold can buy that makes it worth having, as another sailor realized, Robinson Crusoe to wit, when he abandoned the gold he found in the wreck and chose the carpenter's tools.

Mere materialism will never satisfy man's spiritual nature. Man does not live by bread alone; and so, even to the least idealistic of men, the phrase 'the golden age' implies something not entirely or even primarily concerned with loaves and fishes, or even bread and circuses. From a surfeit of these man turns longingly to some ideal condition of things, some state of life, however vague, however remote, that seems likely to satisfy his spirit.

Two of our poets acutely diagnose—we might almost call them psychiatrists, in the best sense—the attitude of mind which evokes this dream-world of a golden age; Shelley, wistfully, and, as it were, regretfully:

We look before and after,
And pine for what is not;[1]

Shakespeare, more robustly, through the lips of Hamlet, and in justificatory wise:

[1] *To a Skylark.*

What is a man,
If his chief good and market of his time
Be but to sleep and feed? a beast, no more.
Sure he that made us with such large discourse,
Looking before and after, gave us not
That capability and god-like reason
To fust in us unus'd.[2]

Both poets emphasize the breadth of man's vision. He looks 'before and after', has prospect and retrospect, fore-sight and hind-sight. That, indeed, gives us the paradox of a golden age that may be set either in the past or the future. Discontent, deep dissatisfaction with the present, with things as they are, turns our glance backward or forward, as the case may urge. Only a super-optimist—a revolutionary or a Labour Government: or an autocrat—a Nebuchadrezzar or a Louis the Fourteenth—would ever see the Golden Age in the present. What is sought is elusive, a will o' the wisp, an El Dorado of our dreams, a mirage luring us forward or backward into a never-never land of fantasy. Even Orpheus cannot clasp his Eurydice.

The Golden Age is usually associated with mankind as a whole, or, at least, a race or nation. But the individual, too, may speak at least of golden years if not a golden age, such egotists are we. In that case the view is almost inevitably backward—to childhood and boyhood, with Kenneth Graeme and Thomas Gray, to the halcyon days of youth, the age of innocence and freedom from all responsibility, the days of Peter Pan; or, with those two Shakespearean kings, who, looking back, could say,

We were, fair queen,
Two lads that thought there was no more behind
But such a day tomorrow as today,
And to be boy eternal,[3]

or, farther still, with Wordsworth, to that heaven which lies about us in our infancy.

In old age the retrospect may not go so far. We see again the days of our prime as our golden years, ourselves as golden lads or girls. We remember the days of our enthusiasm and success, the heyday of vigour, the triumphs of the class-room or the sports field, at college or school. A Swift exclaims on the genius he had when he wrote a certain masterpiece; a Napoleon thinks of the sun of Austerlitz; a Disraeli remembers the Congress of Berlin and Bismarck's eulogium '*Ach der alte Jude, das ist der Mann*'; a Newman recalls the glories of his preaching at St. Mary's Oratory. Even ordinary folk may long for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still. This is the mood so beautifully described by the Greek word, nostalgia, that homesickness with a yearning that finds its final refuge in the heavenly home. The mood significantly abounds today in our literature and in our speech, proclaiming man's profound unhappiness and even pessimism. It has given rise to a whole school of writing which, deprecatingly and even apologetically, we designate 'escapism'.

[2] Act IV.iv.32. [3] *The Winter's Tale*, I.ii.62.

The individual's egotism fades in his look forward. He merges, loses himself in the vision of an ideal state which shall be for the benefit of all men. His drooping spirit revives, he finds compensation for all past disappointments and failures in depicting the world as he would fain refashion it—Plato in his *Republic*, More in his *Utopia*, Bacon in his *New Atlantis*, Butler in his *Erewhon*, Wells in his fantasies. Some are daring enough to try to realize their golden age by Acts of Parliament, or, more drastically, by violent revolution, French or Russian. These, in the words of Holy Writ, take the kingdom of heaven by violence.

Nor—such is human complacency, such their willingness to believe they have at some time or other attained, for however brief a period, to perfection—have men hesitated to describe certain phases of civilization as ages of gold.

We might disregard the egotistic claims of Nebuchadrezzar—'Is not this great Babylon which I have built?'—but we cannot so easily dismiss the insistence of the anonymous author all through the Book of Daniel on the glories of Babylon, even when he has in mind the greatness of the succeeding empires—Persian, Greek, Syrian, and Egyptian—and especially emphasized in his dream of the image with its head of gold—Babylon—while the other empires fade out in silver, brass, and feet of clay.

The world at large has agreed, and not merely the degenerate citizens of a later day, to acknowledge the age of Pericles—that brief, miraculous flowering of human genius—as the Golden Age of Athens. To Virgil and Horace, remembering the horrors of the Civil Wars, the reign of Augustus, when the gates of the temple of Janus were closed, seemed indeed to inaugurate a golden era of security and peace. More surprising is the verdict of so sober a judge as the emperor Trajan on the first five years of Nero's reign as a quinquennium of happiness, while Mr. Asquith thought the Age of the Antonines as probably the period of history when he would most have wished to be alive. The reign of Louis the Fourteenth, Louis le Soleil, is still accounted the golden age of France; and in England, in the sphere of literature, each of three queens—Elizabeth, Anne, Victoria—has had her reign apotheosed as a golden age. But indeed there is hardly a race or nation of any standing that does not acclaim some period of its history, whether in art or literature, music or painting, empire-building or inventions, a golden age.

But it is of the Golden Age in a larger sense than any of those so far mentioned, whether of individual or nation, that I would fain write, a Golden Age that is the airy nothing of the poet or philosopher, to which it is difficult, if not impossible, to give either a local habitation or a name. It is that Golden Age of which poets and philosophers have written and all men dreamt, an ideal age set, either in the past, when the world was young and human nature knew no sin, or in the future, when man should have attained to perfection.

It is indeed strange, pathetically strange, how the human race—not, mark you, a nation here or there, an odd dreamer of dreams—but the whole race seems to turn every now and then wistful, yearning eyes to the 'dark backward and abysm of time' and glimpse there a perfect setting for human life, and that life itself perfect or at least free from checks and fears, inhibitions and prohibitions, all negative emotions.

That is the undying charm of the Bible story of the Garden of Eden, the

most familiar instance that occurs at once to everyone. Man lives in a garden, in close communion with God. He has a mate, and both enjoy perfect freedom save for one taboo. Our English poet Milton has written with sublime eloquence of this Paradise—it is a literal garden—that is Lost, though his Christian faith leads him from the valley of humiliation to look to a Paradise—the garden is now metaphorical—that is Regained.

I have spoken of the vagueness of this Golden Age. We are unable to place it in time. We merely place it with confidence in the past. It belongs to that mysterious tense which so dominated our Latin and Greek studies at school —the Aorist. With the scepticism that comes with maturer years and closer contact with human nature we grow doubtful that there ever was such an age. 'The men of today', we exclaim, with superiority complex, 'are not like the men of yore', and then add, with smiling cynicism, 'they never were'.

What is of real interest, then, in this study of the Golden Age is the mind and attitude of the dreamer or creative artist. What he puts into his picture will reveal to us his idea and ideals. This must be the burden of our quest.

The Greeks and Romans, as well as the Hebrews, indeed the whole western Asiatic world, had this vision of a bygone golden age, with the notable exception of Aeschylus. He saw man's uprise into civilization, his emergence from primordial slime, with the stark realism of modern evolutionary theories. He makes the demi-god Prometheus the saviour of mankind:

> *They, at first, though seeing saw in vain;*
> *Hearing they heard not, but, like shapes in dreams,*
> *Through the long time all things at random mixed.*
> . . . . .
> *All arts to mortals from Prometheus came.*[4]

The whole passage in the *Prometheus Bound*, II.450–514, is a marvellous picture of man's first tentative gropings toward civilization.

But what the ancient writers, with this exception of Aeschylus, were agreed upon was the gradual deterioration of human nature from its pristine perfection or innocence. There were, said they, Four Ages of Man—Gold, Silver, Bronze, and Iron, the last (their frankness is amazing) their own degenerate, contemporary world.

I say the frankness of the pagan world's confession was amazing as it was devoid of the Hebrew sense of sin, original or derived. Sir William Ramsay used to tell his Latin class: 'The Romans had no word for "sin".'

What, then, were the characteristic marks of the pagan Age of Gold? Ovid's description, as given in the first book of his *Metamorphoses*, is very full and detailed. The supreme mark of the age, says the poet, was spontaneity. Things grew of their own accord. The earth unploughed yielded her fruits. Men enjoyed the fruits which grew without compulsion. Rivers flowed of milk and nectar, and honey distilled from the holm-oak. Towns were without walls or trenches. There were no soldiers, no swords, no threatful laws. Men respected faith and right without any rules or regulations. They were content to stay at home. No pine trees on the mountains were felled to make

[4] Anna Swanwick's translation.

ships to sail across the seas to visit foreign lands. There were not even the tools of husbandry, much less the instruments of war. There was only one season all the year round—spring; only one wind—the West.

Spontaneity, I repeat, voluntariness, doing what was right of one's own free will, of one's own accord, nature yielding abundance of food without man's effort—these were the hall-marks of Ovid's Golden Age; and, by contrast, the exact opposite of the age, the world he personally knew. That world was the world of the Civil Wars—was not the very year of his birth marked by the death of the two consuls of that year?—the world which the contemporary poet Catullus had proclaimed ruined by two men, Caesar and Pompey:

socer generque, perdidistis omnia.

Such was the golden age of a pagan world, a visionary dream, pathetically beautiful, but entirely amoral.

Not so the Golden Age of the Hebrew Bible, the so-called Garden of Eden. It, too, represented man in a state of perfect innocence, happy, carefree, but not subsisting without some conscious effort, inasmuch as he was living in what was specifically termed a Garden, which had accordingly to be cultivated. *Il faut cultiver notre jardin* is of older significance than philosophers usually think.

Both the pagan and the Hebrew idea of the Golden Age sprang from their discontent, their dissatisfaction with the world as they knew it. Ovid, any thoughtful pagan, must have been aware that society as he knew it was a broad-based pyramid, sustained by a vast slave-population, with a favoured élite at the top, enjoying the fruits of that slave-toil. Hence the poet's emphasis on a world that knew no toil. Similarly to a nomadic, pastoral folk, constantly seeking pastures new for their flocks, constantly preoccupied with the problem of watering these flocks, the ideal world was a paradise or garden, where herbage abounded and water was plentiful:

> And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food. . . . And a river went out of Eden to water the garden. . . . And the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it.[5]

But more had to be cultivated in the Garden of Eden than trees or herbs. Obedience and restraint had to be cultivated. One tree in particular was taboo, and to taste the fruit was forbidden. Here, then, was law, rule, regimentation, morality in embryo, we might almost say, Puritanism. The Hebrew Golden Age contained within it the seed of conflict, obedience or disobedience; and we all know the story how man fell from his state of innocence, out of that Golden Age, and how sin and death entered therewith into the world. Milton, as already said, has elaborated the theme in his epic of the Lost Garden.

The parallel between the two stories is very striking, and it continues. The pagan poet tells of the race of giants who attempted to scale heaven. The

[5] Genesis 2^{8-15} (A.V.).

Bible tells how there were giants in the earth in those days. The world in either case goes from bad to worse and finally is engulfed in a catastrophic flood. Mankind makes a fresh start. In the pagan version of the story it is Deucalion and Pyrrha who renew the species, in the Hebrew version it is Noah and his three sons. Troubles ensue, Pandora's Box in the one case, in the other the Tower of Babel. To sustain the pagan world there is left frail, tenuous Hope, so well portrayed in Watt's picture. The Hope of the Hebrew nation is much more robust. It takes definite shape as the hope or promise of a prince or saviour who shall redeem the nation, restore it to its pristine glory, in a word, to Paradise Regained. This is what is known as the Messianic hope, and it is the golden thread that runs through the Scriptures of the Old Testament.

The pagan world again went astray. It made bids at empire—Assyrian, Babylonian, Mede and Persian, Greek and Macedonian, Syrian and Egyptian, finally Rome, all to end in despair, as the poet Horace poignantly confesses:

Aetas parentum peior avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos
progeniem vitiosiorem.[6]

The Hebrew remained an optimist. He clung to his Messiah. Moses, the Prophets and the Psalmists, Balaam and Daniel, all looked to a golden age which should be inaugurated by Messiah. But it was still an earthly Paradise, and to the Jews who are not Christians it is still an earthly Paradise, the land of Palestine.

We come now to one of the great moments of history, the reign of the emperor Augustus, when thoughtful men like Horace and Virgil believed for a little that the Golden Age was come again. In that faith they wrote their poems; and one in particular, the *Fourth Eclogue* of Virgil, is acclaimed as a Messianic Ode, so startling are the parallels between its sentiments and many of the Messianic prophecies of Hebrew Scriptures. There will be born a child who shall renew the golden age with all the old marks of peace and security, freedom from toil, from war, from anxiety and care. The whole of creation shall enjoy peace.

We need not concern ourselves here how Virgil came to utter those sentiments. The fact remains that men's minds were filled with a longing for peace and security; and the innocence of childhood seemed the most natural focus for those aspirations. 'A little child shall lead them.'

It was at this moment in history that Christ was born and the bold claim made that he was the looked-for Messiah of Old Testament prophecy. 'The Word was made flesh and sojourned, tabernacled among us', wrote one of his followers. The Age of Gold was come in reality.

Thus there were two claimants in the field—Rome, the Eternal City, and Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God, with his teaching of a kingdom that was not of this world. Conflict, strife between the two claimants was inevitable. The whole universe, said another apostle, had groaned and travailed until now. It still groaned and travailed, and those who stayed their souls

[6] *Odes*, III.vi.46.

on the anchorage of Christianity had perforce—in compensation once more—to envisage a new heaven and a new earth, from which were banished all the ills and anguishments that tormented their present earthly lot; of which new heaven and new earth—remarkably in consonance with the pagan outlook and yearning—there was this conspicuous sign—there was no more sea. For the rest the Garden of the primeval, pastoral world was transformed—thanks, doubtless, to the infiltration of Greek and Roman ideas—into a City, four-square in dimensions, impregnable as any camp of Caesar, whose builder was God, and its streets—in compensation for the stunted, starved, impoverished life on earth—were of gold, and the gates were each a precious stone.

With the sack of Rome by Alaric and his Goths, and the overrunning and gradual disintegration of the empire by the barbarians, the Eternal City faded from men's eyes, and Saint Augustine pointed to a new City, his *Civitas Dei*, laid up in the heavens. Paradise, that is to say, was definitely transferred from earth to heaven just as the earthly Olympus of the Iliad became the heavenly Olympus of the Odyssey. The Galilean had conquered.

But still men have striven to remould the world to their heart's desire. They are impatient. The Celestial City is too far away from them. They will bring down the New Jerusalem from heaven to earth. So we have Rousseau with backward glance: 'Man was born free: everywhere he is in chains.' We have the French Revolution with its watchword: 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.' An event occurs, seemingly world-shattering, the Fall of the Bastille, and Charles Fox exclaims enthusiastically: 'How much the greatest event that has happened in the world, and how much the best!' Wordsworth writes:

Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven![7]

Burns sings of brotherhood and 'lay the proud usurpers low'. Coleridge and Southey form a wild scheme of migrating to America and founding there a Pantisocracy, an anticipation of Communism, a domestic Republic in which all property should be held in common, and the leisure of the workmen should be devoted to literature. There was a belief in idealism about all these men and their ideas. That cannot be said about the revolutions of our own age. Brute violence was the outstanding mark of Hitler's pretended millennium; and Communism is following the same road. But indeed all through the centuries the dream of a golden age has faded. Shelley's Ozymandias and the bricks of Babylon in the British Museum are the apt comment on man's vain aspirations:

Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre![8]

We walk with surer footing with the men of dreams, the seers and philosophers who have been content merely to write or sing of their ideal state, their golden age, if so be there may come to pass some slight fulfilment in the life of mankind. *Litera scripta manet.* It outlives brass and stone, brick and marble. So men turn still to the ideal states I have already mentioned, the

[7] *French Revolution, as it Appeared to Enthusiasts.* [8] Rudyard Kipling, *Recessional.*

Republic of Plato, the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More, Dante's *Paradiso*, Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Shelley's *New Hellas*, and Samuel Butler's *Erewhon*. Tennyson in early Victorian days,

> *dipt into the future, far as human eye could see,*
> *Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be;*
> . . . . .
> *Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battle-flags were furl'd*
> *In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world.*[9]

That was his forward look. Disillusioned, he was fain now to set his golden age in the dim historic and legendary past, making King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table his ideal state, though only a temporary one, open-mindedly averring that

> *God fulfils himself in many ways,*
> *Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.*[10]

So be it. We are still striving for world-peace and concord. But world wars past and to come rebuke all forecasts of a brave new world. Only when man realizes in perfect simplicity and humility, here and now, looking neither before nor after, that there is but one Open Sesame to the Golden Age—the Golden Rule—and without any expostulatory question, 'Who is my neighbour?', only then 'Time will run back and fetch the age of gold'.

J. MINTO ROBERTSON

[9] *Locksley Hall.* [10] *The Passing of Arthur.*

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE SOCIETY OF FRIENDS AND EARLY METHODISM

(*Continued from* p. 323, October 1948)

TROUBLES IN IRELAND

IRISH Friends had opened their hearts to John Cennick, a Methodist preacher turned Moravian, who went there in 1746, and also to the Wesleys, who followed in 1747. Quakers were to be met in Dublin at Mr. Lunell's home, an open house for Methodists. There was Gharret van Hassen, for instance, who is probably to be identified with the 'old Dutch Quaker, who seemed to have deep experience of the things of God' of whom Charles Wesley spoke in 1748, and also with John Garret, 'one of the most lovely old men I ever saw', with whom John Wesley breakfasted in 1756.[57] And there was Dr. John Rutty, the famous Quaker physician, who not only attended Wesley himself, but also the lay Methodist preachers, free of charge.[58]

Quaker hospitality and sometimes Quaker conversions greeted the preachers as they fanned out west and south-west from Dublin, at Tyrell's Pass, Ballyboy,

[57] *CWJ.*, II.37; *JWJ.*, IV.157. cf. *WHS.*, II.129, V.5–6; *JFHS.*, III.86. For another identification, see *JFHS.*, VII.47.

[58] *JWJ.*, III.348, 396; *WV.*, I.140–1. Other Quaker doctors also gave their services to the Methodists, notably Dr. John Fothergill, Dr. J. C. Lettsom, and of course Dr. John Whitehead, who later rejoined the Methodist fold.

Mountmellick, Cashel, and on to Cork, where a friendly Quaker offered land to build on, and at Bandon, where Charles Wesley recorded that he

breakfasted with the only family of Quakers in the town. They behaved with that love and zeal which we meet with in all *the Friends*, till their worldly-wise and envious brethren pervert them, and make their minds evil affected toward us.[59]

Mountmellick in particular, like Bristol, was a prominent stronghold of both Societies. It had formerly been the home of William Edmundson, the leader of Irish Quakerism, to whose *Journal* John Wesley paid high tribute, and was now the home of several influential Friends. Of these Joseph Fry became a leading Methodist, and Joshua Strangman retained friendly relations with Wesley. Probably the most eminent, however, was James Gough, schoolmaster and speaker there.[60]

John Curtis had paid his first visit to Ireland close on the heels of the Wesleys, being described in Quaker records there in March 1748 as:

John Curtis from Bristol, a young man lately convinced, he had been for some time a follower of the Methodists, but growing uneasy with their way left them, and is now become an able Minister of the Gospel.[61]

He made a great impression, and on 24th June 1748 the National Meeting ordered the publication of his farewell message, in which he spoke of himself as having escaped from wandering 'on the barren Mountains of Worship which Man had invented'.[62] The following year he returned to Ireland, apparently making a determined effort to undermine Methodist influence there. On 1st May 1749 Wesley arrived at Mountmellick, recording in his *Journal*:

Being informed that the Quakers in general, as well here as in Cork, Athlone, and Edenderry, had left the preaching from the time of John Curtis's coming, I took occasion, before I preached, to mention here also [as he had done at Edenderry in the morning] the real state of the case between us, but with the utmost caution and tenderness. An hour or two afterward James Gough, the speaker, with two more of his friends, came to expostulate with me on the head. James laboured hard to persuade me that I was misinformed, and that John Curtis had neither directly nor indirectly said one word against the Methodists.[63]

[59] *CWJ*, II.29.

[60] *WHS.*, XXII.107–9. cf. *JWJ.*, Index. Of Edmundson Wesley said: 'His opinions I leave; but what a spirit was here! What faith, love, gentleness, long-suffering! Could mistakes send such a man as this to hell? Not so. I am so far from believing this, that I scruple not to say: "Let my soul be with the soul of William Edmundson!" ' (*JWJ.*, V.137).

[61] *JFHS.*, X.246.

[62] *An Epistle of Love and Advice, to Friends of the Kingdom of Ireland*, p. (1). This is not strictly an attack on Methodism, which it does not mention by name, but on man-made worship generally. The warning against those who try to inveigle them into such worship, however, is almost certainly aimed at the Methodists.

[63] This quotation is from the fuller manuscript version as printed in the Standard Edition (*JWJ.*, III.397). The original printed *Journal*, first published in 1754, contained the added phrase at the end of this passage about Curtis's innocence: 'I heartily wish it were so.'

Fuller information is obtained from Gough's own *Memoirs*, where the commencement of Wesley's sermon in the open market-place is reported: 'Before I unfold to you the oracles of God, I must first remove a stumbling-block out of the way, which is this: I understand one John Curtis from Bristol hath of late been travelling in these parts, and endeavouring to lay waste that good work which it hath pleased God to carry on by our hands, giving out that he was formerly a Methodist and acquainted with me. Now he was never a Methodist to my knowledge, and I think he could not be one in or about Bristol without it . . . I hope no man will account me an offender for speaking the truth. If George Fox were here he would embrace me for it' (*WHS.*, I.59–62). Correspondence cleared up the misunderstanding. Curtis had in fact been a Methodist, but had never claimed intimacy with Wesley.

According to Gough's own account, Wesley acknowledged that the interview had been to his edification, and that he therefore wished he could get the like opportunities with our friends more frequently; that he saw some things in a clearer light than he had done before.[64]

Although Wesley's heart was softened, he was still not satisfied with Curtis's conduct, and Gough's efforts at peace-making did not stop his writing to Curtis on 17th August 1749:

God has greatly broken down the partition wall in Ireland—viz. shyness and coldness among Christians on account of difference in opinion. I think you did not do well in building it up again, or in saying anything in public or private which naturally tended so to do. John, I am sorry for you. May God open your eyes and enlarge your heart. So prays

Your injured friend, [J. WESLEY].[65]

The threatened troubles in Ireland were not so serious as they might have been, however. The following summer Wesley was once more welcomed at Mountmellick, writing from Ireland a tender letter of spiritual exhortation to Joshua Strangman, who had in the meantime left for England.[66] James Gough, also, continued to hold a warm place in his affections, though Wesley felt compelled to counteract the influence of Gough's well-known biographies of the French mystics by watering them down.[67]

ARMED TRUCE

In England itself Methodists and Quakers seem on the whole to have settled down to live in a state of rather uneasy peace together, respecting and being influenced by each other's better qualities, yet always on the watch for possible converts. When in 1747 as a young Methodist preacher Christopher Hopper opened his ministry in the north he was welcomed by the Friends.[68] At Shaftesbury in 1748 two Friends defended John Haime, imprisoned for preaching.[69] About 1750 Thomas Olivers was greeted at Shrewsbury by an imprisoned Friend with the words: 'Wilt thou come next first-day, and preach to the prisoners?'[70] Joseph Cownley (who had been under formative Quaker influence in his early years) while preaching in 1756 in the Yorkshire dales 'near the door of an honest Quaker' was set upon by a tippling clergyman, who was silenced by yet another friendly Quaker.[71] Reciprocation is seen at Norwich, where in 1753 Mary Peisley, a well-known Quaker minister from Ireland, was offered the hospitality of the Methodist chapel for whatever kind of service she cared to conduct. After a meeting including nearly an hour's silence, she remarked:

[64] *WHS.*, I.59–62. [65] *JWL.*, III.14–15.

[66] *JWL.*, III.40. Cf. their later reunion, *JWJ.*, VI.33. See also for Strangman's pedigree, *JFHS.*, III.86.

[67] Wesley published extracts from Gough's *Life of Armelle Nicholas* in the *Arminian Magazine* for 1780, and probably used Gough's translation as the basis of his own *Extract from the Life of Madam Guion.* For Miss Bishop's remarks about the latter biography, which she feared might 'betray the upright in heart into a state of comparative darkness, and unresisted unbelief, under the mask of pure faith, passiveness, and resignation', see *Arminian Magazine* (1786), IX.518 (cf. p. 569). See also Smith, I.852–5, and *JWW.*, XIV.265–8.

[68] *WV.*, I.127. [69] ibid., 52. [70] ibid., 223. [71] ibid., IV.141.

It was remarkable the stillness which they were brought to, more so than many meetings of Friends that I have been in: and in some conversation with their preacher, so called, [probably James Wheatley] he assented to the truth of the necessity of silence in their places of worship.[72]

At about the same time as the Irish difficulties, Wesley's Yorkshire lieutenant the Rev. William Grimshaw of Haworth, was in correspondence with the well-known Friend David Hall of Skipton, under whom James Gough had been trained. Stanbury, in Haworth parish, was the centre of one of the 'Circulating Yearly Meetings' which had affinities with the Methodist Camp Meetings of a later era. Grimshaw wrote to suggest that the rowdyism unfortunately associated with this annual event might be avoided either by giving it up or by holding it more frequently. His letters to Hall were throughout of a co-operative spirit, and courteous to the point of employing Quaker phraseology and dating. If the Friends would make the experiment of a monthly meeting, he said:

I will think it a pleasure to make the speaker and his horse welcome at my house on a First-day. I am persuaded the rabble will soon cease coming, and the Meeting will consist of none but serious souls. I do assure you the partition walls of party and religious denominations are long ago utterly fallen down in me.

A compromise seems to have been reached by the choice of a different date, and on 9th July 1754 Grimshaw wrote to the Friends at Stanbury: 'May the Divine Spirit of God manifest Himself in the midst of you this day.'[73]

It was not all smooth co-operation, however. A perpetual tug-of-war was carried on, with proselytes as prizes. In October 1756, for instance, Wesley recorded with a flourish in his *Journal* the public baptism of a London Friend, while a month later Charles Wesley discovered that twelve Worcester Methodists were 'fallen off to the Quakers, seeking the living among the dead'; about the same period a Methodist class leader of Stockport was persuaded to join the Friends, and to take several members of his class along with him.[74] In 1758 Wesley reissued his *Letter* in the *Preservative against Unsettled Notions in Religion*—and in the same year the Friends at Edenderry 'laboured much to dissuade their people' from listening to Methodist preachers.[75]

One prominent Quaker minister and author, Mrs. Abiah Darby, wife of the well-known iron manufacturer of Coalbrookdale, attacked Methodism in one of its main citadels, Madeley, where saintly John Fletcher had recently become the vicar. Her diary contains several references during the 1760's to lending him books, reasoning with him, and even indulging in a form of spiritual heckling at his Methodist meetings. In 1763, for instance, she recorded:

A strong engagement came upon me to go to the meeting of Parson Fletcher and his followers. . . . I had the Word to declare with power. . . . The Parson heard me patiently and commended what I had said and desired all to take notice of the advice, . . . but objected to the points of Doctrine I had advanced . . . which touched his Copyhold or Priest Craft. I had close work of it for above 3 hours. . . . Ann was engaged in prayer. . . . The Parson kneeled down and upon the whole he behaved with respect.

[72] See *Some Account of the Lives . . . of Samuel Neale, and Mary Neale*, New Edition, 1858, pp. 325–6.
[73] *WHS.*, X.206–10. Cf. Jones, 118–20.
[74] *JWJ.*, IV.189; *CWJ.*, II.139; *Methodist Magazine* (1827), L.21.
[75] *JWJ.*, IV. 260.

The Methodists at Madeley continued courteous but unconvinced.[76]

This state of armed truce, punctuated by sporadic local skirmishes wherever a spiritual weakness was revealed, continued well into the 1770's. This period was heralded by a Bristol Quaker's sharp rebuke to Charles Wesley for training his son as a musician,[77] and also by the conversion of a popular Methodist preacher, John Whitehead, to the Friends, among whom he received a medical education under Dr. Lettsom, though in later years he rejoined the Methodist fold, becoming Wesley's trusted executor and biographer.[78] Another Methodist preacher, Ralph Mather, embraced the mystical tenets of Quakerism a little later, though rather to Wesley's surprise he did not immediately become a Friend. It was Mather who reported in 1775 how at Loughborough

> near twenty are turned from Methodism to Quakerism. As this is the case, prejudice may have shut up their hearts, except to those who can speak 'thee' and 'thou' and wear a broad-brimmed hat, and who have learned their phrases. So I am afraid it is with th se at Barnstaple, as many of the Quakers have visited them.[79]

Proselytes, however, occasionally changed their minds. At Nottingham in 1779, said Wesley:

> One who had left us to join the Quakers desired to be present at the love-feast; in the close of which, being able to contain himself no longer, he broke out and declared he must join us again. I went home with him; and, after spending some time in prayer, left him full of love and thankfulness.[80]

The most notable conquest of the Methodists was probably Zechariah Yewdall of Eccleshall near Bradford, one of a numerous Quaker family, who was baptized by Wesley in 1771, and was eventually the means of bringing many others of his relatives into the Methodist Society, including even his father, who at first listened to the preachers from outside the chapel, 'as he apprehended it would give offence to come in with his hat on'. Yewdall became a very successful itinerant preacher, regarded with some jealousy as one of Wesley's favourites, doing pioneer work in Ireland and Scotland, and being the instrument of noteworthy revivals at Sheerness and Otley.[81]

Some of the conversions were strongly reciprocal in their influence. This was particularly true in the case of Mary Stokes, who in 1772 left her position as a trusted Methodist leader at Bristol for the attractions of Quaker mysticism. Wesley's last letter to her said:

[76] Friendly relationships continued to hold in this area, where there was real co-operation in later years between Friends, Methodists, and Churchmen, especially as other members of the Darby family were not so militant as Abiah. The important Methodist family of Cranage managed to be at the same time trusted workmen of Friend Abraham Darby (being pioneers on his behalf in the discovery of puddling), and regular communicants at the parish church, while eventually the Darby family themselves provided the neighbourhood with an Anglican Church! See *JFHS.*, X.87–92, 156, 196, 294, etc.; Smith, I.511–12; *Dictionary of National Biography*, article 'Abraham Darby'; J. Randall's *History of Madeley*, pp. 60, 273–302, etc.

[77] 'Letters relating to the Wesley Family', Vol. IV, folio 61, at the Methodist Book Room.

[78] See *Dictionary of National Biography*, articles on Lettsom and Whitehead. Cf. Smith, II.915–16, and I.70, where an anonymous defence of Wesley against Toplady, entitled *An Essay on Liberty and Necessity*, is ascribed to Whitehead.

[79] In a letter to Henry Brooke, printed in the notes to Christopher Walton's *Notes and Materials for an adequate Biography of . . . William Law*, pp. 595–6.

[80] *JWJ.*, VI.245.

[81] *Arminian Magazine* (1795), XVIII.109ff.; *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* (1830), LIII.214, 641; *JWL.*, VII.359, etc.

I entreat you to read over with much prayer that little tract *A Letter to a Quaker*. I fear you are on the brink of a precipice, and you know it not. The Enemy has put on his angel's face, and you take him for a friend. Retire immediately! Go not near the tents of those dead, formal men called Quakers! Keep close to your class, to your band, to your old teachers; they have the words of eternal life.

In vain. Mary Stokes did join the Friends, becoming 'one of the greatest and most influential of the women preachers of the eighteenth century', who together with Sarah Grubb formed important links with continental Friends, and was also one of the chief means of bringing a new strain of evangelical preaching into Quaker worship.[82]

Bristol continued to be a storm-centre. Other Methodists also came strongly under the reviving Quaker witness there, Sally Flower succumbing like Mary Stokes, while Mary Bishop held out, in spite of the allurements of John Helton, a popular Methodist preacher converted to Quakerism by Barclay's *Apology*.[83] Helton it was who in 1778 published the only really formidable reply to Wesley's thirty-year-old *Letter*, an octavo pamphlet of sixty-six pages entitled *Reasons for quitting the Methodist Society; being a Defence of Barclay's 'Apology'*. Helton rightly pointed out that against only a few of Barclay's propositions did Wesley raise any serious objection, and thought that he could bring forward evidence to show that Wesley had changed his mind on the questions of justification, women preachers, and war.[84] He was answered in a pointed twelve-page *Appeal to All Men of Common Sense*, written by another of Wesley's preachers, 'John Fenwick, late Farmer'.

Wesley himself seems to have been content to leave the matter where it stood, even though Helton's pamphlet passed through a second edition in 1779, and a third in 1784. He did venture into print once more against the Friends, however, in the fourth volume of his *Concise Ecclesiastical History*, published in 1781, where he spoke of the early Quaker Societies as being 'composed mostly of persons that seemed to be disordered in their brains'—a sentiment which he refused to recant, in spite of the pleading of his Quaker friends. One of the very last letters which he wrote reaffirmed his views:

I am fully persuaded it is all the naked truth. What the Quakers (so called) *are* or *do now* is nothing to the purpose. I am thoroughly persuaded they *were* exactly such as they are described in this *History*. . . . But I love and esteem you and many of the present Quakers.[85]

Whatever his theories about past Quaker weaknesses, and present dangers, Wesley most certainly maintained friendly contacts with individuals among them,[86] and dealt courteously with some of the less balanced exponents of the

[82] *JWL.*, V.335. Jones, 198–9, 211, 238–42, 277–8. Cf. *JWJ.*, VI.185.

[83] *JWL.*, VI.278, 285, 288, 297, 309, 318. Cf. *Arminian Magazine* (1786), IX.518, 569.

[84] Helton's pamphlet is quite friendly in tone, and on p. 3 he states clearly: 'As I intend no reflection on a religious Society, many of whom I much esteem, I shall only observe in general on this head, that having about a year since met with Barclay's *Apology*, I was fully convinced, that the principles, worship, and discipline of the people called Quakers, were more consonant to scripture, reason, and to my own feelings, than those of the Society to which I was united.' It was dated at the end, 'Melksham, 3d Mo. 28, 1778'.

[85] *JWL.*, VIII.252.

[86] In the very year of Helton's *Reasons* Wesley's famous *Arminian Magazine* was ushered into the world by the Quaker press of Dr. Joseph Fry.

mystic way, such as Richard Freeman of Somersetshire,[87] and John Bousell of Norwich.[88] The key to his attitude is to be found in his sermons on 'Catholic Spirit' and 'A Caution against Bigotry', and in a letter to a Friend whose boarding-school at Worcester he greatly admired:

> It is the glory of the people called Methodists that they condemn none for their opinions or modes of worship. They think and let think, and insist upon nothing but faith working by love.[89]

SPIRITUAL BALANCE SHEET

The varied contacts between Methodism and Quakerism throughout over half a century prior to Wesley's death in 1791 were bound to leave their traces, though it is difficult to assess the extent of this influence. Many features to be found in both Societies were due, not to direct borrowing, but simply to parallel growth, especially as both started from the same fundamental principle of following the leadings of Providence. Some of these likenesses have been mentioned above. Other similarities, in which there is either the proof or the likelihood of actual imitation, may now be considered.

The organizations which gradually emerged, by process of trial and error, bear striking resemblances. Like the Friends, the Methodists had for a time their Monthly Meetings, though in Methodism these were soon overshadowed by the Quarterly Meetings.[90] These latter have a long and mixed pedigree, being probably indebted to Benjamin Ingham, to the Moravians, to the Welsh Associations, and even to the old Religious Societies, which had behind them (as had the Friends) the influence of Behmenistic mysticism.[91] There also seems to have been direct Quaker influence at work, mainly through John Bennet, the great promoter of such gatherings in Methodism. Shortly after

[87] In 1779 Freeman sent Wesley a letter containing twenty theological queries, to each of which Wesley gave careful thought, though a hasty man might have consigned them to the wastepaper basket as the whims of a fanatic. A copy of Freeman's questions and of Wesley's answer is preserved at Friends House, London.

[88] Bousell, a religious free-lance who described himself as 'a Disciple of Jesus Christ, and an Offspring of the Primitive Quakers', included 'A Few Words to those called Methodists' in his *Trumpet of the Lord sounded upon the Mountains*, of which in 1789 he sent Wesley a copy, with a lengthy letter of exhortation. Wesley replied: 'I believe what you say, or write, proceeds from a real desire to promote the glory of God by the salvation of men: Therefore I take in good part all you say, and thank you for your letter to me. Your advice is good as to the substance of it; little circumstances I do not contend for. I likewise approve the exhortation, in your printed Treatise, to the people called Methodists.' So much did he approve that Wesley apparently himself prepared Bousell's 'Epistle to the Methodists' for publication in the *Arminian Magazine*, together with their correspondence. Like many other articles certainly prepared by Wesley, it appeared after his death, in the magazine for 1792. Cf. Bousell's *Trumpet*, p. 10.

[89] *JWW.*, V.485, 497; *JWL.*, VII.190. Cf. *JWJ.*, VII.59. The Quaker antiquarian Morris Birkbeck, writing in 1792, was one of those whose prejudice against Wesley was not overcome, so that he could write of Wesley's courteous treatment of Richard Freeman as dictated by his hatred of the Quakers, a hatred caused by the fact that 'the most respectable, truly religious, and valuable part of his converts frequently left him and joined to them', so that Wesley 'at length *forbad* the attendance of their Meetings, which he at one time recommended in preference to all others besides his own, poor man, they so frequently became convinced of Friends' principles and of the Truth'. Friends House MSS., Portfolio 2.16.

[90] cf. Bennet's MS. Diary, 1743–7, for details of the Monthly Meetings in Methodism.

[91] Actually the annual Methodist Conference, which can be likened to the Friends' Yearly Meeting, had itself begun in 1744 as the first of a proposed series of quarterly conferences (*WHS. Publication*, I. p. 18). Cf. for other possible influences the MS. *Account of Benjamin Ingham* (Rylands Library, Manchester); D. Benham's *James Hutton*, pp. 29–30, 216–17, etc.; W. G. Addison's *Renewed Church of the United Brethren*, pp. 80, 100–1; M. H. Jones's *Trevecka Letters*, pp. 257–306, espec. 265; *Whitefd.*, II.57–8; J. S. Simon's *John Wesley and the Religious Societies*, p. 14; *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* (1843), LXVI. 376–82.

the first Methoidst Quarterly Meeting was held in October 1748, Bennet copied into his letter book the four foolscap pages of the Friends' 'Yearly Epistle' for 1747, apparently in order that he might guide the following Conference as to the nature and value of Quaker practices.[92]

The lay ministry of the Friends also is paralleled in Methodism. The leaders and stewards of the Methodist societies were comparable to the elders and overseers of the Quakers, while both communities were served by the unpaid labours of itinerant lay ministers. It must be remembered, however, that the Friends were much slower to organize their work than the Methodists, and during the eighteenth century were still feeling their way. It was not until 1737, for instance, that the London Yearly Meeting 'first clearly defined membership'.[93] Far from indebtedness in this respect being always of the Methodists to the Friends, sometimes it was probably the other way round. The Quaker office of overseer, for example, emerged long after that of the Methodist class leader, to which it probably owed much.[94] On the other hand, in the employment of women both in this capacity and later as preachers Wesley probably acted partly under Quaker influence.[95] The Friends' idea of a 'free' or unpaid ministry also had its influence on Methodism, and was one of the foundation principles of the body which broke off toward the end of the century under the name of 'Quaker Methodists', now the Independent Methodists.

Probably the most important contribution of the Friends to Methodism, however, was in the realm of Christian conduct rather than in those of organization, ministry, theology, or worship. Many of the Quaker 'testimonies' Wesley regarded as utterly superficial, and unlike the Moravians could not agree with them on the questions of pacifism and the taking of oaths. In other matters he was not afraid to follow their good example, however. In his *Advice to the People called Methodists, with regard to Dress* (first published in 1760) he openly avowed:

> Many years ago I observed several parts of Christian practice among the people called Quakers. Two things I particularly remarked among them—plainness of speech, and plainness of dress. I willingly adopted both, with some restrictions, and particularly plainness of dress. . . . I advise you to imitate them, First, in the neatness, . . . secondly, in the plainness of their apparel.[96]

The Friends' care for children and the poor also impressed Wesley. In 1744 he was eager to see their Workhouse in London, and he was familiar with that at Bristol, while he was very interested in Quaker schools such as that of Mrs. Price at Worcester.[97]

[92] Copy of Bennet's Letter Book in the keeping of the writer. The 'Yearly Epistle' was later to have its Methodist counterpart in the pastoral address of the annual Conference.

[93] Jones, p. 108. [94] *idem.*, pp. 130–1.

[95] See *JWL.*, VI.290. Well-known women peachers were 'The Female Brethren' of Leeds, with Sarah Crosby and Anne Tripp at their head, Mary Bosanquet (who married the Rev. John Fletcher), Sarah Ryan, Sarah Mallet, Elizabeth Hurrell (under whom the missionary William Warrener was converted), and Sarah Stevens. See *Methodist Recorder*, Winter Nos., 1894:64, 1895:65–9. There were several examples of Methodist itinerant preachers whose wives also were preachers. Hannah Kilham, one of these, eventually became a Quaker missionary, and did a useful work as a translator (Smith, II.58–61, *Supp.* 213–4).

[96] *JWW.*, XI.466–8. Cf. Sermon 88, 'On Dress'. See also his advice *re* conditions in Ireland: 'Be cleanly: In this let the Methodists take pattern by the Quakers' (*JWL.*, V.133).

[97] *WHS.*, XIV.29; *JWJ.*, VII.59; *JWL.*, VII.190.

The outstanding example of the philanthropic influence of the Friends on Methodism, however, is in the case of the slave traffic. Anthony Benezet's most famous attack on this was in *Some Historical Account of Guinea*, published in Philadelphia in 1771. This book had a profound effect on Wesley, who read it as soon as it was reprinted in England the following year. Immediately he became Benezet's ally in his great campaign, and a month or two later Benezet wrote to Granville Sharp:

> My friend John Wesley promises he will consult with thee about the expediency of some weekly publication, in the newspapers, on the origin, nature, and dreadful effects of the slave trade.

Soon, however, Wesley found a better way of lending the prestige of his own name to the cause, by abridging Benezet's *Account* for his famous *Thoughts on Slavery*, first published early in 1774. This was plagiarism in a good cause, and on receiving a copy Benezet replied:

> The Tract thou hast lately published entitled *Thoughts on Slavery* afforded me much satisfaction. . . . Wherefore I immediately agreed with the printer to have it re-published here.

Much earlier Benezet had striven to persuade George Whitefield and the Countess of Huntingdon of the evils of slave-holding, and he numbered other prominent Methodists among his friends, notably two preachers, Captain Thomas Webb of Bristol, and Nathaniel Gilbert of Antiqua.[98] His large share in the 'convincement' of John Wesley, however, was one of his greatest services in the fight for abolition.

As far as their general spiritual outlook was concerned, the Friends seem to have left little mark on Methodism. Although the two Societies had much in common in their teaching on the inner light and the witness of the Spirit, they parted company at the fork leading to quietism *via* the mystic way. Apart from a few individuals who left the ranks of Methodism, the influence of Quaker mysticism does not appear to have been widespread or lasting. Not so the repercussions of Methodist evangelism on the Friends, however. There seems little doubt that Methodism was a powerful stimulus in recalling Friends to their own first principles. The challenges of Wesley's *Farther Appeal* were echoed by leading Friends. Dr. John Rutty, for instance, in his *Diary*, could sigh for the spirit of the Methodists:

> The Methodists outstrip thee quite, and consequently must advance beyond thee. I will catch a little of their fire, so help, Lord![99]

He could also persuade other Friends to understand and copy some of the good points of Methodism, in his *Essay towards a Contrast between Quakerism and Methodism* (1771), saying:

[98] See G. S. Brookes' *Friend Anthony Benezet*. On p. 85 Brookes compares Benezet's *Account* and Wesley's *Thoughts*. Cf. *JWJ.*, V.445; *JWL.*, VIII.275–6; *Arminian Magazine* (1787), X.44–8.
It is interesting to note that the Friends House copy of Wesley's *Letter to a Person lately join'd with the People call'd Quakers* belonged formerly to Nathaniel Gilbert, being autographed by him.

[99] *WHS.*, VII.54.

I gladly embrace the present opportunity of paying a just tribute of praise to the methodical Brethren, even as burning and shining lights, and patterns of Christian vigilance; and their conduct as a just rebuke.[100]

New blood could help to infuse new customs: Dorothy Ripley, daughter of Wesley's friend and preacher William Ripley of Whitby, was brought up in an atmosphere of family prayer and the singing of hymns, which she took over with her when she became a Quaker missionary.[101]

Methodist theology also won its way almost unnoticed into Quakerism, this process becoming more marked in the last quarter of the century, the beginnings of a profound spiritual transformation, when a large proportion of the Friends were carried over from a mystical to an evangelical basis, eventually formulated by Henry Tuke. Rufus M. Jones, in his *Later Periods of Quakerism*, acknowledges that

the incipient evangelical awakening was due primarily to the influence of the Methodist movement, and to the corresponding evangelical revival in the Church of England and in many Nonconformist groups.[102]

The formative exponents of this new spiritual outlook came from other folds, Mr. Jones giving pride of place to Wesley's errant friend, Mary Stokes, of whose evangelical preaching he says:

There can be no question of the tone and emphasis of this gifted, impassioned woman, nor of her great influence both upon other Ministers and upon the rank and file of the Society. She brought with her into the Society of her adoption a fervour and a dynamic quality in every way like that which marked the founders of Methodism. . . . She struck a new note in Quaker preaching, but she was so deeply imbued with all that was best in the Quaker spirit that her hearers hardly suspected what a change of emphasis marked her glowing messages. She was a gentle revolutionist, transforming people who had no idea they were being transformed.[103]

In spite of occasional cross-currents, it may be said that during the latter half of the eighteenth century Methodism and Quakerism were sailing parallel courses, and were often within friendly hailing distance. Each enriched the other, thus greatly strengthening with the passing of the years their individual witness to the fundamental truths of the Christian Gospel. On the one hand the social witness of Methodism was reinforced and extended, while on the other John Wesley's genuine 'concern' for the Friends was at last rewarded, and his spiritual victory achieved, though not so much by direct attack as by a process of infiltration.

FRANK BAKER

[100] *Essay towards a Contrast*, p. 10. Actually this work was much more of a comparison than a contrast, showing by extracts from the official codes of discipline how similar were Methodists and Friends, though there is a concluding section defending silent meetings.

[101] *WHS.*, VI. 37–44; *JFHS.*, XXII. Dorothy Ripley also was converted by the influence of Barclay's *Apology*.

[102] Jones, 276. Cf. pp. xiii-xiv, 274–8.

[103] Jones, p. 278. The new approach to theology can also be seen in Rutty's *Essay*, where he praises the Methodists' 're-publication of this ancient doctrine of faith in Christ Jesus' (p. 7).

THE PLACE OF JAMES THOMSON IN THE POETRY OF NATURE

(*Continued from* p. 158, April 1949)

THE first part of *The Seasons* to be written and separately published was *Winter*. There was a touch of audacity in the attempt to win a public by such a subject. English Poetry had been more than shy of it and had rarely used it otherwise than as a sombre background to enhance the light and gladness of Spring and Summer. One can understand this. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch draws a vivid word picture of what the season meant, especially to the poor, in Tudor and even later times: 'the stint of food and fodder; the windows unglazed, therefore shuttered against the weather; hall and kitchen therefore dark day-long for months, or lit only as Tom bore logs into the hall, or a niggardly faggot stolen from the woods fed the labouring man's fire. No reading, no evening newspaper there . . . the room full of icy draughts, wherein your feet kept shuffling in the straw, and coughing drowned (the speaker's words).'[11] It is not a pleasant picture. Fortified against the onslaughts of winter as we are in these days of household comforts and modern hygiene, there are still people who sympathize with Sir Walter Raleigh, when he wrote to a friend in May 1889: 'I . . . begin to see the summer before me. . . . Beyond that a long tunnel black and close and dense and with no end to it that can be foretold. *I shall shriek as I go into it, I know.*[12]

So must many a man have felt in those far-away late autumns; and how they shrieked when they came out of it, to know that

Sumer is icumen in,
Lhude sing cuccu!
Groweth sed, and bloweth med,
And springth the wude nu![13]

No wonder was it that men's and women's voices swelled the chorus of returning Spring. Shakespeare puts it all into his song at the end of *Love's Labour's Lost:*

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 blood is nipp'd and ways be foul,
Then nightly sings the staring owl,
Tu-who;
Tu-whit, Tu-who—a merry note,
While greasy Joan doth keel the pot.

When all aloud the wind doth blow,
And coughing drowns the parson's saw,
And birds sit brooding in the snow,
And Marion's nose looks red and raw,

[1] *The Poet as Citizen*, p. 193 [12] *Letters*, p. 39. [13] *Cuckoo Song, circa* 1250.

When roasted crabs hiss in the bowl,
Then nightly sings the staring owl,
Tu-who;
Tu-whit, Tu-who—a merry note,
While greasy Joan doth keel the pot.

No, not even the roasted crabs can render it an attractive picture. We can understand how Tom and 'greasy Joan' and Marion and all their tribe hailed the time

When daisies pied and violets blue
And lady-smocks all silver-white
And cuckoo-buds of yellow hue
Do paint the meadows with delight.

The real theme of nearly all this early poetry in which Winter figures is not its *appearance*, but its *disappearance*; the time when, in the words of a modern poet,

The hounds of Spring are on Winter's traces;

when

Winter's rains and ruins are over,
And all the season of snows and sins.[14]

Snows and sins! There is more in that phrase than Swinburne's passion for assonance; there are 'ancestral voices' in it; all the steely horror born of generations of suffering, darkness and cold, when Nature herself seemed to sin against man. There is even a suggestion of it in Milton's great *Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*.

Such, in brief, was the literary background against which Thomson, greatly daring, composed his poem, *Winter*. At last the grisly subject had *a poem to itself*. Thomson was as much alive to the harsh features of the season as his predecessors, but he did not recoil from it with the same vigour and distaste. He was alive to beauties which they had missed and he describes even the 'horrors' in words of keen discernment and revealing charm. He faces the season with all the courage but without the animosity of *King Lear:*

Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! blow!
You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout
Till you have drench'd our steeples, drown'd the cocks!
. . . . .
Rumble thy bellyful! Spit, fire! Spout, rain!

Thomson could not write like that but he could act like it. What must men have thought when they first glanced at a poem where they read,

[14] *Atalanta in Calydon*, First Chorus.

Welcome, kindred glooms!
Congenial horrors, hail! *with frequent foot,*
Pleased have I, in my cheerful morn of life,
When nursed by careless solitude I lived,
And sung of Nature with unceasing joy,
Pleased have I wandered through your rough domain;
Trod the pure virgin snows, myself as pure;
Heard the winds roar, and the big torrent burst;
Or seen the deep-fermenting tempest brewed
In the grim evening sky?[15]

Though Thomson does not hurl his maledictions at the austerities of Winter, he does not ignore them, but looks intently, if not wholly admiringly, at them; and he re-creates a storm for us, in words and phrases that shriek with the wind and boom with the surge of great waters.

He gives us a little picture of a frost-bound river, which must have been a revelation to many a reader:

. . . to the sedgy bank
Fast grows, or gathers round the pointed stone,
A crystal pavement, by the breath of heaven
Cemented firm; till, seized from shore to shore,
The whole imprisoned river growls below;[16]

artistry of which no man need be ashamed!

Thomson's was a great achievement, but it was only preparatory to those greater ones which mark the third era of Nature Poetry. He was a *literary photographer* of exceptional skill, whose pictures will always be treasured because of their faithfulness to Nature; *he was not the great Artist.* Photography depicts; Art interprets. He saw and taught others to see; whereupon the chosen ones among them trod the next stage of the poet's *iter ad astra* and passed from *sight* to *insight.* Wordsworth looked at the World in Thomson's way, but saw more than he did. Nature to him was *sacramental.* It is true that Thomson proceeded 'from Nature to Nature's God', but he did so very largely in the cool, calculating fashion of that deistic age; 'God' was the irresistible conclusion of a syllogism whose premisses were bound up with Nature.

For such a 'God' a man may have some measure of personal regard or no regard at all. Thomson's regard was fervent and there were occasions when he expressed both gratitude and awe in impassioned words; but the God whom he worshipped was always exterior rather than interior to the Universe He Himself had made. Sometimes he rose to heights of almost mystical adoration, as in the Hymn appended to *The Seasons*, and saw in God a pledge of his own immortality:

When even at last the solemn hour shall come,
And wing my mystic flight to future worlds,
I cheerful will obey; there, with new powers,
Will rising wonders sing: I cannot go
Where Universal Love not smiles around,
Sustaining all yon orbs, and all their sons (sic);

[15] *Winter*, l.5. [16] ibid., l.727.

From seeming evil still educing good,
And better thence again, and better still,
In infinite progression.—But I lose
Myself in Him, in Light ineffable!
Come then, expressive Silence, muse His praise.

Wordsworth represents the third period better than anyone else, and what Nature and the Universe meant to him he tells us in many a fervent passage. Perhaps nowhere is he more explicit than in his parable of the 'curious child', holding to his ear 'a smooth-lipped shell' and hearing

Murmurings, whereby the monitor expressed
Mysterious union with its native sea—
Even such a shell the universe itself
Is to the ear of Faith; and there are times,
I doubt not, when to you it doth impart
Authentic tidings of invisible things;
Of ebb and flow, and ever-during power;
And central peace subsisting at the heart
Of endless agitation. Here you stand,
Adore, and worship, when you know it not;
Pious beyond the intention of your thought;
Devout above the meaning of your will.[17]

These are regions beyond the syllogism. Here is sight of the Promised Land to which Thomson helped to lead others, but which he himself never entered.

Wordsworth pored over the face of Nature as had Thomson; but he found a more recondite and sublime Reality and portrayed for us 'the shape and colour of its mind and life'.

In other ways, too, Thomson influenced those who followed him. Is it conceivable, for example, that Thomas Gray, as he wrote of 'the rude forefathers of the hamlet'—

For them no more the blazing hearth shall burn,
Or busy housewife ply her evening care;
No children run to lisp their sire's return,
Or climb his knees the envied kiss to share—

owed nothing, whether consciously or unconsciously, to Thomson's description of the country-man perishing in a snowdrift as he fought his way toward home on a winter's night of wild storm, and whose dying thoughts were of

His wife, his children and his friends unseen,

while

In vain for him the officious wife prepares
The fire fair-blazing, and the vestment warm;
In vain his little children, peeping out
Into the mingling storm, demand their sire
With tears of artless innocence. Alas!
Nor wife, nor children, more should he behold,
Nor friends, nor sacred home?[18]

[17] *Excursion*, iv.1, 132. [18] *Winter*, l.311.

—or that when he wrote

Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,

he was wholly uninfluenced by Thomson's

not a beauty blows,
And not an opening blossom breathes in vain?

We hear echoes of him in unexpected places. Is it, for example, mere fancy that links his

various Nature pressing on the heart,

with Wordsworth's

Sensations sweet,
Felt in the blood, and felt along the heart?

One has only to read Cowper's *Winter Evening* (Book IV of *The Task*) to discover his influence. Though Thomson in his *Winter* had sung of outdoor things—storm, frost, death—he was by no means insensitive to the indoor delights of the season.

Again, can anyone read Thomson's *Pastoral Betwixt David, Thirsis and the Angel Gabriel, upon the Birth of our Saviour*, without recalling John Byrom's great Nativity hymn, *Christians, awake, salute the happy morn?* Hear Gabriel.

Rejoice, ye swains, anticipate the morn
With songs of praise: for lo! a Saviour born.
With joyful hearts to Bethlehem repair,
And you will find the Almighty Infant there;
Wrapped in a swaddling band you'll find your King,
And in a manger laid, to Him your praises bring;

and two of David's lines are

For lo! this blessed, this propitious morn,
The Saviour of lost mankind is born.

The *Pastoral* is one of fourteen 'Juvenile Poems', which, we are told, were first published in the Aldine Edition of Thomson's Works. Dr. Byrom wrote the first draft of his hymn as a Christmas-morning offering to his daughter in 1745, and Thomson died in 1748. If the Doctor had not seen Thomson's verses we can do no more than remark the surprising similarity of the two compositions in sentiment, phrasing, and metre.

So Thomson's elusive shade haunts our English poetry and every true poet treats him with some measure of respect. It is significant that he was not included in the *Dunciad*, that being perhaps the highest compliment that any contemporary poet could expect to receive from Alexander Pope. Collins mourned his early death in a specially written Ode. Charles Lamb, writing on Scotsmen's enthusiastic affection for Robert Burns, comments: 'Thomson they seem to have forgotten'[19]—and this he evidently feels does not redound to their credit. To Thomson, be it noticed, fell the honour of introducing Alfred

[19] *Elia*: Imperfect Sympathies.

Tennyson to English Poetry, as he himself tells us: 'When I was about eight years old, I covered two sides of a slate with Thomsonian blank verse in praise of flowers. . . . Thomson then being the only poet I knew.'[20]

Great is the sense of satisfaction and relief when the conscientious reader of Thomson's poems reaches the end. He has completed a task, perhaps long-deferred, which it is very unlikely he will repeat or even wish to repeat. He has, however, his reward, in that he has chiselled out *his own Thomson*, in those marked passages of vivid, unforgettable word pictures to which he will return again and again and upon whose beauty he will, in quiet, care-free moments, love to dwell.

W. LAMPLOUGH DOUGHTY

[20] Hallam Tennyson's *Memoir* of his Father, p. 9.

Notes and Discussions

G. K. CHESTERTON—RECONSIDERED

ALTHOUGH Maisie Ward's biography of G. K. Chesterton erred on the side of idolatry, its account of Chesterton's personal history enables a reconsideration of his religious outlook.

Throughout his career (he died on 14th June 1936) Chesterton was admired as a defender of the Faith whose scintillating paradoxes and arresting epigrams were valuable contributions to Christian Apologetics. He was accepted as an original thinker and his confident pronouncements were widely respected as final judgements. The publishers' note commending the *Autobiography* declared that Chesterton was 'above all, the Laughing Philosopher, with a special genius for exhibiting the unfamiliar side of a question', and Miss Ward endorses Etienne Gibson's verdict that Chesterton was 'one of the deepest thinkers who ever existed'.

What, then, was Chesterton's contribution to the understanding of Religion? Or is the question unfair, and ought we not to quietly accept Chesterton as a great imaginative writer, thinking of him as he thought of Dickens—that 'his merits as much as his limitations make him the very last man in the world to be treated in this strict and stringent fashion'?

Now there can be no doubt that Chesterton's reputation as a philosopher was established on the apologetical character of his writing; neither can it be doubted that Chesterton himself intended his writing to be judged as essays in Apologetics. The announcement of his supremacy as an artist in words, rather than as a thinker, would therefore do scant justice to his designs, as it would also do an unkindness to most of his admirers. And it is Chesterton the thinker whom Maisie Ward's biography presents; it seeks to unfold the evolution of an Intellectual.

Unfortunately, however, this biography seeks to prove that Chesterton was

always a Catholic at heart. It claims that as early as 1894 he had independently discovered 'the wealth of Catholic truth'. But this is special pleading. For, prior to 1922, the year in which he became a Roman Catholic, the spirit of Chesterton's utterance, and the cast of his mind, were Protestant. So the question of the character of his interpretation of Religion is not foreclosed by the fact of his secession. Indeed, the last stage of his religious development, which in the biography is described as 'Completion', was really a contradiction of his early position.

Unlike many of our great literary men, Chesterton had a happy childhood, upon which he looked back with a gratitude which found spontaneous acknowledgement in much of his serious writing and unconscious expression in much of his fiction. The phrase 'those days of my boyhood'—is often to be found in his *St. Francis* and in his *Stevenson*, as well as in certain intimate chapters of *The Well and the Shallows*, and when the phrase occurs, it is used affectionately. The same affection is evident in the remarks he makes about many of his favourite characters; they all have the memory of a happy childhood. Owen Hood was 'always fishing for a dream of his boyhood', John Mallow came back with increased conviction to those places 'where I played as a boy, narrowing my circles like a bird going back to her nest'; and, on one solemn occasion, Flambeau and Father Brown 'had simultaneously a reminiscence of childhood, of the elfin and adventurous time when tall weeds close over us like woods'. And it was that happiness of his childhood that Chesterton the writer was ever seeking to convey and to vindicate against all those influences which, in his opinion, imperilled its significance.

This anxiety to justify the beauty of child-life was begotten of the religious crisis he endured between 1892 and 1895 while a student at the Chelsea Art School. He describes his experience at this time in *Orthodoxy* and in the *Autobiography*. But whereas his crisis is presented in the earlier work as an intellectual one, it is described in the *Autobiography* as a 'sort of congestion of the imagination'. Perhaps the clearest account of Chesterton's state of mind at this time is to be found in Gabriel Gale's confession in *The Poet and the Lunatics*—'the dreadful doubts are not the doubts of the materialist. The dreadful doubts, the deadly and damnable doubts, are the doubts of the idealist—the real sceptic who doubts matter and the minds of others, and everything except his own ego. . . . I have been through nearly every form of infernal idiocy.'

From this intellectual and moral impasse Chesterton emerged a victor without loss, largely through the influence of his friend Lucien Oldershaw who acquainted him with the poetry of Whitman, which strongly appealed to Chesterton. It was in consequence of his discovery of Whitman that Chesterton commenced his Note-Book, that seed-bed of his later thoughts wherein the youthful Chesterton is

> *calling the mind*
> *suspiciously, to establish in plain day*
> *Her titles and her honours.*

The predominant theme of these Note-Book thoughts is that of the naturalness of gratitude—the theme which he developed so cleverly and so beautifully when he visualized Chaucer standing in history as 'a great poet of gratitude', and St.

Francis stepping into the world out of a 'furnace of glowing gratitude and humility'.

The naturalness of gratitude became Chesterton's first principle: to him, ingratitude was unnatural. And, while he admitted that the idea was not rational, in the narrow sense of the word, he maintained that its acceptance was more reasonable than its rejection. It was a truth of experience: its psychological foundation was the emotion that thrilled the soul of Gabriel Syme—the Man who was Thursday—'the feeling of a strange and vivid value in all the world around him, in the grass under his feet'.

On the strength of this deliverance from his painful scepticism Chesterton published the volume of Poems entitled *Greybeards at Play*, and in the poem on 'The Pessimist' called upon the sceptic to 'take the word of a common man' as an answer to the riddle of the universe.

Now the conception of the ultimate authority of the common man became the ground of Chesterton's subsequent literary criticism and religious polemics. In his hands Browning, Dickens, Chaucer, Cobbett, Stevenson, and St. Francis —all of them—became people whose life and thought redounded to the credit of the common man. Browning found 'the beginning and the end of all optimism in the faces in the street'; Chaucer gloried in the commonplace because he had 'so great a faith in common sense': Dickens conveyed the 'old atmosphere of a democratic optimism—a confidence in common men': Stevenson 'advanced the disturbing paradox that . . . the young child who should lead us was the common (or garden) little boy'. And it was the same with Chesterton's fiction: Gabriel Syme felt himself to be 'the ambassador of all these kindly people in the street', and in that he was at one with all Chesterton's heroes.

This romantic estimate of the common man Chesterton expressed as a truth of reason and not as a private and peculiar feeling. But in his mind there was a fixed idea that an irreconcilable conflict raged between the scientific account of human nature and the religious democratic conception of the genius and the dignity of Man. To Chesterton, the ordinary man's experience was of metaphysical significance since it was universal in character and unaccountable —in the final analysis—from any purely scientific standpoint. The verdict of human experience was 'truer' than any scientific statement, for experience transcends science: 'When you say that the world is round, do you mean it? —No: it is true but you don't mean it', remarks Gabriel Syme to Rosamund Gregory. And there can be no doubt that on this point Chesterton was *substantially* right. For what Gabriel Syme intended to convey is the truth that there is a vast field of vital experience in which truth is found, though science does not recognize it for its real value, while many of the truths about the world which Science does disclose are remote from general experience. To a certain extent, and in relation to certain issues, the verdict of the common man might be more true than that of the scientist as such. So far Chesterton was right. Unhappily he made this insight the ground of an unreasonable attitude to Science. 'Lady Joan Brett . . . asked herself (in a doubt that had been darkening round her about many modern things lately) whether Misyra Ammon's views were really more fanciful than many things the scientists told her.' Father Brown also shared his creator's prejudices on this subject, for the

little priest says: 'Science is a grand thing when you can get it. . . . But what do these men mean, nine times out of ten when they use it nowadays? . . . They mean getting outside a man and studying him as if he were a gigantic insect, in what they would call a dry impartial light, and in what I should call a dead, dehumanized light.' Thus, Chesterton saw Man as 'a tower of tenor and mystery' and resented any attempt to view Man scientifically, for the scientific view (in his opinion) was humanly unsatisfactory, the view of mere experts whose authority was less than that of the ordinary man. This resentment explains much of his exaggeration in *The Everlasting Man.*

With regard to the authority of the common man, however, the Catholic Chesterton differed from the Protestant Chesterton. In the book on Dickens (1906) are these words: 'Men give out the air of Dickens without even opening his books; just as Catholics can live in a tradition of Christianity without having looked at the New Testament'—a comment which discloses the fundamental fault of Catholicism, namely, the distrust of private judgement. Likewise in one of the *Tremendous Trifles* he points out the similarity between the method of the law and the method of Jesus: The law 'collects twelve of the ordinary men standing around. The same thing was done by the Founder of Christianity.'

After his secession Chesterton surrendered this conception of authority and replaced it with the authority of the Catholic Church. His reason for this was that private judgement had ruined human thinking. In *The Thing* (1929) he depicted the Roman Church as alone sustaining 'the independent intellect of Man' and in 1935 he contended (in *The Well and the Shallows*) that 'the moment men began to contradict the Church with their own private judgement everything they did was incredibly ill-judged . . . those who tried to stand apart from authority could not in fact stand at all'. But the Father Brown stories are the most interesting illustrations of this change. For those characters in the stories who represent the non-Catholic world are superstitious while the Roman priest alone is rational. Fiennes in *The Oracle of the Dog* for instance, is 'too clever to understand animals, and too clever to understand men when they act like animals', and this because of his modern outlook which is arbitrary without being authoritative. And for the Catholic Chesterton Fiennes is typical of the common man who contradicts the Church.

The other provocative feature in Chesterton's writing is paradoxicality. Some people condemned Chesterton for this; they found it wearisome and they considered it to be bad style. They felt about Chesterton what Dr. Johnson felt about Rousseau, that his paradoxes were due to his 'childish desire of novelty'. Yet Chesterton's paradoxes were not due to any conscious striving after effect; they were due to his conviction that Paradox was the truest interpretation of our ambiguous life. 'Paradox', he wrote in *The Ball and the Cross*, 'is a thing which belongs to all religions, to all vivid and violent crises in human life.' Chesterton's paradoxes therefore cannot be dismissed as idle quips and quiddities; they must be judged as essays in understanding, as startling deductions from the premise of the ultimate irrationality and arbitrariness of the world, statements of that final contingency of Nature which is the ground of Christian humility, the occasion of Christian gratitude, and the justification of Praise.

Nevertheless, Chesterton often put paradox before integrity, and especially in regard to historical religious issues. Yet his perversity was not entirely deliberate: it was, rather, the result of his imaginative power. For example, from the Appendices to *The Everlasting Man* it is evident that Chesterton, though aware that some of his paradoxes were made at the expense of accuracy, was none-the-less unrepentant because he was defending his peculiar method of writing history. Now these Appendices are best understood when viewed in the light of a remark made by Father Brown in *The Curse of the Golden Cross*: 'It is really more natural', says that worthy, 'to believe a preternatural story that deals with things we don't understand, than a natural story that contradicts things we do understand. . . . It isn't the legend I disbelieve, it's the history.' This is the clue to Chesterton's attitude to history, and he bluntly states it as his personal attitude in the book on St. Francis: 'I have never been quite clear about the nature of the right by which historians accepted masses of detail . . . as definitely true, and suddenly denied their truthfulness when one detail was preternatural.' Such 'picking and choosing' implies that the original chroniclers were either—'liars or lunatics'. Here, too, is the ground of Chesterton's robust detestation of Higher Criticism which he lampooned in *The Flying Inn.* Higher criticism erred in seeking a natural explanation of supernatural events and in impeaching the good will and integrity of the Evangelists. The rationalistic mode of historiography was false; the surer method was the imaginative one in which 'the mind moves by instincts, associations, premonitions'. Thus, there was, at the back of Chesterton's mind, a fear of Science; the modern approach to Religion, which is scientific in spirit, was to him both untrue and morally dangerous. 'Don't you see', says Gabriel Gale in *The Shadow of the Shark*, 'that dreadful dry light shed on things must at last wither up the moral mysteries as illusions. . . ?'

It was a powerful case that Chesterton presented on behalf of Traditionalism.

It is when Chesterton's standpoint is followed through, however, that its unsatisfactoriness is disclosed. His attitude was irrational and his mouthpiece, Father Brown, was impressive, as a rule. But not always: in *The Honour of Israel Gow* and in *The Hammer of God*, the little priest was very wide of the mark in his estimate of the genius of Scotch Puritanism. For in the first of these tales Father Brown says: 'Scotch people before Scotland existed were a curious lot. In fact, they're a curious lot still. But in prehistoric times I fancy they really worshipped demons. That is why they jumped at Puritan theology.' In *The Hammer of God* the same theme is touched upon: 'Scotch Religion was made up by men who prayed on hills and high crags, and learnt to look down on the world more than to look up to Heaven.' Such quotation from Chesterton's fiction is not unfair, since the same move is played in the book on Stevenson, where Chesterton speaks for himself. Clearly therefore, an approach to history which can result in such misrepresentation is one that is fundamentally faulty; certainly it does no credit to 'one of the deepest thinkers who ever existed'.

Now Chesterton's secession becomes intelligible in this context; and it is better to call his transition a secession than it is to call it a conversion. For, all things considered, it is difficult to feel that he was a convinced convert. There are many passages in his writings which refer to his change of allegiance, the two most intimate passages being the essay entitled 'Mary and the Convert'

and part of the concluding chapter of the *Autobiography*. In 'Mary and the Convert' he claimed to have seen the need for an image, 'single, coloured, and clear in outline', which would adequately relate in his imagination, the Divine and the human. And it was the image of Mary which did this: it appealed to him before he had 'shed the nursery religion in which the Mother of God had no fit or adequate place'. In the *Autobiography* he declared that he became a Catholic to 'get rid of his sins', for only the Catholic conceptions of confession and absolution could meet his moral needs.

Here, again, Chesterton made his feelings do service for reason. When he makes his infant affection for coloured imagery into a reason for becoming a Roman Catholic one can only adapt a remark of Dr. Johnson's and point out that there is no real correspondence between sculpture and theological truth. With regard to the need of 'getting rid of his sins' Chesterton, with his acute mind, should have perceived that with or without the Catholic conceptions of Confession and Absolution, no man is justified apart from personal faith. It is the faith that makes the Sacrament effective. It is disappointing also to reflect, after Chesterton's moving testimony, that he did not often go to Communion because he was 'too frightened of that tremendous Reality on the Altar'.

To 'place' Chesterton is not so difficult as is sometimes suggested. He once confessed that he detested 'the man with a message'. Yet that is what he himself was pre-eminently. His reputation as a Laughing Philosopher will suffer because he laughed at the wrong things. Yet, even so, there will be many for whom his writings will have a value. For Chesterton is to them a man who beheld our bewildering world and pronounced it 'very good'.

E. M. DODD

APROPOS THOMAS MANN'S *DOCTOR FAUSTUS*

THE EXIGENCIES of present-day journalism, even of quarterly journalism, make it very difficult to do justice to Thomas Mann's latest novel, *Doctor Faustus* (Secker and Warburg, 15*s*. net). So vast is its scope and so many are the subjects that it touches upon, that it should have been written and published in the spacious days of Jeffrey's *Edinburgh* and Lockhart's *Quarterly*. Then there would have been adequate time to study it at leisure and sufficient space to discuss it fully and at length.

Doctor Faustus has a sub-title: *The Life of the German composer Adrian Leverkühn as told by a friend.* That indicates that the novel is written as though it were a biography, and that a good deal of the book is given over to things musical. There have been novels written about musicians before, but scarcely one that treated its subject so learnedly. Mann is a German, one of a musical race. In the course of his novel he says: 'In Germany music enjoys that respect among the people which in France is given to literature.' The technical discussions and analyses in which he indulges would qualify Herr Mann to practise musical criticism or musicology, if he so desired. That is why the Editor has asked me, a musical critic, to write a few words on a novel.

But first I should like to say that, quite apart from the musical dissertations, the average novel reader will find *Doctor Faustus* not easy reading. The style is involved, and the translator, Mr. H. T. Lowe-Porter, has found it necessary to write a prefatory note on the difficulties he has encountered. One cannot help admiring his work, but (though we can grant that German is a more grammatically complicated language than English) there are one or two passages in which the translator seems to be a little careless. For instance, he twice seems to insert an unnecessary 'all', as in the following sentences: 'What all don't people think of!' and 'What all has not happened before our eyes.' It is not surprising, therefore, that one wishes the book had been written by a Frenchman. It would have been briefer, more lucid, more witty, quite as profound (in spite of popular conceptions to the contrary). But equally naturally it would have been a different book.

English readers ought not to be surprised that Herr Mann has chosen the subject of a contemporary German composer as his subject and chief character. Two years ago, he broadcast for the B.B.C. a talk entitled *Germany—her character and destiny*. It was printed in *The Listener* of 12th June 1947, and I was sufficiently stimulated by it to make an extract in my note-book. Although it is rather long, I should like to quote it, since, in my opinion, it succinctly expresses the thought that lies behind his novel.

It is a grave error on the part of legend and story not to connect Faust with music. He should have been musical, he should have been a musician. Music is demonic realm; it is 'Christian art with a negative prefix' as Sören Kierkegaard put it. Music is calculated order and chaos-breeding irrationality at once; the most unrealistic and yet the most impassioned of arts, mystical and abstract. If Faust is to be representative of the German soul, he would have to be musical; for the relation of the German to the world is abstract and mystical, that is, musical—the relation of a professor with a touch of demonism, awkward and at the same time filled with the arrogant notion that he surpasses the world in 'depth'.

What constitutes this depth? Simply the musicality of the German soul, that which we call its inwardness, or *Innerlichkeit*, its subjectivity, the divorce of the speculative from the socio-political element of human energy, and the complete predominance of the former over the latter. Europe always felt it and understood its monstrous and unfortunate aspects. In 1839 Balzac wrote: 'If the Germans do not know how to play the great instruments of liberty, still they know naturally how to play all instruments of music.'

Martin Luther, a gigantic incarnation of the German spirit, was exceptionally musical. I frankly confess that I do not love him.

Doctor Faustus was first published in German in Sweden in 1947, so the talk came after the completion of the novel. It must have been written while all the thought that had gone to the making of *Doctor Faustus* was still fresh in the author's mind.

Frank reference to the 'demonic' is surely something new in contemporary literature. That he himself realizes that the question must be handled carefully, not to say gingerly, is shown by the fact that the chapter depicting Adrian Leverkühn's Faustian compact with the Devil is written, in the original, in German of the time of Luther, thereby giving the translator one of his major problems. Musicians will see in the passage I have quoted an echo of the

extreme Puritan condemnation of the arts. I wonder whether Herr Mann will be surprised to find himself aligned on that side.

Herr Mann is haunted by two major problems. First, being a German exiled from his native land by the Nazi régime, he is seeking an explanation of the degradation of his country. Secondly, he is concerned with the divorce of so much modern art (be it pictorial art, music, or literature) from ordinary folk.

Evidence of this may be found everywhere. Innovators such as Schönberg and Hindemith make scarcely any contact with the music lover who responds to the accepted great classical and romantic composers. In the U.S.S.R., composers like Prokofiev and Shostakovitch have been censured by the authorities because they did not write a desired type of music, music that should be 'understanded of the people'. This is a reflection of the kind of aesthetic taught by Tolstoy in his *What is Art?*

Yet it is not entirely true that modern art cannot come to terms with or appeal to a wide public. Toward the end of his life the Hungarian Béla Bartók (also an exile in America) was undoubtedly finding such a public.

Nor do I feel that it is just to use the expression 'demonic' of present-day artistic phenomena. It may be granted that subjects treated by Schönberg and his pupil Alban Berg (*Wozzeck*, for example) are morbid and macabre, even ghoulish. But it is also undeniable that Hindemith, in his opera on the subject of Matthis Grünewald and the peasants' war, dealt with a topic very much apropos these times—the liberty and integrity of the artist. He has also written a ballet, *Nobilissima Visione*, round St. Francis of Assisi.

The last three symphonies of Vaughan Williams form an interesting example of the 'trickiness' apparent in the valuing of contemporary music. Some people argued that his F minor Symphony, written in 1934, was a savage protest against modernism. The same people welcomed the quietism of his D major Symphony, first performed during the war but composed before it. They regarded this Symphony as the summing-up and resolution of all that he had previously composed. Nevertheless, the ruggedness of his Fourth Symphony returned in his Sixth in E minor, first performed last year.

Where Herr Mann does correctly diagnose something that is wrong with much modern art may be found on page 134 in a letter imagined as being written by Leverkühn.

> I have always had to laugh, most damnably, at the most mysterious and impressive phenomena. I fled from this exaggerated sense of the comic into theology, in the hope that it would give relief to the tickling—only to find there too a perfect legion of ludicrous absurdities. Why does almost everything seem to me like its own parody? Why must I think that almost all, no, all the methods and conventions of art today *are good for parody* only? (author's italics).

Since, in this discussion of modern music, I have brought in the name of Arnold Schönberg, I ought to add that in an after-note, Herr Mann acknowledges his debt to the Austrian composer's *Harmonielehre*. Moreover, on page 191, Herr Mann attempts an exposition of the twelve-note system. Before the publication of the book in England *The Observer* reported a story that Schönberg was bringing a libel action over *Doctor Faustus*. But I have not heard anything further of that.

The novel is represented as being written by Dr. Serenus Zeitblom, a typical product of a German university, and his character is really as interesting as his hero's. He writes unsystematically, apologizing occasionally for introducing subject matter too soon, out of time or logical order. He tells the story reluctantly, although one suspects a secret pleasure in disclosing something awful. He is sitting down to write the story while the defeat of his own country in the recent war is obviously and inevitably imminent (Leverkühn has died in 1940). One of the interesting 'overflowings' is a description of the opening phase of the 1914 war, and the bewilderment of the Germans by the defeat of their army at the Marne.

Leverkühn is portrayed as at once an attractive and a repellant man, extremely aloof. Zeitblom has known him since childhood, and neither his marriage nor his call to military service can keep him apart from his hero for long. Leverkühn is also shown as first taking up the study of theology 'out of arrogance'.

Another interesting character is Wendell Kretschmar, Adrian Leverkühn's composition teacher. He is an American with German ancestry. One whole chapter is devoted to a summary of four of his talks on music, the subjects being: Why did Beethoven not write a third movement to the Piano Sonata, Op. 111; Beethoven and the Fugue; the Elemental in Music; and Music and the Eye.

It is obvious that such amplitude of discussion gets in the way of the portrayal of character, as it is ordinarily understood by the novelist and his reader, though there are, of course, plenty of character sketches of Leverkühn's acquaintances and friends throughout the book. In fact, whenever the imaginary narrator Zeitblom reminisces instead of analysing and dissecting, the story comes extraordinarily alive and the reader warms to it.

Doctor Faustus is a paramount tract for the times; but as a novel, I doubt whether it will live and capture the world as Tolstoy's *War and Peace* has done.

STANLEY BAYLISS

Recent Literature

An Approach to Christology, by A. R. Vine. (Independent Press, 21*s*.)
Dr. Vine divides his book into two parts. In the first he deals with the metaphysic and Christology of Nestorius. In the second he outlines a way of approach to an orthodox Christology compatible with modern thought. Having studied the newly recovered apology of Nestorius, the *Bazaar* of Heracleides, he felt uneasy as to the verdict of history on Nestorius. He therefore made a minute analysis of the *Bazaar*, and as a result arrived at two conclusions: (*a*) that Nestorius was rightly condemned by his contemporaries and that their verdict needs no revision; (*b*) that there are nevertheless some most valuable elements in the thought and method of Nestorius which, with some revision and extension, might provide a way of approach to a solution of the Christological problem. Of the two parts of this thesis, the first has an obvious appeal to the student interested in the study of technical details in Nicene and post-Nicene Christological debates and controversies. Part Two has a wider appeal, for it carries with it a challenge to the modern mind. Is it possible that a sympathetic study of the mind of the ancient heretic will reveal a metaphysic which, translated and interpreted afresh, points us today to a profounder Christology than that which can be reached in any other way? We are familiar enough with attempts all through history to fit the stupendous fact of the Incarnation into the framework of philosophies. Are we in a better position nowadays to assay the task afresh, not least in the light of the New Physics and the newer views of the relation between the Natural and the Supernatural to which our wider knowledge seems to point? While no finite mind can fully comprehend the nature of ultimate reality or solve the problem of the relation of Being to Becoming, of Time to Eternity, are we not, however, better equipped today than were the Ancients in grappling with the theological problem: *How could GOD lead a human life?* Can we fit any such conception within the framework of our modern modes of thought? Well, let a man first study Dr. Vine's exposition of the metaphysic of Nestorius and try under his able and penetrating guidance to enter more fully into the mind of this ancient teacher, and then turn to Part Two of this thesis, and watch its writer grappling with the problem of how to carry the mind and the metaphysic of Nestorius across the centuries, and to give us their equivalent in terms of our own modern world-view. How far he succeeds, space forbids us to examine, but we hope we have said enough to excite the curiosity of students, for a rich feast awaits them in this book.

H. MAURICE RELTON

An Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics, by Auguste Lecerf. (Lutterworth Press, 25*s*.)
Professor Lecerf, of the Theological Faculty in Paris, wrote two volumes—one on the nature of religious knowledge, the other on the foundation and specification of religious knowledge—which were published in French in 1931 and 1938 respectively under the general title *Introduction à la Dogmatique Réformée*. This translation of the two volumes is a real service to theology. The first part considers from the Calvinist viewpoint the problems of Philosophy of Religion, and indeed of epistemology in general. After attacking many familiar philosophical positions, particularly that of Durkheim, the author supports a moderate critical realism. The traditional 'proofs' are not employed, but God 'appears as the crown of the theory of knowledge'. The Calvinist conception of God is distinguished from Deism and pantheism, and the difficult question of predestination is summed up thus: 'Calvin's thesis is precisely that an act of which the futurition is certain can be perfectly free in its mode of

realization.' In the second part the author seeks to show that dogmatics must be Reformed. After defending the rights of Calvinist apologetics and philosophy, he shows, in order, that dogmatics must be theist, Christian and orthodox, and Protestant. There follows a considerable discussion on the authority of Scripture. Finally he tries to show that Dogmatics must be Reformed rather than Lutheran or Methodist. The work has many interesting features, First, Lecerf, who was described in 1930 as 'the last of the Calvinists', lived to see a great Calvinist revival. We tend to think only of the Swiss or Barthian form of this. It is well to be reminded that there are Calvinists in Holland and France, who have a quite independent tradition. In one of the very few references to Barth, Lecerf quotes him as saying: 'We cannot make a philosophy of religion without a bad conscience.' The second point of interest is that a Calvinist should set himself to prepare the way for such a philosophy. Works such as this and those of Emil Brunner will free Calvinists from the charge that none of them is interested in epistemological and apologetic questions. But does their defence succeed? From the start the author assumes the whole of the Calvinist position which seems to us so doubtful. This leads to the third point of interest: the issue between Calvinism and Methodism. Lecerf sets out firmly his objections to a plea which he had read for a return to Wesley. His real objection is that Wesleyan Arminianism is anthropocentric: it does not give the glory to God alone. But is not a God who seeks to save all men, more glorious than One who wills the damnation of some so that His righteousness may be demonstrated? For all Lecerf's wide culture and genial courtesy, there is a Calvinist rigidity about his work: nevertheless we greatly regret that his death in 1943 prevented him from completing this major contribution to Systematic Theology.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

The Theology of F. D. Maurice, by Alec R. Vidler. (S.C.M. Press, 8*s.* 6*d.*)

In this book Dr. Vidler has rendered a signal service to theological students, and especially to young students. This service is twofold. In the first place, the book revives effectively the memory of the foremost English theological thinker and teacher of the nineteenth century. In the second, Dr. Vidler, by his method, has rendered an even more important service, for he gives full quotations and careful references direct from Maurice's writings on all the subjects of Maurice's great witness. Maurice was a voluminous writer of treatises, sermons, letters to the Press, and private correspondence. These are now mostly out of print, and only accessible with great difficulty. Dr. Vidler has made an exhaustive study of them all. The result is that in this book Maurice lives and teaches again. It will be an indispendable handbook in future. Frederick Denison Maurice was the greatest Christian prophet of the last century in England. No other teacher approached him in his deep and far-reaching influence over the best minds, both clerical and lay. 'A spiritual splendour', Gladstone called him. He touched life at many points, yet always as a theologian. He drew all his judgements of truth in regard to the universe, to history, and to human affairs, from the Supreme Truth of the Holy Trinity. It is not too much to say that the whole of his teaching was an exposition and application of St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians 1^{12-20}, particularly of the declaration that 'all things have been created through Him (the Son), and unto Him; and He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together. And He is the head of the body, the Church'. Maurice did not create a School or formulate a System. Both of these were repugnant to him. He belonged to no Theological School, though he had affinities with them all. Catholic and Anglican to the core, he combated the reactionary and exclusive tendencies of the Tractarian Movement. Profoundly evangelical in faith and

experience, he was treated as a dangerous foe by the professed Evangelicals. Essentially modern—except in relation to Biblical criticism—he was out of sympathy with Modernism. Versed in the history of Christian Thought, he was no scholastic. So, in a sorely divided age, Maurice became the reverenced teacher of multitudes, who, wearied of dissension and ecclesiasticism, sought to reach the City of God. What, then, was his outstanding witness? The following summary will set it forth. All men have been created by, atoned for, and redeemed by the Son of God, incarnate, crucified, and risen for man's Salvation. All men belong to a reconciled world. It is for them to recognize and claim what is already their inheritance in Christ. No man is outside Christ, whether he knows it or not. Nor is the Church separate from Mankind. The latter is the true state, the Kingdom of God. In it men should find the fulfilment of their manhood, the standpoint from which their whole life should be directed. The Church is not founded upon opinions, or even creeds, but upon the all-embracing *Fact* of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. All the mistakes, the failures, and the divisions of the Church have arisen because Christian have descended from this height to become absorbed in conflicting opinions and consequent controversies. All this is explained by Maurice himself in Dr. Vidler's eight chapters, and, above all, in the first three, 'The Head and King of our Race', 'The Idea of a Church Universal', and 'The Sacrament of Constant Union'. Since there are signs that doubts in regard to the Baptism of Infants are troubling some members of all the Communions that practise it, Dr. Vidler's statement of Maurice's belief and his own may be summarized: 1, Baptism asserts what the child really is and belongs to. It asserts the claim of Christ upon him, and the offer of Christ to him, rather than his claim upon Christ. 2, Baptism brings the child to his *inheritance* in Christ, and brings this inheritance to him. It assures and conveys to him all that God in Christ Jesus graciously wills to convey to him in and through the Church, as the Body of Christ. 3. The significance of Baptism and its fulfilment are to be completely realized by the child's subsequent entrance into the full membership of the Church, with its benefits and responsibilities, whether by Confirmation or by some similar reception. It need only be added to the warm commendation of Dr. Vidler's book that his explanations and comments are always to the point and timely.

J. Scott Lidgett

The Psalms Translated and Interpreted in the Light of Hebrew Life and Worship, by Elmer A. Leslie. (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, *via* Epworth Press, $5.)

For upwards of thirty years most of the work done on the *Psalter* has been concerned with the classification of the Psalms according to literary type, with their relation to the cult, with the evidence which they are held to present for the existence of an enthronement ritual as part of the New Year Festival, and with the place of the king in that ritual. In this commentary Dr. Leslie has sought to popularize the results of the researches of Gunkel, Mowinckel, Schmidt, and other scholars. He gives us a new translation of the entire *Psalter* and rearranges it in sections, the main headings of which themselves indicate his indebtedness to the above scholars—e.g. 'The Hymn in Hebrew Worship'; 'The New Year Festival in Israel'; 'Psalm Liturgies'; 'Psalms Concerning the King'; 'Prayers of the Sick and the Penitent'; 'Songs of Trust and of Wisdom'. On each Psalm there is a running commentary which seeks to relate it to the worship of ancient Israel. (For general introduction and discussion of such matters as Psalm titles we are referred to the author's article in the *Abingdon Commentary*.) It need hardly be said that there is much that is controversial. But to be fair to Dr. Leslie's commentary it is necessary to recognize both its *Gattung* and its *Sitz im Leben*. It is addressed to the reader who is not a specialist; and it does not provide

a detailed argument in support of current views of the *Thronbesteigungsfest* and divine kingship in Israel. Its success must be measured by the effectiveness with which it presents to the modern reader the wealth of religious inspiration in the *Psalter*. The translation is faithful, vigorous, and (with very few lapses) dignified. Gunkel's textual conjectures are frequently adopted, as the footnotes show. It would have been an improvement, however, if *all* variations from the Massoretic Text had been indicated (say by the use of different type), for the intelligent reader who has no Hebrew may want to know which divergencies from the renderings of the standard versions are merely differences in translation and which are the result of the emendation of the text. The exposition is reverent, and, in the best sense, imaginative; and he must be a dull reader to whom it does not bring a deepened sense of the unsurpassed union of literary and spiritual power which the *Psalter* presents. Each Psalm is treated section by section; and the development of the theme or the varying mood of the Psalmist is clearly and effectively brought out. Sometimes a more detailed exposition, particularly of some of the great theological terms of the Old Testament, might with advantage have been offered; and, although the general reader does not want to be confused by a multitude of conflicting interpretations, he ought occasionally to be informed that there is more than one way of taking a passage. He is likely to be seriously misled by the application of the term 'legend' to the events of the Exodus and the invasion of Canaan, although when used as a *terminus technicus* it is not always as derogatory as it sounds. But such criticisms do not detract seriously from our gratitude to Dr. Leslie for this inspiring volume. (Among some slips the following may be mentioned: p. 30, *nebhel* (not *nehbel*); neither Numbers 10^{2} nor 1 Chronicles 15^{24} refers to the *shôphār*, though the rendering of English versions is 'trumpets'; p. 63, n. 4, the term *yôm shôphār* does not occur in Numbers 29^{1}.)

GEORGE W. ANDERSON

The Gospel according to St. Mark, by A. M. Hunter. (S.C.M., 7*s*. 6*d*.)

This is the first of the *Torch Bible Commentaries*, a new series designed for the general reader. While sound critical scholarship provides the groundwork, the aim of the series is to expound the scriptures as containing the message of the living God rather than to explain minute points of grammar or archaeology. The present volume fulfils this purpose admirably. This does not mean that it is devotional or homiletical but it avoids treating the Word of Life with the cold dispassionate precision with which a scientist might dissect a specimen. Dr. Hunter's comments give the reader just the needed guidance as to the exact meaning of the text, but he never loses sight of the theological issues, which are brought out with sound judgement and forceful brevity. The method is to study each paragraph of St. Mark separately, first giving a general note on it and then adding comments on details. It is difficult to see why the commentary has been based upon the Authorized Version, but this is possibly the editorial policy for the whole series. Had the Revised Version been taken as the basis, a number of comments would have been unnecessary (e.g. 2^{16-17}, 3^{14}). In the treatment of the miracles there is little attempt to rationalize, except in the fairly obvious cases of the Gerasene demoniac and the fig tree. The general standpoint on this question may be indicated by a quotation: 'If we had more of the faith that rebels, . . . the faith that expects great things from God as its birthright, we should not only find our Lord's miracles more credible, but we should find for ourselves a power-house of illimitable energy.' (On p. 37 '21–36' should be '2^{1}–3^{6}'.)

T. FRANCIS GLASSON

St. Paul's Gospel to the Romans, by Gwilym O. Griffith. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 10*s.* 6*d.*).

Mr. Griffith selects the Epistle to the Romans as normative for Paul's theology, and presents, not a detailed exegetical commentary, but a broad and comprehensive survey of the essential teaching. It is not part of his purpose to discuss the critical problems of the Epistle, of which, however, he shows himself fully aware. The treatment has many commendable features. A salutary warning is given that we should not look for fixed definitive doctrine in the Epistle; the age of systematization had not yet come. The Apostle's thought is interpreted both in its historical setting and occasion and in its bearing on the modern world. In particular the author emphasizes the cosmic scale of Redemption in Christ as integral to the Pauline doctrines of grace viewed as a whole. Any student who has tried to write a paraphrase of *Romans* will be grateful for the author's successful attempt, with its interspersed explanatory connexions, and for the careful definition of such key terms as 'faith', 'flesh', 'glory', and 'the Wrath'. We welcome the insistence that there is continuity between the doctrines of Paul and the teaching of His Master. Incidentally Mr. Griffith, following some eminent scholars, leaves open the possibility that Paul may have seen and heard Jesus in the flesh. The chapter on 'Christ and the Spirit' is especially valuable: the Person of the Father, the Person of Christ, and the Person of the Holy Spirit, are 'all of them represented as having an inter-relationship so close that the terms applied to them are often interchangeable, yet not to the extent of dissolving the distinctiveness of each'. A useful Questionnaire is appended, but no Index. There are occasional lapses in the readable language and style: 'up against' is not pleasing, and is there no simple periphrasis for the cumbrous term 'anthropocentricism'? The notion of 'faith in His blood' (Romans 3^{25}) is absent from Paul, as indeed from the New Testament; the Revised Version punctuation and translation should be followed in that passage. But differences on points of exegesis inevitably arise. They do not detract from the value of this study of 'the Gospel according to St. Paul'.

HENRY G. MEECHAM

The Johannine Epistles, by C. J. Barker. (Lutterworth Press, 5*s.*)

This is one of a new series of commentaries on the books of the Bible 'designed to meet the needs of the ordinary Bible-reader who has no specialized knowledge and so throughout is anxious to discover a message and meaning for life in the world of today'. While no task is more urgent in these days than the popularizing of exegesis, a fresh discussion of critical questions is hardly to be expected under the purpose of this series. Mr. Barker thinks it doubtful whether sufficient data for a considered judgement on the question of authorship are available. He holds, however, that it is clear that these letters have a distinctive flavour of their own, and that, like the Fourth Gospel, to which they are at least closely allied, they are unique. One cannot help thinking that our commentator might have brought their uniqueness more vividly into relief. He tends to generalize and his commentary often blurs the sharp outlines of the text. That classic commentary, Law's *Tests of Life*, has a place in the useful little bibliography at the beginning of the book, but does not seem to have influenced deeply its author. Would it not have greatly enhanced the impressiveness of the exposition he offers if, following in Law's footsteps, he had shown, in language simpler and less theological than Law's, that the writer of the First Epistle, charging the Gnostics whom he attacks so vigorously with being wrong about Christ, about themselves and about their fellow-believers, asserts that each of these misapprehensions is bound up with the others? In view of the purpose of the book, it is

surprising that no thoroughgoing attempt appears to be made to draw any kind of parallel between the spirit of that age and of this, or to compare the fatalism of the Gnostic intelligentzia of the first century with its modern counterpart. It is only fair, however, to bear in mind the purpose and scope of this little and commendably cheap commentary; it will soon vindicate its usefulness to the constituency for which it is designed. One's only regret is that it could so easily have been made more arresting and provocative, and that it is perhaps too apologetic to do justice to the fiery spirit of the Christian prophet who wrote the three Epistles of John.

J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY

A Rebirth of Images, by Austin Farrer. (Dacre Press, 25*s*.)

As the sub-title indicates, this book is about 'The Making of the Apocalypse'. It is of such a nature that it is hardly possible to give an adequate outline in a short review. 'The Christian revolution,' according to Dr. Farrer, 'is essentially a transformation of images.' In the Apocalypse we get a deeper insight than anywhere else into the process of the rebirth of images. The author is writing of heaven and of things to come, and that means that he is writing about that realm which has no shape at all except that shape which the images give it. In his book both the images and the process of inspiration by which these images were born in his mind may be studied. There is clear evidence of framework in the Apocalypse, but as the reader proceeds, the whole seems to disintegrate into series of visions and oracular utterances. Is it that the book is not a unity, or did the author break down in the execution of his plan, or has some editor rearranged the material and spoilt the harmony of the structure? Dr. Farrer rejects all these solutions, and is at great pains to construct the formal pattern underlying the whole, with the help of that knowledge of the Jewish-Christian mind in the first century which research has now made possible. The book, he thinks, consists of a work of judgement in six evenings and mornings *plus* a sabbath-eve. This scheme is applied to the whole historical process. As God created the world in six days, in six days He will bring the world to come, each day being conceived, perhaps, as a thousand years. John supposes a history of six thousand ages. The first five days of his book all fall within the latter part of the fifth historical age and deal with the 'little while' between the First and Second Advent. Christ had come at the end of the fifth age; the sixth would be the millennium, initiated by the Second Advent and terminated by the Last Judgement. A part of the difficulty in seeing or unlocking the pattern is that 'there is a perpetual tension between the claims of part and the claims of the whole: each section being almost allowed, but never quite allowed, to become an apocalypse in itself. Another part of the difficulty is that the book is 'threaded upon several strands of continuous symbolism'. Along with the pattern of the six days there is also the pattern of the Jewish calendar of Feasts—Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles, Dedication. Each section of the book represents the feasts of a single quarter, but 'within each section the author flies round all four quarters not only once, but twice, or three times'. Dr. Farrer works out the shape and details of these quarters, and notes in the last vision of all that the Jerusalem of the world to come is a four-square city, taking in the whole zodiac. The length and breadth and height of the city are equal—i.e. it is not a city, but a sanctuary: the Holy of Holies had the dimensions of a cube. It is generally understood that self-consistency is not to be expected in an apocalyptic writing, but Dr. Farrer has succeeded in working out a consistent pattern and interpretation which has taken seven years to produce, and which he offers for criticism. He has strengthened the hands of those who maintain that the Apocalypse is a unity. His identification of the John of the Apocalypse with the author of the Gospel (but not with the son of Zebedee) may

not win much support. In view of the many differences within the book, it remains questionable whether the subtle parallels and the other arguments which he advances necessarily imply unity of authorship, as against the hypothesis that both books may be the products of a school which had its centre in Ephesus in the latest decades of the first century.

F. BERTRAM CLOGG

Essentials of Demonology, by Edward Langton. (The Epworth Press, 15*s*.)

Dr. Langton has devoted many years to the study of the belief in angels and spirits, both good and bad. This is the sixth book he has written on the subject. It deals with the origin and development of Jewish and Christian ideas concerning demons and evil spirits. The author has worked through the Old and the New Testaments and later Jewish literature. He has also examined the ideas concerning demons which are to be found in the religions of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Persia, so as to judge to what extent Jewish and Christian ideas may be said to be dependent upon contact with these other peoples and religions. The book is a very thorough and painstaking piece of work, and a veritable mine of information, not easily otherwise accessible. Dr. Langton's judgements are careful and sound. He deals first with the general ideas of primitive peoples, and then with early ideas prevalent in Arabia and in the Mesopotamian valley. The first stage is that ghosts and spirits (i.e. ex-human and non-human beings) are not regarded as being either good or bad, but supernatural and 'uncertain', so that man has always to be careful about them. Moral distinctions come later. In the second chapter we have an account of Old Testament demons in all their varied forms—serpents, hairy demons, night demons, and demons of pestilence and disease. The origin of the idea of Satan is discussed, both here and in the next chapter, which deals with Persian demons in all their varied multitude. Here Dr. Langton, rightly as we hold, comes to the conclusion that the idea of Satan is native to Hebrew thought, and in the Old Testament owes nothing to Persian ideas about Ahriman, the supreme Spirit of Evil. It is probable, nevertheless, that post-Old Testament ideas were influenced by the strong Persian dualism of Persia, and that this influence appears in the New Testament figure of Satan as the Prince of the counter kingdom of evil. When the author turns to the New Testament, he shows how prominent and widespread the belief in demons was, and how they were everywhere accepted as being real and effective in their evil deeds. It is evident that Jesus accepted the common beliefs of the time in this matter as in many others. Dr. Langton rejects any theory of 'accommodation' on the part of Jesus to popular and erroneous ideas. But he adds—and again rightly, as we would hold—'such an acceptance by Jesus does not prove that these popular beliefs correspond with reality'. Such beliefs were part of His human limitations, and did not affect the validity of His spiritual teaching. Altogether this is a useful and helpful book.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow. (University of Chicago Press and Cambridge Press, 33*s*.)

This is the kind of book that is produced in America better than anywhere else. There every facility is given for 'graduate' (i.e. post-graduate) research. This is a collection of essays by experts in many fields of Biblical study, who are members and guests of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research, and is edited by H. R. Willoughby with Paul E. Davies, Floyd V. Filson, and G. Ernest Wright, as an Advisory Committee. These names promise a rich feast and the reader is not disappointed. The

book is divided into two parts, the first dealing with general surveys of main areas, the second with special studies of salient problems. Here there is only space to indicate the kind of subject that is treated. A few samples will suggest how much more there is to reward the eager reader. R. A. Bowman surveys Old Testament research between the great wars; J. C. Rylaarsdam reviews Intertestamental Studies since Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*; and M. P. Parvis gives an account of New Testament Criticism in the world-wars period. While these studies summarize the discussions and theories which have aroused most interest in the recent past, there are others which point to the lines along which progress is likely in the near future. The famous archaeologist, W. F. Albright, not only takes stock of loss and gain through the years of war in Europe but forecasts the future of Biblical studies; O. R. Sellers writes about the status and prospects of research concerning the Psalms; and H. M. Orlinsky reports current progress and marks out problems in Septuagint research. The problems and tasks to be grappled with in the three fields of Old Testament, Intertestamental, and New Testament research are handled respectively by F. C. Prussner, Ralph Marcus and Paul Schubert. Turning to special studies we observe how theology is coming into its own, however slowly. W. A. Irwin deals with Revelation in the Old Testament; O. J. Baab with Old Testament Theology: its possibility and methodology; D. W. Riddle reassesses the religious importance of Paul; and F. V. Filson lays bare the central problem concerning Christian origins; whilst A. N. Wilder discusses New Testament Theology in transition. We must also mention such timely essays as those by P. E. Davies on the relevance of Apocalyptic for ancient and modern situations; by the famous scholar F. C. Grant on the teachings of Jesus and first-century Jewish ethics; and by S. E. Johnson on the emergence of the Christian Church in the pre-catholic period. Nor is the less technical side of the subject forgotten, for A. A. Hays writes about the role of the Bible in the Reformation and A. P. Wikgren offers a critique of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. Many readers will find as much interest in the essays to which no reference has been made. One is impressed by the wide variety of critical temperament. Some of the writers are quite radical in their approach, but others would have been considered decidedly conservative a few years ago and would hardly have found a place then in such a symposium published by the University of Chicago. But all the writers are extremely competent to handle the topics assigned to them, and the book as a whole must stimulate many a young student to devote himself with zest to the serious study of several branches of biblical knowledge. The book is appropriately dedicated 'To the Students of Today who will become the Biblical Scholars of Tomorrow'.

WILBERT F. HOWARD

The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, by Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield. (The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia, $3.75.)

The eight chapters and two appendices of this book are composed of articles and addresses produced during the time (1887–1921) when the author was Professor of Didactic and Polemical Theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary. After his death in 1921 a collection of his writings was published in a volume entitled *Revelation and Inspiration*, of which the work under review is largely a reprint. An introduction of sixty-five pages, however, has been added by Dr. Cornelius Van Til, who not long ago launched an attack under the title of *The New Modernism* on the Neo-orthodoxy of Barth and Brunner. Dr. Van Til argues from a philosophical point of view, as Dr. Warfield from a biblical and theological, in support of Orthodox Calvinism as the only thoroughly sound position for Christian thought to adopt. He criticizes Lutheranism and Arminianism, Romanism and the Dialectical Theology—the two

former more gently, the two latter very vigorously—for working with a non-Christian epistemology, which leads them all in their various ways to deny the absoluteness and infallibility of the Bible as the Word of God. Dr. Warfield's style is less abstruse and more persuasive, but both writers bring great erudition to the task of maintaining the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. The result is a book to delight the heart of the Fundamentalist. Yet it is Fundamentalism with a certain difference, and although it is unlikely to convince any but the already persuaded, it cannot be dismissed simply as a piece of learned obscurantism. There is point in Dr. Van Til's contention that things are what they are in virtue of their place in the plan of God, that they can be rightly understood only in the light of the Divine revelation given us in the Bible, and that that revelation must be accepted as infallible unless we are to make of it, as well as of everything else, precisely what we please. At the same time, it seems unnecessary (to say the least) to identify the revelation with a verbally inspired and inerrant 'original pure text' of the Bible, which it is the business of textual criticism to recover for us. Similarly, there is point in Dr. Warfield's argument that if we regard the Bible as authoritative in respect of the doctrine of the Trinity and Christology, we ought not to find it more difficult to accept its teaching about its own nature as Scripture (i.e. the view of Scripture taken by Christ and the Apostles in the Bible). But is this teaching really quite the same as the verbal inspiration theory of Protestant Orthodoxy? And is it precisely this theory that has been universally held in the Church until quite modern times? The point of the theory, according to Dr. Warfield, lies in its assertion that the biblical writers are not the authors of the biblical message, but that it is a message from God. The Bible, however, is admitted to be a human as well as a divine book in all its parts; God speaks to men through men in the language they can understand, and there is something of the nature of 'progressive revelation' in the Bible. We are warned, moreover, against drawing too close a parallel between the 'inscripturation' of the Spirit and the incarnation of the Word. In view of these facts, it should scarcely have been necessary for Dr. Warfield to regard the Bible as no less infallible in matters of science, history, and geography, than in things pertaining to salvation, or to claim that no single error has ever yet been demonstrated to exist in it.

PHILIP S. WATSON

The Romance of New Testament Scholarship, by Wilbert Francis Howard. (The Epworth Press, 7*s.* 6*d.*)

The debt which students of the New Testament already owe to Dr. Howard has been greatly increased by the publication of the Drew Lectures delivered in the United States in October 1947. The terms of this lectureship require that the subject shall be treated in biographical form. In successive chapters the researches of representative scholars are considered, and the contribution of each to New Testament studies sympathetically assessed. In these fascinating pages many of the great figures of New Testament scholarship are seen once again as living men. One may perhaps detect in some quarters today signs of rebellion against the wholesome tradition that would-be scholars must know what their predecessors have done; but there can be little doubt that one of the conditions for fruitful research in any given field is an accurate and comprehensive survey of what has previously been discovered. In making such findings available for students, Dr. Howard is a pre-eminent master, and his encyclopedic knowledge of the work of New Testament scholars gives to his own judgements, when he chooses to formulate them, a quite peculiar degree of authority. The opening chapter treats of four representative pioneers in the Early Church: Marcion, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. The remaining chapters deal in turn with the contributions of representative German and British scholars in the

fields of exegesis, textual criticism, the *papyri*, and archaeology. But a mere catalogue of the contents gives little idea of how rich and suggestive this book is. It is emphatically one to possess and to read. The student of the New Testament who has it on his shelves will find himself frequently returning to it, and never without reward.

WILLIAM F. FLEMINGTON

L'Eglise et les Ministères, by Philippe H. Menoud.

Jésus-Christ édifiant son Eglise, by Pierre Bonnard. (Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel, 2.85 *francs suisses* each.)

A stream of theological works of high standard continues to appear in Switzerland. These two are *cahiers*, essays, but of similar quality to the longer works. Dr. Menoud examines the New Testament teaching about *The Church and the Ministries*. He refers to French, German, and English authorities, including Dr. Flew. He starts with the nature of the Church: having disproved the notion that the Early Church was an anarchic society of ecstatics, he deduces his main theme, which is that the Spirit and the Church are inseparable. 'If Peter had been purely spiritualistic he would have concluded that Cornelius, having received the Spirit, was dispensed from baptism.... If Peter had been a pure traditionalist he would not have wished to recognize the action of the Spirit where baptism had not yet been administered.' Similarly in the ministries, Spirit and tradition unite. The apostle, as witness of the Resurrection, was the doctrinal and disciplinary authority; prophets and teachers came next. Other manifestations of the Spirit, e.g. healing and 'tongues', are sporadic, and have not the permanence of a ministry. Professor Bonnard writes of the concept of 'edification' in the New Testament. He takes the word 'edifying' literally, and tackles the problem as to whether the apostolic preaching aimed at the edification of the individual or the construction of a community. The figure of a building plays a large part in primitive Christian thought. Yet the construction of the Church is not an end in itself; it is not built once for all; indeed, it is for ever incomplete, constantly shaken; but its foundation is always Christ. The Church is threatened by individualism—religious, moral, and doctrinal. 'Therefore to give oneself to Christ means: to let oneself be edified, incorporated into His community.'

E. GEOFFREY PARRINDER

The Photian Schism: History and Legend, by Francis Dvornik. (Cambridge University Press, 35*s*.)

Our generation is learning that there is an Eastern Europe as well as a Western and that the two are very different. This is true in the Church as well as in politics. Eastern Christendom, centred for a thousand years at Constantinople, has had its own way of looking at both faith and order, and its struggle for equality with Rome led after some centuries of bickering to the separation of 1054 A.D. The major cause of this difference was the question of Roman supremacy, and it has usually been held in the West that it was in the ninth century, during the papacy of Nicholas the First and his immediate successors, that the battle began. One of the chief protagonists was the Patriarch Photius, who was naturally looked upon in the West as a scheming anti-Roman archschismatic. The East, on the other hand, has looked on him as a great Churchman, a genuine Christian and even as a saint. It has been Dr. Dvornik's task to reopen this whole controversy in the light of materials, particularly Slavonic and Greek, either not easily accessible to Western apologists or ignored by them. The result is a vindication of Photius, a conclusion no doubt particularly gratifying to Dr. Dvornik as a Czech as well as to Dr. Dvornik as a man of learning and exact scholarship. He has first of all made a careful historical reconstruction of the period and then he has shown by an exhaustive examination of the sources how the 'legend' arose. In face of this array of evidence it is difficult to see how it will ever be possible

for his conclusion to be gainsaid in the future. Nevertheless one or two notable points emerge, perhaps unintentionally. Eastern Christianity appears in a very unfavourable light. The Photian question would seem to have been more a matter of personal rivalry between the patriarchs Ignatius and Photius than a quarrel between East and West concerning the spiritual overlordship of Bulgaria. The *Forged Decretals*, which played so great a part in the Roman question, are hardly ever mentioned by Dr. Dvornik. Indeed in Constantinople everything was personal and political. 'Extremists *versus* Moderates' in the days of Photius was simply a new phase of the old Iconoclastic struggle, which itself was a revival of the circus factions of Blues and Greens so well described by Gibbon. When the Photian controversy was out of the way, the rivalries reappeared in the '*tetragamy*' controversy as to whether Emperor Leo the Sixth should be allowed to marry a fourth time. Any excuse was good enough for a quarrel, but, while the factions were at war, both of them were subordinated to the State. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Eastern Church has so long been completely supine where genuine religious issues are involved in politics. The ineffectiveness of the Church in Russia today has its roots away back in the character of Byzantine Christianity.

A. VICTOR MURRAY

Makers of Modern Thought, by G. O. Griffith. (Lutterworth Press, 15*s*.)

The thinkers selected for treatment are Bacon, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, Rousseau, Comte, Marx, T. H. Huxley, and Freud. The reason for the choice is neither that these thinkers are claimed to be the greatest of the modern line nor simply that they appeal to the author as subjects for interesting essays, but that they mark the stages of man's preoccupation, in the sphere of thought, with himself. The book might well have been entitled *The Rise and Fall of Rationalistic Humanism*. Bacon and Descartes, while respecting the province of religion, try to mark out a field in which reason shall be sovereign. Spinoza wipes out the boundary, making reason the sole organ of truth. Kant also will have only a rational religion, and, even so, in effect makes morality independent of it, the moral man needing nothing but his conscience to rest on. Rousseau crashes into the modern glorification of sophisticated civilization with his brilliant but wilful praise of the simple life. Comte returns to the self-sufficiency and adequacy of reason as science, and though in the end he relapses into a religion, this is a religion that has nothing to worship but Humanity. Marx is plainly man-centred—thinking of society only, not the individual—and is at present the most influential of the atheists. Huxley made himself the apostle of evolutionism, but at last recoiled, on ethical grounds, from the implications of his naturalism: he admitted that man should not follow the laws of his biological nature, but should rebel against them. Finally, in Freud the whole ground of the modern pride in man's reason is exploded: willy-nilly, he says, our actions are ruled by instincts, with reason as little more than an instrument of deceit in the service of self-excuse. In sum, man's vainglorious theory of himself has collapsed under the same sort of science that fashioned it, thus matching his recent collapse in the sphere of practice.

The theme is worked out in a clear and skilful way, and the religious moral of it all is indicated without being laboured. But the book has value quite independently of the theme. It can be regarded as an introduction to modern philosophical thought, and it will be especially useful to those who have had no formal training in philosophy. Mr. Griffith's sympathetic handling of the biographical aspect of each thinker holds the attention and carries it forward to the theories outlined and examined. Whether he intended it or not, his first few chapters make no heavy demands on the reader, the level of treatment rising gradually toward the end. He can tell a story, bring out

the human interest of a life, turn an epigram, expound a theory fairly, and criticize it with neatness and force. He writes enviably well. I cannot think of any other recent book on the subject that could be read with as much enjoyment and profit by educated readers, particularly those with religious susceptibilities (for Mr. Griffith has the refreshing courage to take his religious faith for granted, instead of protesting it or arguing it). His discussion of the philosophical theories is entirely competent. There are omissions here and there (e.g. there is no mention of Bacon's influence on the Royal Society and on the French Encyclopedists), and some drastic brevities of exposition (e.g. of Kant's theory of knowledge), but it would be carping to make these into points of complaint. The author has written as good a book as could be written for readers unversed in the technique of philosophy. He is an unusually able teacher.

T. E. JESSOP

Human Knowledge: Its Scope and Limits, by Bertrand Russell. (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 18*s*.)

The central purpose of this book, Lord Russell tells us, is to examine the relation between individual experience and the general body of scientific knowledge. Well and good, but the next words are startling: 'It is taken for granted that scientific knowledge in its broad outlines, is to be accepted.' He adds that he accepts 'scientific common sense'. William James objected to those who 'whacked the block universe on top of us', and one may equally object to the assumption in an inquiry concerning knowledge that a certain type of knowledge is to be accepted as it stands. Moreover, who is to define the 'broad outline'? Scientific knowledge changes daily. The physics we learnt at school is certainly not the physics of today. We have just got used to the ideas of a curve in space and an expanding universe, when Einstein now tells us that he does not care whether space is curved or not, and Professor Hubble of the Mount Wilson Observatory says that the universe is not expanding! Any book on the Quantum theory, they tell us, may be out of date by the time it is published! If Lord Russell means that our science proceeds in faith that its findings can be true, one may agree, but that applies to all quests for knowledge. These are not the days when any special certainty can be claimed for scientific knowledge, whether in broad outline or not. Not even the experts are likely to find this book easy reading. Some chapters presuppose a greater familiarity with mathematics than many possess. Other chapters seem easy, but will need close attention if the point is to be grasped. Though we are told the book is for the general reader, that elusive individual will need to be special rather than general in his knowledge of the issues discussed here, if he would profit by his reading. One is glad that Lord Russell acknowledges the obvious truth which so many epistemologists have ignored, that our knowledge of the universe is only possible so far as we are members of the universe, and depends on its effects upon us. In this respect 'man is the measure of all things', whatever that famous saying may originally have meant. It is also good to know that Lord Russell is not impressed by the notion of 'the block universe', towering over a tiny swarm of human gnats. While there is no reason to assume that the universe can *think*, man can. Man's is the *only* measure, therefore, in the universe. One does not expect Lord Russell to speak of religious knowledge, though the respect he shows toward experience might well have led to a consideration of the enormous extent of religion amongst all civilizations, pre-civilizations and uncivilized people throughout all the ages. If religion is nothing but a colossal illusion, it is hard to see how anyone can look to experience as indicative of anything true. Here is Lord Russell's conclusion: 'All human knowledge is uncertain, inexact, and partial. To this doctrine we have not found any limitation whatever.' That may not seem an inspiring end to 527 pages

of close reasoning, even though it may be the inevitable end. But does not this conclusion itself presume the possibility of a knowledge that is certain, exact, and impartial? Can there be error if there is no such thing as truth? If there is, to whom does it belong? 'But where shall wisdom be found and where is the place of understanding?' The author of Job held that man knoweth not, but that God knows. Lord Russell stops at the negative, and is rather less advanced, therefore, than the Hebrew thinker of more than two thousand years ago. But the value of the book is not to be measured by this. Its worth lies in the full and frank discussion of all the main problems of epistemology. On this account no student of metaphysics can afford to miss it.

ERIC S. WATERHOUSE

The Comforts of Unreason, by Rupert Crawshay-Williams. (Kegan Paul, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. Crawshay-Williams has written a clever, provocative, and amateurish book to show how our mostly irrational thought is prompted by a desire for comfort. He accepts Freud's rather naïve division of our life into pleasure-seeking and reality-seeking tendencies, and then proceeds to analyse the former, so far as it is mistaken for knowledge about the real world, into some five classes of irrational desires. These motives, lying behind irrational (that is, unscientific) thought, are the desires for absolute certainty about the objective world, for approval by oneself and others, for excitement, for self-assertion, and for conformity. In addition there are hosts of impulses from primitive life and from society which stir us to irrational behaviour. All these prompt us to use well-known devices of self-deception, which leads to mental comfort rather than to science, by methods now familiar from the study of pycho-analysis. Our philosophies, moralities, and religions, are especially liable to such self-deception, and may be amusingly and yet ruthlessly exposed by the modern psychology of the abnormal. In short, they are largely illusions prompted by the desire for emotional satisfaction, compendiously entitled 'comfort'. Doubtless much of Mr. Crawshay-Williams' analysis is salutary in a world largely given up to mass-hysteria, excitement, and suggestibility, but he does not seem to be sufficiently aware of the limitations of his own method. He wittingly adopts loose but popular terminology —speaks of human groups as 'herds'—plays upon the word 'objective' without defining it—defines matter as any objectivity observable, with its related phenomena—and thinks that the law of universal causation is sufficiently proved by thousands of years of observation of such phenomena. As if much more than observation—namely, fallible memories, histories, and records—were not involved! Yet, in the case of morality, tradition and authority are not for him objective evidence! It is significant that the chief authority in Logic whom our author quotes is J. S. Mill, whose theory of causation has been abundantly criticized. And whilst we may concede the importance of the logico-experimental methods of modern science, we may ask whether relativity and therefore subjectivity do not enter into them, and thereby condemn them to that kind of unreality-thinking which our critic finds in the cases of universals, values, and God. After all, scepticism is a double-edged weapon.

ATKINSON LEE

Gods and Men. A Testimony of Science and Religion, by Sir Richard Gregory. (Stuart & Richards, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This important work is as comprehensive as its title suggests. Rarely have so many profound subjects been treated within the compass of a book of similar size. In every part the impression given is that of competency and fullness of knowledge. From the writer's eminence in the scientific world this would follow as a matter of course in his treatment of scientific subjects, but religious and ecclesiastical matters are also

dealt with on a broad scale. Whether we agree or disagree with the opinions expressed we cannot but admire the evident sincerity and extensive knowledge of the writer. The earlier chapters deal with man's reactions, at various periods, to the world in which he has found himself. At first the flat-earth theory naturally prevailed. Maps were drawn of the over-arching skies, and the places of the sun, moon, planets, and constellations were indicated. Many diagrams are provided which assist the exposition given. The Ptolemaic system was devised in the second century A.D., and was accepted for fourteen centuries. This placed the earth in the centre as a stationary globe, and the sun, moon, and five planets were pictured as moving round it in their appointed courses. Such is the conception presented in Dante, and (for the most part) in Milton. Then came the revolutionary conceptions of Copernicus and Galileo. Since that time the heliocentric conception has changed man's view of the universe. This brief citation of subjects gives but little idea of the interesting way in which the writer develops his themes, always in the context of religion. The religious interest of the book is, in fact, as strong as the scientific. From the beginning the story of the heavens has been closely linked with religious experience and outlook. This is well illustrated in the chapters on 'Calendars and Festivals' and 'Sun-worship and Temples'. Still more interesting to many readers will be the treatment of 'Sacred Books and Beliefs'. The chief religious systems of the world are outlined, and their peculiar contributions to civilization are indicated. The prominent elements of Jewish and Christian belief and culture are discussed. Many tributes are paid to the helpful contributions which have been made to civilization by the Christian Churches, though adverse criticism is not lacking. At this point many students, with the present writer, will feel less inclined to accept all the views expressed. It is possible to appreciate all that is good in other religions, and yet to give a distinctive and unique place to Jesus as the Saviour of men and the final revelation of the personal God who is the Father of all men. Nonetheless the book is worthy of a careful study by all who wish to know more concerning the relative contributions made to civilization by science and religion from the earliest days to the atom bomb on the one hand and Amsterdam on the other.

EDWARD LANGTON

An Outline of Christian Sociology, by W. G. Peck. (Jas. Clarke & Co., 6*s*.)
Freud and Christianity, by R. S. Lee. (Jas. Clarke & Co., 8*s*. 6*d*.)

These books are the first two volumes in a new series, 'Theology for Modern Men'. The first writer, Canon W. G. Peck, a well-known Anglo-Catholic authority on social questions, sets forth what are 'the aims and purposes of living and working together in society, if the Christian doctrines of God and man are true'. Only when the natural life of man is related to its Ultimate End, communion with God, can his personal-social nature be truly expressed. Salvation is the restoration of man to his wholeness, and this includes the redemption of the social order along with, and integral to, the full redemption of the person. For the person is never an inviolate 'individual'; he is product of and creative in society. The Theology of Incarnation, insisting that the natural order is God's creation, brings a severe indictment against any system which treats the material world simply as a means to economic ends. Every chapter in the book provides a wealth of material for keen study-groups on the purpose of Work, Industrial Relationships, Living in Community, and the distinctive Christian witness in political affairs.

The second book gives first a clear and brief *résumé* of Freud's psychoanalytical teaching, and then devotes its major part to showing how its results may be brought to bear on the ideal of perfection which Christianity enjoins. We have been too little ready to realize how the unconscious, with its pleasure-pain aims, its fantasies, and

its wishful thinking, have influenced our religious beliefs and conduct unawares. Freud finds in man a 'death instinct' as well as a 'life instinct'; man seeks life, and fears it, and, as Dr. Lee draws out what psychology reveals about this conflict, the Johannine view of eternal life as beginning here and now takes on an even richer meaning. The mother is our bridge from self to the world around us; the father is our road to God. The father-image in a child's developing life is pivotal, the basis for our belief in God as Father. Its critical dangers through a wrong parental relationship are clearly shown. But need we fear for our faith because wish-fulfilment influences our ideas of God? Dr. Lee shows how atheism is not a sign of maturity, but the repetition of an infantile situation. He re-examines both the widely-accepted view that the authority of Conscience lies in an unconditional 'ought' and the ideas of Original Sin and Atonement in a way which may be disconcerting to those who only know theology. But the chapter on 'The Ego and the Love of Jesus' provides a positive message, and the whole book will help us in understanding ourselves and in our pastoral practice. Even where technical, both books are plainly written, and the print and format are attractive.

THOMAS J. FOINETTE

The Christian Origins of Social Revolt, by William Dale Morris. (Allen & Unwin, 12*s*. 6*d*.)

Mr. Morris has written on a most interesting and difficult subject. He begins by surveying very swiftly some of the 'Social Heresies of the Middle Ages' and then passes under review such matters as 'The Medieval Church and the Peasant', 'The Protestant Reformation', and the Levellers, Diggers, and Quakers, concentrating, in his last four chapters, upon the course of the last two hundred years. The publishers announce that this is 'a lucid and invigorating piece of historical writing on the influence of religion on social and political history'. It is vigorous, certainly, and lucid; but one feels unhappy about commending it for several reasons, even though Mr. Morris is rightly urgent in his plea that 'above all, Socialism must recapture the sense which many of the pioneers had of serving a great impersonal end which gives a meaning and a dignity to our own brief, petty lives'. Of course, one recognizes that the point of view is that of the Socialist, with a consequent appreciation of what has been done to improve the conditions of life for the workers in field, mine, or factory. The picture of Luther is a mere travesty; it misses his unique spiritual work and concentrates upon a few unfortunate remarks made in connexion with the Peasants' War. For each of his chapters Mr. Morris relies largely upon one or two authorities; they are almost all partisan, and some of them lack his own generosity. For instance, the sixth chapter, on the Peasant War, leans heavily on a dozen long quotations from F. Engels' book, *The Peasant War in Germany*. Again, his brief references to Methodism depend upon the Hammonds's *Town Labourer*. One would have thought that at least some of the Methodist historians, sympathetic to social reform, might have been consulted. It is this kind of slightness as well as a tendency to select the odd people of the faith (or not of it—e.g. Robert Blatchford) that makes us wish the word 'Christian' was not so prominent in the title. The book also suffers from looseness of style, repetition, and faulty proof-reading.

HAROLD S. DARBY

Alternative to Serfdom, by John Maurice Clark. (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 8*s*. 6*d*.)

State unification and standardization threaten the intimacies and liberties of lesser groups. How is the threat of totalitarian 'hugeness' to be countered? How can society preserve its most precious personal values in an age of mass industry, applied science, and militant ideologies? Professor Clark recognizes that the old individualism is obsolescent, and that the Policeman State which merely told people what

they must *not* do, is being superseded by the Santa Claus State to which people in general look for 'handouts' with little thought of reciprocal obligations. The present crisis is admitted to be the most dangerous since the falling of Rome; but like a good American, Professor Clark comes down on the side of hope, and interprets the crisis as one of drastic transition rather than of doom. He grants that our complicated modern society demands better individuals to hold it together, that we have not yet grown up to the moral demands it makes, and that a selfish sectionalism clings to the great groups, whether big business or big labour, or, for that matter, big nation. Dismissing as utopian or too distant any hope of religious enthusiasm or unanimity, the author is driven to demand a high degree of social responsibility and positive tolerance in the citizens he describes. (By 'positive tolerance' is meant, not that which is born of indifference, stalemate, or live-and-let-live expediency, but of a generous appreciation of the value of diversity and of the rights and interests of other groups.) Unless honesty, reasonableness, and public spirit be forthcoming, our civilization, and with it our freedom, will vanish in a new form of barbarism. Professor Clark is careful to point out that he is not asking for heroic virtue, but only for that minimum of self-control and voluntary co-operative temper without which the modern State can only avoid the Scylla of tyranny by falling into the Charybdis of chaos. Yet he asks for a good deal; we hope he may get it. To some of us it seems that he, like so many others, is asking for the fruit without the tree, for human graces which can only be born of Divine grace.

F. BROMPTON HARVEY

George Fox's 'Book of Miracles', edited with Introduction and Notes by Henry T. Cadbury. (Cambridge University Press, 21*s*.)

This book is the result of an extraordinary piece of research at the library of the Friends House, Euston Road. The editor discovered, in the comprehensive catalogue of all George Fox's papers and books, a reference to a *Book of Miracles*. The book itself had been lost, but the catalogue cited the beginning and end of the account of each 'miracle'. There are over a hundred and fifty such entries as

> 'Daniel Baker who went . . . crutches . . . never wore them afterward.'
> 'George Quilter who liveth . . . gout . . . to his glory.'

From the lives of Fox and other material in the library, Dr. Cadbury has reconstructed many of these incidents with details. He has done his work so well that we see—as Dr. Rufus M. Jones says in his Foreword—a new George Fox going about seventeenth-century England, not only preaching fresh messages of life and power, but 'healing all manner of disease'. Earlier historians of Quakerism purposefully obscured this healing ministry. Perhaps they did not want the movement to be saddled with these incidents, so hard to explain or repeat or harmonize with science and culture. One gets the impression that they were a little ashamed of this aspect of Fox's work. I think that these accounts should be accepted as trustworthy, though admittedly an element of 'heightening' often—I almost wrote always—creeps in when incidents of mysterious recovery from illness are reported. The power of the mind over the body under certain conditions of the mind of both healer and patient is immeasurable, and many men like George Fox and John Wesley have been able to call forth that expectant trust which, in the context of healing, is what the New Testament means by 'faith'. The book has taken years to complete and a tribute is due to the patient accuracy of the long research successfully completed. One of the things that struck me was the evidence that George Fox went on with his healing ministry in spite of repeated failure. He told one cripple boy to 'stand up in the

Name of Jesus' and the boy 'failed and sat down again'. He told another to throw away his crutches, 'but the cripple remained a cripple still'. Probably such cases needed skilled medical or surgical attention, but the point is that Fox did not hand over all healing to the medical profession. Alas, we have! To pretend that religion and health never have anything to do with one another is to make nonsense of all the healing miracles of Jesus Christ. It is good that the Quakers are no longer ashamed of the healing ministry of George Fox. Let an honourable place be kept for the art of healing through the use of material remedies and psychotherapeutic techniques, but I welcome a book which makes a contribution to the restoration of the healing function of the Church and I hope that many will consult its fascinating pages. Unhappily it costs a guinea!

LESLIE D. WEATHERHEAD

The Life and Times of John Sharp, Archbishop of York, by A. Tindal Hart. (S.P.C.K., 21*s*.)

This well-written account of a life lived very near the centre of English ecclesiastical politics in the last quarter of the seventeenth and the opening years of the eighteenth centuries, merits careful reading by all students of the Evangelical Revival. It provides a useful corrective to the mistaken notion that pre-Methodist Anglicanism was lifeless and corrupt to the core. The vices were there, gross and plentiful, but John Sharp's career is a plain proof that tireless and disinterested service did not lack recognition and reward, and that Dutch William and his successor, Queen Anne, knew an honest man when they saw him, respecting him all the more because he did not trim his sails to catch the breeze of court favour. John Sharp—there is something brisk and business-like about the very name which nothing in his career belied—was a son of the West Riding, and was born at Bradford just as the Civil War was beginning. He went up to Christ's College, Cambridge, in Restoration Year 1660, and was fortunate enough, whilst still a fledging cleric, to attract the notice of Heneage Finch, destined to rise to the Lord Chancellorship. Sharp was his sons' tutor, but he was more than that, and the successful lawyer proved a staunch friend to the young pedagogue, introducing him to the great world, and setting his feet on the road which led eventually to Bishopthorpe. Though Sharp was an unswerving High Churchman with little sympathy for any scheme that would make the slightest concession to Nonconformity, he was of so fine a Christian temper that Richard Baxter was his friend. He was nearly fifty when he came back to his native county to hold the Northern primacy for twenty-two years, a longer reign than any of his predecessors since the Reformation. He was no titular nor absentee Archbishop, for, though as Primate of England he had unescapable responsibilities at Whitehall and Queen Anne in particular could not see him often enough, yet he was true father-in-God to the enormous province under his care. Methodists should think kindly of the man who befriended Susanna Wesley in her hour of need when Samuel, her husband, was imprisoned in Lincoln Castle for debt. ' "Tell me, Mrs. Wesley," said the Archbishop, "whether you ever wanted bread?" "My Lord," said I, "I will freely own to your Grace that, strictly speaking, I never did want bread. But then I have had so much care to get it before it was eat, and to pay for it after, as has often made it very unpleasant for me. And I think to have bread on such terms is the next degree of wretchedness to having none at all." "You are certainly in the right," replied my Lord, and seemed for a while very thoughtful. Next morning he made me a very handsome present, nor did he ever repent of having done so.'

WILFRID L. HANNAM

From My New Shelf

By C. Ryder Smith

From Moses to Paul, by George A. F. Knight. (Lutterworth Press, 15*s*.)

In its sub-title this book is called 'A Christological Study in the Light of our Hebraic Heritage'. The writer has evidently spent years in an attempt to 'reconcile Christians and Jews'. He holds that in the second Christian century both Judaism and Christianity went astray, the latter by turning to Greek thought for its account of itself and the former in reaction to the attack of the Christian Church. In the first century, on the other hand, there was no great obstacle to their unity. There are not a few excellent pieces of study in the book—for instance, there are many suggestive quotations from Rabbinical writings, and it is rightly contended that Hebrew ideas about 'the word' and 'name' and 'glory' and 'wisdom' of God, and so on, found their focus and fulfilment in Jesus. On the other hand, there are a good many statements on detail that may be challenged. Here, however, I must keep to Professor Knight's chief claim. To use his favourite phrase, he holds that Christ was 'the extension of the *nephesh* or personality of God'. This means that a doctrine of the Divine immanence permeates the Bible, and that the Hebrews had no need of any doctrine of 'mediation'. In Jesus, and in Jesus only, the Divine 'immanence' was complete. The foundation of this novel teaching is the use of the term *nephesh* in the Old Testament. The writer claims that *nephesh* means 'personality' because it denotes the centre of thinking, feeling, willing, etc. He might have made the same claim for *leb* ('heart') and *ruach* ('spirit'). He hardly mentions *leb* except to identify it with *hypostasis* in Hebrews 1^3—by what can only be called a forced exegesis. He says more about 'spirit', especially in the latter part of his book, but earlier he joins those who hold the doubtful opinion that in the later Old Testament writings *ruach* is just a part of *nephesh*. It is on the exposition of the last word that his whole book rests. He argues that the *nephesh* of a man extends by a kind of immanence to his home and property but he gives no real evidence for this. The Hebrew home, for instance, was not knit together by a common *nephesh* but by a common 'blood', and 'blood' is not said to 'feel', 'think', etc. Passing from man to God, Professor Knight argues that God's *nephesh* is similarly immanent, particularly in Israel, and he even argues that Israel may be called the *basar* or 'flesh' of God! What is the Old Testament evidence for all this? Professor Knight agrees that *nephesh* is very rarely ascribed to God. He might have added that where this occurs, it is under such phrases as 'my *nephesh*', where the term is used in a secondary way—as equivalent to 'I'. Apart from two quotations from Old Testament passages of this kind, the New Testament never ascribes *psyche* to God, neither do the writers of the Apocrypha. Men share *nephesh* or *psyche*, in the usual sense of the terms, with animals, but *ruach* or *preuma* with God. Again, the evidence given for a Hebrew doctrine of Divine immanence is altogether unsatisfactory. For instance, Professor Knight urges that God, in the Shekinah, was immanent in the Temple (but he does not mention the Rabbinic saying that there was 'no shekinah' in the Second Temple). It is true, of course, that the Shekinah 'dwelt in' the Holy of Holies, and the term 'immanence', in the literal sense of its Latin origin, might be used to denote this. But while the Shekinah dwelt *in the midst* of Israel, it also dwelt *apart*, isolated by its holiness. This other side of Jewish teaching is incompatible with what is usually meant by 'immanence'. Again, when Professor Knight denies that there is any Hebrew doctrine of 'mediation', surely he ought to have said something about the use of the word 'Mediator' in the New Testament. One more point must suffice. Professor Knight says nothing at all to explain why the Jews rejected Jesus in the *first* century. What of our Lord's own conflict with the

Pharisees and Paul's with the Jews? Their scholars might quite well have agreed with this writer's exposition of the terms 'word', 'name', and so on—though not with his doctrine of immanence—but they fell foul of the ascription of the terms to *the particular man*, Jesus of Nazareth. All Christians agree that here Judaism went fatally astray, but it was not under any doctrine of 'the extension of the personality of God'. Professor Knight tells us that he has found that 'young people' easily understand such phrases as this! Some older people will want to ask a few questions.

The Beginnings of Western Christendom, by L. E. Elliott-Binns. (Lutterworth Press, 25*s*.) Here is history as it ought to be written. The book differs, therefore, from a good many others that deal with Christian history before Constantine. For instance, this is not a mere text-book, nor has the writer any 'axe to grind' on such disputed points as the origins of the Christian ministry. It is documented as few books are even in this age of documentation. One can only marvel at Canon Elliott-Binns's multitudinous footnotes. He quotes *papyri* and archaeological evidence as easily as the books of all periods. In an illuminating phrase or two he often offers apt comparisons with other parts of Christian history. Again, he is careful to set the story of the Church in its social and political background. Indeed, the whole of the first of the three parts of the book is given to 'The Setting'. The next is on 'Local Expansion', the third on 'Belief and Organization', and there is an epilogue on 'The Church and the Empire', which sets persecution in its right perspective. Worship and art are not forgotten. By the term 'Western' the writer means the area that later fell under the sway of the Popes, but he makes no artificial attempt to isolate this in the period with which he deals. The West and the East had not yet said to each other: 'I have no need of thee.' It would be possible, of course, to ask questions about a few details. For instance, the writer is not quite consistent in his account of a doubtful point about the Muratorian Canon (pp. 214, 217); he has a reference to Methodism that some will challenge (p. 157); and it may be doubted whether the Germans have proved less tractable to the Gospel than the Jews. Some mention might have been made of the portraits in the Catacombs, especially the reputed portrait of Jesus. The Canon wrote too soon to notice the theory of the ministry that Bishop Kirk has sponsored. About this much disputed question, while he quietly tells us his own opinion on some points, he is remarkably 'objective'. We could have spared the itinerary of the Italian cities, which gives such meagre results for the period, in favour of such a compact conspectus of the arguments of the Apologists as the writer gives us of the teaching of the Gnostics. But it is 'against the grain' to enumerate small points in criticism of this rich and excellent work. The style carries the reader along without the device of superfluous sentences. On its subject, so far as I know, this book has no rivals. Perhaps the chief impression that it finally gives is the combination of variety, fluidity, and unity in the far-flung Early Church. Here, *mutatis mutandis* of course, is it not a pattern for today?

Reading your Bible, a new Lectionary, by Rupert E. Davies. (The Epworth Press, 7*s*. 6*d*.) Mr. Davies was for many years chaplain at Kingswood School. In conducting daily prayers he found it best to select a number of passages and prefix a brief description of its subject to each Lesson. In the first and largest part of his book he gives specimens of the method, choosing books from the Apocrypha as well as the two Testaments. He begins with Job and follows the order of the books in the English Versions, but adds a table to show the approximate dates of each book. He does not tell us on what principles he has selected certain books and omitted others, nor by what method he has assigned a given number of Lessons to the several books. For instance, he has thirty-two extracts from Ecclesiasticus and thirty-four from

Matthew. But, if a reader follows him through this volume, he should be able to apply the method elsewhere for himself. In the second part of the volume Mr. Davies takes five subjects, the Teaching of Jesus, Some Parables, Human Nature and Destiny, Worship, and the World-wide Mission of the Church—and chooses passages from various Bible books to illustrate them. The third part is a careful exposition of the Lord's Prayer. Of course, Mr. Davies has once and again to make his choice between various interpretations of a text. As he says, his choice will not always convince others. He uses the Revised Version, with occasional variations. This book will greatly help those who want to read their Bible 'with understanding'.

The First Assembly of the World Council of Churches, the Official Report, edited by W. A. Visser t'Hooft. (S.C.M., 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This volume includes 'the Message of the Assembly' and the Reports of the four Sections that prepared the way for 'Amsterdam', as accepted by the Assembly itself. These had already been published in the four volumes discussed in our last number. During the Assembly four Committees held sittings, and revised various reports—including four on 'The Life and Work of Women in the Church', 'The Significance of the Laity in the Church', 'The Christian Approach to the Jews', and 'Christian Reconstruction and Inner-Church Aid (prisoners of war, refugees, etc.)'. These reports, like those of the Sections, were 'received by the Assembly and commended to the Churches for their serious consideration and appropriate action'. There are brief synopses of the discussions in the Assembly, and a 'Statement of the Youth Delegation', which covered much ground in quick time, with reports of its Sections. There are, of course, chapters on the Constitution, Purposes, and Regulations of the Assembly, and so on, with lists of its officers and members. When one glances over these lists it looks as if the confusions of Babel had been undone. For instance, a negro Methodist from the West Indies presented the report of the Youth Delegation. Then, unhappily, there is such a phrase as 'Eight unfilled places for Eastern Orthodox Churches'. Not least important, there is some account of the worship of the Assembly and its methods.

World Encounter, To Amsterdam and Beyond, by Alan Walker. (The Epworth Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*)
The Wholeness of the Church, by Oliver Tomkins. (S.C.M., 5*s.*)

The writers of these two books are both 'men of Amsterdam'. For the rest, the books are very different, yet complementary. Mr. Walker, thinking that he would look at world problems with his own eyes in preparation for the Conference, spent a few weeks on his way from Australia to Holland in U.S.A., Britain, and part of the Continent. In writing of his journey he guarded himself against the superficiality of the mere globe-trotter by talking to Church leaders and other men and getting *their* views about their own countries. He gives five chapters to a kind of phantasmagoria of the big cities and big universities and big churches of U.S.A. He has the eye for a significant story. In England he passed into a grey light, finding the Church 'perplexed, but not in despair'. On the Continent he passed into 'darkness that can be felt', alike in Germany and Italy and Czechoslovakia and France—yet in them all he saw 'the light that shineth in the darkness and the darkness overcomes it not'. When he writes of Amsterdam, it is chiefly to tell us of the overwhelming sense of the blessing of God, spite the several unresolved differences that inevitably emerged. He ends: 'Our destination must be Amsterdam, *and beyond.*'

It is to this 'beyond', or rather to a crucial problem in it, that Mr. Tomkins, one of the Council's secretaries, addresses himself. He left Amsterdam with a 'concern' about the laity. It is so easy for 'the little man', whether he be minister or layman, to say 'Amsterdam? Ecumenicity? Very interesting and very good—but what can

I do about it?' Mr. Tomkins knows that true 'ecumenicity' is a frame of mind that ought to mark every Christian, and that unless there is local ecumenicity, the world-wide type only beats the air. So he sets out to show that the word means that every Christian must learn through Christ to *want* to get to know his fellow-Christians of the other local churches, and that this means the giving of no little time and the overcoming of no little prejudice and the habit of seeing through other men's eyes and the universal admission of error—yet that it is essential today. Mr. Tomkins does not minimize difficulties, but sets them squarely out. His analysis of the meaning of 'ecumenicity' or 'wholeness' is admirable. It is just *agape* at work amid our divisions. 'Apply 1 Corinthians 13 to the "local situation" ' almost summarizes his message. Not the least merit of his book is his insistence that merely superficial efforts to 'get together' are so much waste of time. Here is an urgent but considered word on a crucial issue.

World Revolution in the Cause of Peace, by Lionel Curtis. (Blackwell, Oxford, 7*s.* 6*d.*) This book falls into three parts. In the first Mr. Curtis describes the way in which the Founding Fathers of the United States, despairing of agreement in any other way, at last bypassed the Legislatures of the thirteen States, by whom they had been appointed, and appealed successfully instead to the people themselves. The suggestion is that this is a model for today. In the second part the writer has two purposes—first to show, by quotations from leading statesmen, that, if the world is to be saved from yet another war, every State *must* submit to some limitation of its sovereignty; and, second, to display the two ways to federation that at present offer—the ways not very aptly called 'federal' and 'functional'. Under the first some kind of federation would be at once attempted—even if it be only through a merely *consultative* assembly; the second would seek to reach federation gradually, by the practice of limited but *binding* agreements to which Governments had consented. (In fact, both are likely to be tried at once.) In the third part Mr. Curtis sets out his own bold plan. He would at once form a federal State, with 'power to act' (and not merely to advise) in certain defined realms, and, if need be, to coerce any State within the federation. He would deny the right to secede, and from the first he would include not only European democracies, but all English-speaking States throughout the world. He believes that, if only statesmen were bold enough to adopt this policy, and were to bypass Legislatures (and Parliaments?) and appeal, in some undefined way, to the peoples themselves, the peoples would agree. Mr. Curtis admits that there are points where the example of the Founding Fathers is not a guide, and that help might rather be found from other federations, but he does not pursue either subject. Again, while he does, in passing, hint at some of the immense difficulties that beset his own plan, he does not mention them all, and still less does he meet them. Indeed, this experienced student of 'world affairs' is desperately sure that the only 'way out' is by 'leaping' without over-much 'looking'. His book deals with a subject of dire urgency, on which every citizen needs to ponder and ponder at once. Any reader, whatever his convictions, will find in it a very helpful account of the problem that now challenges the world with a peremptory 'Solve me or fight another war!'

Heresies, Ancient and Modern, by J. Oswald Sanders. (Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 7*s.* 6*d.*) The other day I was asked 'What is the creed of Jehovah's Witnesses?' and I was nonplussed. This book sets out the main doctrines of thirteen modern heresies. There is also one chapter on ancient heresies, which might have been omitted. The most useful chapters are on Spiritism, Christian Science, Seventh Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Theosophy, Christadelphianism, Mormonism, and British-Israelism. Sometimes Mr. Sanders tells briefly of the founders of such sects. Under

these heresies (and sometimes elsewhere) he gives 'chapter and verse' for his accounts of the various creeds. He deals also with Romanism, 'The Unity School of Christianity', Freemasonry, Faith Healing, and Unitarianism, always with something useful to say. He meets the claims of each heresy by appealing to the Bible. His approach is Fundamentalist, but other Christians, when once they know what a sect teaches, can frame their own answer in their own way. It is remarkable how many of these sects revolt against the doctrines of Hell and 'vicarious punishment'.

Parish and Parish Church, their Place and Influence in History, by P. D. Thomson. (Nelson, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

This book is 'an expansion of the Baird Lecture of 1935'. While the chapters that deal with Scotland are good, the same cannot be said of the others. There are numerous mistakes in facts. Dr. Thomson says, for instance, that Alfred was 'virtually' ruler of all England when he died; that the Bishopric of Dorchester-on-Thames was moved to Winchester; and that the monks of every monastery took pastoral charge of the area around it. This was where they differed from the 'canons'. Again, the writer is quite sure that *pontifex* means 'bridge-builder' and seems to think that *conversi* means 'converts'. Two or three times he implies that every monk and friar was a priest, and he says that both Oxford and Cambridge were founded by secular priests. He claims that every local church had a 'parish', but, in the strict sense of the latter word, this is true neither of the earliest Christian period nor the latest. In the area of a true parish every *inhabitant* is *ipso facto* a parishioner. Other examples might be given—for instance, under the New Testament. Again, in Dr. Thomson's rosy account of the parish his perspective is sometimes wrong. For instance, in a chapter which claims that in England the Parish Church was 'the cradle of democracy', he writes as if the parson, churchwardens, etc., were the only organ of local rule, omitting even to mention the Justices of the Peace in the county and the mayors and aldermen of the towns. In another chapter he himself declares that the Bishop was almost the autocrat of the parishes of his diocese; what then of democracy? He gives a whole chapter to the splendid history of architecture in the Western Church, and he has similar chapters about the other arts and literature. Here he rightly claims, however, that all these had their small beginnings in humble local churches, and perhaps one should not complain because he takes so large a view of his subject. But, outside Scotland, there is hardly any documentation, and, when a writer generalizes as Dr. Thomson does, a careful reader cries out for it. But, when the writer gets his foot upon his native heath, the chapters are much better. There are more facts and dates and instances. Perhaps the best of the good things in these chapters is the account of Knox's *First Book of Discipline*. It is a pity that Dr. Thomson did not confine himself to Scotland, and give us more details of the fascinating story of the parish there.

Set Free, a continuation of *The Former Days*, by Norman Maclean. (Hodder & Stoughton, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

Dr. Maclean is rather sparing of dates, but here he carries forward his autobiography from somewhere about 1880 to the death of Queen Victoria or a bit later. He takes us from his boyhood's home in Skye to Raining's School at Inverness, then to St. Andrews and Edinburgh Universities, and then back to the Islands and Highlands. 'Set Free' means 'set free from "fanatical Puritanism" '. This is a delightful book, but it is a serious book too. Dr. Maclean has always loved two things with all his heart, the Highlands and the Established Church of Scotland—and even when he is not writing of them, he never forgets the blight that fell on his Gaelic fatherland when the chiefs turned into rapacious landlords, and the blight that fell upon the Church through disruption after disruption. Yet in the main his book is a happy one. He

is fond of bypaths, but they always lead back at last to the main road. He tells us about himself by telling us how he reacted to the beauty of nature and to this man and that from the 'highest' to the lowliest in the land. He is charitable to all—unless it be to Dr. Rainy! He preaches now and then for this is a preacher's autobiography. The book swarms with stories like bees about a queen. A reader will learn more about the life of Scotland in the nineteenth century (and its outskirts) from this episodical book than from many a regular history. On an average Dr. Maclean gives some ten pages to each year of this section of his life—but he was right to do so.

The Land of Look Behind, by W. J. Brown. (Latimer House, 9*s.* 6*d.*)

Mr. W. J. Brown went to Jamaica to spend the Christmas of 1947 with his old friend 'Max', *alias* Lord Beaverbrook. He kept a kind of journal, writing it, for the most part, before breakfast. While in Jamaica incident followed incident so quickly that the writer has not much room for dissertation, but, especially on the way home, when his fellow-travellers did not greatly interest him, his way is to begin with the news of the ship, especially when it rolled (!), and then, seizing on an item on the wireless or a hint in a book from the ship's library or even a word dropped at table, to go off into reflections. These are always interesting, for 'Max' told him that he is the best journalist in England but one. But Mr. Brown is the kind of journalist who seeks to persuade his readers of this or that. The one persistent subject is Russian communism. Mr. Brown diagnoses it as a doctor diagnoses a fell disease, and warns and warns. He calls England a 'third-rate power', but loves her dearly and believes that she has a mission, or rather *the* mission, in the earth today. Of course, there are many excellent stories, ranging from Churchill through Bustamente to banana-packers. This journalist does not hesitate to speak of God. In a Foreword, that is a bit too long, he teases his readers about his book's title. There are one or two errors—for instance, the Elginbrod verse (in a garbled version) is ascribed to Burns! Once and again we learn that Mr. Brown can lead 'community singing'.

The Earliest Christian Confessions, by Oscar Cullmann, translated by J. K. S. Reid. (Lutterworth Press, 4*s.* 6*d.*)

This is an English translation of a work in French, which was reviewed by Dr. Parrinder in our April number (p. 172). As there shown, it is an excellent book and it is welcome in an English rendering.

BOOKLETS, PAMPHLETS, AND REPRINTS

For some years Mr. Gilbert Thomas's book on *William Cowper and the Eighteenth Century* (Allen & Unwin, 16*s.*) has been in demand but out of print. In a second edition he has omitted a few passages that are no longer topical. One of the book's chief features is an exposition of that much misunderstood factor in Cowper's life, his *Calvinistic* Evangelicalism. Mr. Thomas also does justice to John Newton. . . . In *Notes on the Gospel according to Mark* (S.P.C.K., 1*s.* 3*d.*), Canon J. E. Fison offers 'a fresh correlation of the Gospel and the post-war world'. He makes brief but very suggestive comments on each verse or group of verses. Mr. Eric E. Yelverton adds paragraphs here and there. There is salt here, and pith, and 'pep'. Specially useful for groups. . . . In *The Bible* (S.P.C.K., 1*s.* 3*d.*), the Rev. C. F. Evans has some sixty pages in which to equip a modern Christian to read the Book. He has two guiding ideas—that Christ is the Omega of the Old Testament and the Alpha of the New, and that the Bible is the Book of the Kingdom of God. A serviceable approach. There are bibliographies and *questionnaires* (which don't shirk problems). . . . We are often told that Jesus' friends were 'ordinary' people. In Mr. Edward Rogers'

play, *First Easter* (The Epworth Press, 2*s*.), he describes what he thinks ordinary people would say and do in the Upper Room when Jesus was not there. For instance, when 'the women' know that Jesus is alive again, they get a meal ready for the happy group. Well, wouldn't they? For this play the producer has a *minimum* to do. . . . In *Jesu Rex, a Passion Play* (The Epworth Press, 1*s*. 6*d*.), too, Jesus is never present but always there. Here Mr. F. H. Everson's main theme is the *enemies* of Jesus. There are over twenty 'characters' and none is a 'lay figure'. This play has already passed the test of presentation (can the writer be right about Bethesda?). . . . Mr. Reginald Glanville believes that, by putting in the simplest of backgrounds, children may be given 'a clear picture of Jesus', and in *Jesus Out and About* (The Epworth Press, 1*s*.), he takes twelve stories and shows teachers how to do it. He says at one point that the Temple was like a cathedral, but in it the people did not worship under a roof. But on every page he more than vindicates his method—and it is *the* method. . . . In *The Love of God* (for men in Christ) Mr. A. Gordon James takes Paul's great *Quis Separabit?* passage (Romans $8^{35,\ 37-39}$) and puts it, phrase by phrase, into modern terms (The Epworth Press, 1*s*. 6*d*.). He takes 'angels and principalities' to mean the objects of 'the Mystic Sense'. In this booklet there is a grain of the wheat of the Word in every sentence. . . . It is more than time that the Anabaptists were not judged solely by the exceptional episode at Münster. There is a brief but illuminating account of the movement and its sequel today in Mr. Ernest A. Payne's *The Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century* (Carey Kingsgate Press, 1*s*.). He makes use of recent research. . . . The Advisory Committee on Christian Pamphlets (on which the Rev. Frank H. Cumbers represents Methodism) has issued a very useful selection of *Christian Pamphlets* suitable for general use (*via* The Epworth Press, 3*d*.). They are grouped under 'Christian Doctrine', 'Prayer', 'the Bible', 'Christian Behaviour', 'Church Membership', 'Political and Social', 'Evangelistic', 'Christian Biography', and 'For Youth Leaders'. Only recent pamphlets seem to be included.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Journal of Theological Studies, January–April (Geoffrey Cumberlege, 10*s*. Annual subscription, 16*s*.).

The Last Supper, by J. Jeremias.
Three Recent Editions of the Greek New Testament (I), by G. D. Kilpatrick.
Some Current Conceptions of Historiography and their Significance for Christian Apologetic, by Norman Sykes.
Gregory of Tours and Gregory the Great, by O. Chadwick.

The Scottish Journal of Theology, March (Oliver and Boyd, 3*s*. 6*d*.).

From Paul to Jesus, by G. S. Duncan.
The Parable and the Preacher, by R. S. Wallace.
Calvin's Concept of Revelation (especially in Creation), by T. H. L. Parker.
Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life, by J. G. Matheson.
The Christian View of Man: an Examination of Karl Barth's Doctrine (in his recent volume), by W. A. Whitehouse and J. B. Souček.

Theologische Zeitschrift, Sept.–Oct., 1948, (Verlag Friedrich Reinhart AG., Basel; bimonthly parts, Fr. 4.50, annual subscription, Fr. 28).

Offenbarung und Geschichte in Alten Testament, by W. Eichrodt.
Versuche zur Erklärung von Hiob 1924, by J. J. Stamm.
Zehn Jahre nordamerikanischer Literatur zum Alten Testament, by W. Baumgartner.
Der johanneische Gebrauch doppeldeutiger Ausdrücke als Schlüssel zum Verständnis des vierten Evangeliums, by O. Cullmann.
Der Briefwechsel zwischen Johannes Buxtorf II. und Johannes Coccejus, by E. Staehelin.

do., Nov.–Dec., 1948.

Die Mahlzeit mit Paulus auf den Wellen des Mittelmeers Acts. 27, 33–38, by Bo Reicke.
Calvin im Lichte der Hexenprozesse von Peney. Ein Epilog, by O. Pfister.
Ein neues Schleiermacherbuch. Zu Felix Flückiger, Philosophie und Theologie bei Schleiermacher, by Arnold Gilg.

do., Jan.–Feb., 1949.

Das Problem des Urtextes der Septuaginta, by Peter Katz.
Die origenistische Spekulation und die Mystik, by Hans Jonas.
Der Ort der Trinitätslehre bei Emil Brunner, by Martin Schmidt.

do., March–April, 1949.
Le dictionnaire hébraïque de Ludwig Koehler et Walter Baumgartner, by Paul Humbert.
Christliche Existenz nach dem Zeugnis des Jakobusbriefes, by Werner Bieder.
Der Ausgangspunkt der Lehre vom Worte Gottes bei Johannes Hus, by J. B. Jeschke.
Philosophische Randbemerkungen zu Karl Barth, Die protestantische Theologie im 19 Jahrhundert, by Herman Gaufi.

Harvard Theological Review, July, 1948 (*via* Oxford University Press, single numbers $1, $3 a year).
Cults in Thessalonica, by Charles Edson.
Watts in America, by Robert Stevenson.
Neotera, by Campbell Bonner and Arthur Danby Nock.

do., October, 1948.
Kebes and Lemures, by Herbert J. Rose.
The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament, by Wilfred L. Knox.
The Abbé Lamennais on Freedom, by Frederick E. Ellis.
Pliny and the Christians, by Robert M. Grant.

The Expository Times, March (T. & T. Clark, 1*s.* 3*d.*).
Psychology after Freud, by J. G. McKenzie.
The Status of the Theologian in Philosophy, by W. S. Urquhart.
Theology and Literature (in Preaching), by Roy McVicar.

do., April.
The Christological Problem, by John Baker.
Man or Machine? (in three Utopias), by T. Tudor Rhys.

do., May.
Christ, the Word, by Kenneth Harper.
Karl Barth on Man, by E. L. Allen.
Paul the Christian, by Charles E. Cook.

The Journal of Religion, January (University of Chicago Press, *via* Cambridge Press, $1.75).
This number is 'dedicated to the memory of Shirley Jackson Case', a former editor. It includes a reprint of one of his articles, two articles (by C. C. McCown and Paul Schubert) that appraise his contribution to 'socio-history', and a full bibliography.

The Hibbert Journal, April (Geo. Allen & Unwin, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
The Nemesis of Diversity (in Education), by John Murray.
Faith and Philosophy, by T. F. Torrance.
Pressure Group and Community, by Kenneth Henderson.
Japanese Sintau (Shinto), by T. Baty.

Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan.–March (Theological Seminary, Dallas, Texas, $2.80 *per annum*).
The Millennial Issue in Modern Theology (first part), by John F. Walvoord.
Church Reform in the Late Middle Ages (concluded), by Peder Stiansen.
The Theology of 'Paradise Lost' (continued), by Earle E. Cairns.

The International Review of Missions, April (Oxford Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*).
Christian Theology in India, by A. J. Appasamy.
The Birth of a Church (in Basutoland), by Alex. Berthoud.
William Carey's 'Pleasing Dream' (of a Council of Missionary Churches), by Ruth Rouse.
Am I my Brother's Keeper? (Inter-Church aid to Missions), by B. D. Gibson.
Communism and European Jewry, by Robert Smith.
The (Evangelical) Realignment of Medical Missions, by Frank Lake.

The Congregational Quarterly, April (Independent Press, 2*s.* 6*d.*).
Amsterdam and the Missionary Societies, by Norman Goodall.
Some Recent Trends in Biblical Scholarship, by A. J. B. Higgins.
Existentialism and Christian Faith, by E. L. Allen.
Our Common Needs (Germany and England), by Herrman Klitscher.

Studies in Philology, January (University of North Carolina Press, *via* Cambridge Press, $1.25).
Peter Moone and John Ramsey, Verse Satirists of the English Reformation, by Cathleen H. Wheat.
Addison as Translator; A Problem in Neo-Classical Scholarship, by Lillian D. Bloom.
Reception of the Elizabethan Playwrights on the London Stage 1776–1833, by Donal J. Rulfs.
The Critical Approach to Lavengro-Romany Rye, by John E. Telford.

The Yale Review, Spring (Yale University Press, *via* Oxford Press, $1.50).
Atomic Power Politics, by Walter Isard and Vincent Whitney.
The Letters of Henry James to Mr. Justice Holmes, edited by Mark DeWolfe Howe.
The Fate of our Fourth (Dixiecrat) Party, by William G. Carleton.
T. S. Eliot, by David Daiches.
A View of Argentina under Peron, by Richard Lee Marks.
Lesson from Luzon, by David Bernstein.

The Journal of Politics, February (The University, Gainesville, Florida, $4.50 *per annum*).
Twelve articles 'concerning the changes and developments that have taken place in the American Presidency' and 'their worth and permanence'.

Our Contributors

WILLIAM F. LOFTHOUSE M.A.(OXON), D.D.(ABERDEEN)	Principal and Tutor in Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Handsworth College, 1925-40; President Methodist Church, 1929-30. Author of *F. H. Bradley*, and many books on theology.
MALDWYN EDWARDS M.A., PH.D.	Methodist Minister. Secretary, Methodist Temperance and Social Welfare Department. Author of *John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century*, *After Wesley*, *Methodism and England*, *This Methodism*. Beckly Lecturer, 1947.
HAROLD S. DARBY M.A.	Resident Tutor, Handsworth College: The Mr. and Mrs. J. Arthur Rank Chair of Pastoral Theology, Church History and Organization. Author of *The Grace and the Love, the Face and the Voice.*
W. S. HANDLEY JONES	Methodist Minister. Poet, essayist, literary critic. Author of *The Unveiling, and other Poems* and *It Crossed my Mind.*
J. MINTO ROBERTSON M.A., LL.D., F.E.I.S.	Late Headmaster, Aberdeen. Fellow of the Educational Institute of Scotland. Contributor to various journals.
FRANK BAKER B.A., B.D.	Methodist Minister. Registrar of the Wesley Historical Society and Secretary of the Methodist Historical Society. Awarded first prize Eayrs Essay 1948 for *The Relations between the Society of Friends and Early Methodism* (printed in this Review, October 1948). Author of *A Charge to Keep* and *Charles Wesley as revealed by His Letters.*
W. LAMPLOUGH DOUGHTY B.A., B.D.	Methodist Minister. Author of *John Wesley in Lincolnshire. John Wesley, His Conferences and his Preachers*, and *Studies in Religious Poetry of the Seventeenth Century.*
E. M. DODD	Congregational Minister. Previously contributed, *Preaching Values in Dostoevski's Novels*, and a comparative study of *Schweitzer and Kierkegaard.*
STANLEY BAYLISS	Musical Editor, *Daily Mail*. Contributor to *The Choir* and other musical journals.
C. RYDER SMITH B.A., D.D.	Principal, Richmond College, London University, 1929-40. Professor in Theology 1932-40. President Methodist Church, 1931. Author of many theological books.

Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton

NEW BOOKS ISSUED BY THE EPWORTH PRESS

THE KINDNESS OF GOD. By S. W. Carruthers, M.D., Ph.D. *4s. net*

'In many congregations over many years, men and women gratefully remember the visits of Dr. Carruthers and pay tribute to his wise, practical and encouraging sermons, a selection of which are to be found in this book.'

MAKING SENSE OF THE UNIVERSE. By A. Price Hughes. *6s. net*

'This book is like life. It is made up of odds and ends, parts and pieces, principles and persons. Life has its few outstanding adventures like birth, marriage, and death; but of these the individual knows little. The rest of life is made of odds and ends, trivial events and daily tasks. Anything that gives meaning to these far-flung adventures and these odds and ends of life is more precious than Aladdin's lamp. It is the conviction of the writer of this book that religious faith gives meaning to life. It turns the odds and ends of life into a pattern, it forms the broken and unwanted materials into a design of beauty. So through the odds and ends of this book faith ever shines, giving the harmony of music, the joy of beauty.'

THE LORD JESUS CHRIST (A Study in the Lordship of Jesus). By K. H. Crosby, B.A., B.D., Ph.D. (Lond.) *7s. 6d. net*

'The aim of this book is to exalt the Lord Jesus. Some years ago the writer had the privilege of instructing successive groups of African students upon the subject of what Christians are to believe. Since the first Christian creed was "Jesus is Lord," the writer took this as the centre around which his teaching was to revolve, and this book is the result of his efforts and those of his students.

'The book does not profess to be a compendium of Christian theology. It deals with the Person of Christ, and the purpose of the Incarnation, of the Life, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of the Lord Jesus, according to New Testament teaching. It traces the practical effect of His Grace in the lives of the first Christians and aims at helping to make that Grace available for His followers to-day.

'While the book has been written primarily for African students, the writer trusts that it may be found of value in an even wider field.'

BRIGHT INTERLUDE. By H. L. Gee. *6s. net*

'Having tramped the *Shining Highway* and taken a *Winter Journey* alone, and having also gone upon a *Gay Adventure* with a friend, the author of those popular books is now hustled off to the seaside by his wife (Judith) and his two children, David and Pamela—the latter making her first appearance in these lively and very entertaining pages.

'Crowded with fun and surprises, this story of a family holiday by the sea has music and singing, laughter and excitements, yet much that is tender and precious. We believe that all who read H. L. Gee's latest book will find life a little sweeter, faith a little stronger.'

NEW EDITIONS AND REPRINTS

WHAT IS THE OLD TESTAMENT. By C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D. *6s. net*

YONDER. By Leslie F. Church. *Paper Cover, 1s. Cloth Binding, 3s. 6d. net*

MARY-MARTHA AND HER CIRCLE. By William J. May. *5s. net*

WHILE THE CANDLE BURNS. By Rita F. Snowden. *5s. net*

Obtainable from your local Bookseller or

THE EPWORTH PRESS, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton