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

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

THE
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

OCTOBER 1920

WHERE IS HOLY RUSSIA NOW?[1]

THOSE who loved the old Russia with all its characteristic piety and charm and its unspoiled life-values, which had so strong an attraction for the imaginative and perhaps also for the sentimental and rebellious, are often asked the painful question: 'Where's your Holy Russia now?' Writers aver that with the revolution the Russian Church and Russian religion collapsed 'like a pack of cards.' Peasants were reported to have closed their churches pending a decision on the part of the Provisional Government as to whether there was a God. Pilgrimaging was said to have ceased and a godless materialism suddenly to have possessed all classes of society. The ease with which the peasants stole the land of the great proprietors, and the tenacious greed with which they held to it, were taken as signs of the complete lapse of religion. It might be remarked, not in extenuation but as a supplementary detail, that few Russians of any class, high or low, understand the ethical and moral aspect of their religion. From a Western point of view it is generally held that Russian religion has shown up extremely badly in the revolution, and those of us who praised Holy Russia in the old days are reckoned to have been 'entirely wrong about the Russians.'

There is one consolation, and that is, that those who

[1]

praised 'Holy Russia' were nevertheless generally right in their prognostications as to what political revolution would mean—they saw the unhappiness, the ruin, the misery, in the swing from mediaevalism to the other extreme of anarchy and murder.

Still, 'Holy Russia' was not invented in the twentieth century as an ornament for the Triple Entente. It did have a counterpart in reality, and in our cinema-glimmering and secularized Europe it was an enormous and startling fact. It cannot simply have been lifted from off the earth as by enchantment when the red twins came from New York and Geneva, the Lenin and Trotsky of our tale. The spiritual power of the Russian people cannot have been annihilated. It cannot, on the other hand, have rallied to one side alone in a bitter civil war. Admiral Koltchak was fond of appealing to Holy Russia and in the name of Holy Russia. But as the vice-emperor of unholy Siberia he was perhaps farther away from it than Lenin himself. On the other hand, Denikin, with his Mahometan tribesmen and his Cossacks, had little of the glamour of real Russia. The Cossacks are the least Slavonic of the Russians. In them is the blood of the Tartar—and they are the most superstitious and least spiritual of all Russian believers. Holy Russia never comes marching out of the south. For the farther south you go in Russia the less religion really matters. The Reds have held nearly all the while the characteristic religious provinces of Russia. Though the Soviet leaders have been mainly atheists the people whom they governed have been Christian. "Why do you call me agnostic?" asks Lenin of Mr. Lansbury. "I am not agnostic, I am atheist."—"I who do not believe in God" vaunts Gorky, in his reflections on Tolstoy.

It calls therefore for some faith, still to believe in Holy Russia. It was easy when the Lord was by your side. But when they have taken Him and killed Him you naturally go back to your nets and your fishing, and you assume that

you and others were mistaken in Him, and you cannot regain the vision till He comes walking toward you on the shore.

I read recently a remarkable article from the pen of Alexander Kuprin on the Russian Church and how it was coming through its great ordeal—the present revolutionary era. It ought to be explained that Kuprin, the author of many humorous, daring, and sentimental stories, has the reputation of being far from religious. One would have to discount testimony as to the heroism of the Russian Church if written by a *religiose* man, who above all things wanted it to be heroic. One feels on surer ground when the testimony comes from a well-tried man of the world. This in brief was Kuprin's article.

He recalled the stupefaction of the civilized world when many years ago the Synod excommunicated Count Tolstoy, and then the letter which the Countess Tolstoy wrote to Antony, the Metropolitan of Petrograd—'You hierarchs teach humility and simplicity, and yet you drive about in carriages drawn by six horses, you are clothed in silk and velvet and brocade, you wear gold mitres on your heads, and vestments covered with diamonds.' Kuprin thought such language most exasperating to the Metropolitan, who nevertheless replied very meekly—

'Yes. For the greater glory of the Church we wear the gold and brocade and precious stones. But if in God's will there should come a time when Russia should be visited with affliction and poverty and humiliation, we, like our great saint Serge Radonski, would go about on foot, clothe ourselves in simple homespun, and use wooden vessels at Communion.'

The Russian novelist sees as it were a prophecy in these words. Has not such a time come—and more swiftly than any could have dreamed? 'Churches have been turned into cinema-theatres,' says Kuprin, 'altars into public conveniences, sanctuary seats into playing-stools. Ikons have been torn down and desecrated and their rich

frames stolen. The sacred cloisters have been used as barracks and rubbish pits. Bishops have been pulled down from their high places by the hair, to be torn in pieces in their cathedrals or hanged at the gates of the church enclosure. Is this not the crown and extremity of martyrdom endured by the whole Russian nation? And is it not a symbol of that involuntary prophecy of Antony, that Benjamin, the present Metropolitan of Petrograd and Ladoga, goes about his work either on foot or by tram, in a modest cassock and wearing a simple skull-cap? And how our ordinary Russian priesthood has been transfigured, how it has grown, in the storm and the flame!'

Kuprin points out how the village priests, addicted in the old days to so many undignified venial sins, have the splendid human and divine material that slumbered undeveloped in them, and he ascribes it to the purity of their race. For in Russia the calling of priest, though free, is nevertheless by tradition confined to a number of families.

'Only in the Jews has the racial purity of blood been so completely preserved as it has been in our Russian village priests. Almost without exaggeration it may be said that, owing to their marriages (a Russian priest, before being ordained, must be able to show a wife of his own. He and she are almost always in the twenties) being arranged exclusively in their own class, the Russian clergy, from the time of Vladimir the Great, have entirely escaped any admixture of foreign elements with their good Slavonic blood. These early marriages and healthy country life have preserved this blood from the damage which might have been caused by earlier exhaustion and vicious diseases. And it must be said that our Levites are a very sturdy, healthy, fruitful, and enduring race.'

To-day they have emerged as martyrs, leaders, pastors, feeders of the common people, and they have stood forth and not denied their God in the hour of tribulation. In them Kuprin sees the most credible sign that the Russian

nation as a whole is approaching an unforeseen spiritual renewal.

Arrests, inquisitions, forced labour, these the little-fathers have taken calmly, without complaint, without petitions for mercy, but also without affectation. When it has been their lot to be sentenced to death they have faced the rifles of the Red soldiers 'gently and magnificently like the ancient martyrs. Some could not restrain their flaming words; others have found silence and duty more eloquent than spoken language. It is a heroic spirit that shines forth in them.

'At present,' Kuprin says, 'the clergy are standing entirely outside the political struggle. The atheistic and somewhat militantly anti-Christian political leaders have had to acknowledge that the people as a whole are too sunk in ignorance to be deprived of their faith.'

Russia has had religious revivals before, her Radstockism, her Bogo-iskateli (God-seekers), but these, says Kuprin, were mere fashion, hypocrisy, blasé curiosity. This of to-day is an elemental, geological movement, slowly and inexorably rising and freeing a continent from a flood.

'The Church as of old is revealing itself as a symbol, a refuge, and a support. And it is impossible in this connexion not to call to mind the wonderful words of the gospel, 'Fear not, little flock. For it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.'

Thus witnesseth Alexander Kuprin. It is rather surprising at first thought that the various Labour emissaries, inquirers, and investigators whom we have sent to Russia have brought back no tidings of the Russian Church and anything other than stories of atrocities on one side or another in the civil strife. Even George Lansbury, who is a professed Christian, brought no tidings of Holy Russia, and on the other hand the Protestant minister of the gospel, Mr. North, was equally silent. Mr. H. V. Keeling, Mr. Tom Shaw, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Bertram Russell and others—well,

they did not go to Russia to report on religion. I am afraid that these people, more or less intelligent, were nevertheless limited by their strictly Anglo-Saxon outlook and temperament, and by the fact that they did not know enough of the ways and language of the Russian people.

American visitors to Russia observed more, and the accounts which Mr. Wardwell, of the American Red Cross, and Mr. Thomas Whittamore, of one of the non-partisan relief societies, give, are entirely compatible with Kuprin's story. The former of these was present in Moscow when the Bolsheviks were so far mollified that they allowed in the churches a memorial service and prayer for the dead Tsar, Nicholas II. 'The fervour of the people, the crush, the sobbing of the congregations was something most remarkable,' said he. 'People went to church simply to weep for Russia.' Whittamore, on the other hand, a most selfless and devoted soul, trusted by both sides, a man who succoured many, many starving children, testified to the growth of Russian religious passion all the time of tribulation. I dislike taking anything at second hand, but listening to him, I could not but feel that what he said was true and in keeping with Russian psychology—

> The blacker the night the clearer the stars.
> The deeper the sorrow the nearer to God.

or as a dialogue puts it—'Did you find them religious down there?' 'I found them suffering.' 'What sort of people were they?' 'Russians.' 'Then I know they were religious.'

We have heard of the persecution and of the troubles and difficulties of the Patriarch Tikhon. But we have heard also how the popular struggle behind him grew, and the impossibility of carrying on 'class-hate' against the Church. Russia has no 'clericals,' never had 'clericals' in the Western sense. Her priests and ministers and monks and bishops were never academic people divorced from the main currents of popular life. On the other hand Russia

never had sporting priests. The Vicar of Bray type never once turned up in the revolution. I am afraid the Church of England would show less stamina in England if a Bolshevik revolution overtook us. And we should not stand behind our bishops as the Russians have stood behind theirs. The Russian peasantry has taught the Bolshevik leaders much that they did not know about Russia before. And it is to the credit of the political sagacity of Lenin and his *confrères* that they have accepted their new knowledge and acted upon it. Thanks to a certain amount of mutual accommodation of mind the Russian people have gone a long way toward Christianizing their masters. I believe that in this respect the Russian people will ultimately go *all* the way.

One's mind is naturally solicitous about certain people and certain landmarks and customs and buildings in Russia. Details and accurate information are wofully lacking. But we hear that Prince Paul Trubetskoi, the Lord Halifax of the Russian laity, died last year of typhus—Russia's greatest Christian layman, a hero too, who did not shrink from persecution and starvation, nor fail to stand and live for 'Holy Russia' even in her worst hour. Nesterof and Vasnetsof, the modern religious painters and interpreters of 'Holy Russia,' are reported dead; Ivanof and Bulgakof are reduced to penury and want; Merezhkovsky, Alexander Blok, K. D. Balmont, bright voices of Russia, are long gone silent. Of scores of noble characters known in the old days one never hears a word. Rozanof, that religious and strange genius, was executed. Andreyef also is supposed to have died. It is said that the Iverskaya Madonna has been removed from her shrine at the entrance to the Kremlin and that the Sisters of 'Martha and Mary' have her in their keeping, but the abbess of that famous Moscow sisterhood, the Grand Duchess Elizabeth, is also accounted dead. On the feast-day of St. Sergey in 1918 the Bolshevik propagandists are said to have exposed the

remains of the body of St. Sergey to tens of thousands of pilgrims, and shown them that the body was actually dust and that it had not remained incorruptible for eight centuries. And the people went away disappointed and confused in mind. But still pilgrimaging to the shrine continued. Travellers in the Holy Land remark that throughout all these troubled times there has nevertheless been a tiny stream of pilgrims from Russia to the Sepulchre. The stream has never dried up. As for Mount Athos, never have there been so many pilgrims as in these years.

For my part I refuse to believe that all who are reported dead are really dead. When peace comes many of these dead ones will reappear. Because a man has disappeared from ordinary human ken is no reason for assuming that he has for ever passed away.

What is the likeliest thing that a true lover of Russia and a true Russian would do in these days?—not run to England or France or America but remain in Russia, not refuse to take up the Cross, but be glad to take it up. There are many of the greatest of Russians going about in Russia to-day in rags, doing the hardest of manual labour, living the life of the poorest of her people, many also who have become nameless monks and nuns, beggars, pilgrims, and even soldiers in the Red army. When the time comes they will reappear, and there will be a happy roll-call when many a man and woman given up as lost will come forward again and cry *adsum* when the world and Russia calls.

It will certainly be asked: Why did Holy Russia fight against the Allies? The answer will be that as far as Russia was concerned the Allies' intentions were not really in keeping with Holy Russia. The Allied armies never made themselves loved by the Russians. The soldiers failed to understand the Russian people because they, the Russians, were so unlike themselves in their ways. Then again, Russia knows, and has all along known, that France

and England were acting from commercial and financial motives, not from love of Russia. By no public act at any time since the March, '17, revolution did the Allies show that they cared in any way for the Russian people, but they did show to the quick-sighted Russians an appalling desire for the oil and the gold. We rallied Holy Russia thereby behind the Red leaders.

Great Britain and France are guilty of a great deal of Russian blood and of the destruction of many Russian shrines. Lvof, Sazonof, and the rest, are also guilty of entering into relationship with foreign powers to shed the blood of Russia. If captured by the Bolsheviks they would probably be convicted of treason and condemned to death. General Golovine's letter showed our war-minister in an objectionable light, but if anything Golovine himself was more despicable than he. Let the Russians who want to fight fight by all legitimate means, but not conspire to get English Tommies sent out to do their terrible work.

How they follow one another,—the Ironside adventure, the Koltchak adventure, the Yudenitch adventure, the Denikin adventure, the Polish adventure, the Wrangel adventure! All failures, and all financed and fomented from London and Paris! It is no use crying *shame*. We are drowned in these adventures.

How characteristic was the news about the taking of Kief. It was stated that the Poles, having as bad Catholics destroyed the Russian cathedral at Warsaw, had gone a step further and blown up the Vladimir cathedral at Kief. So it was reported in the Bolshevik wireless. Next day, however, the Poles issued a *dementi*. They did not blow it up; it was shelled by the advancing Bolshevik army and was in that way damaged.

In all Russia there is hardly anything more beautiful than the cathedral of St. Vladimir. Its walls live with the most beautiful modern religious art in the world—the most inspired paintings of Vasnetsof and Nesterof. If

you wished to see something perfectly beautiful in modern Russia you would go to that temple of the Orthodox faith. It truly was a part expression of Holy Russia. What does it matter who injured it, Poles or Bolsheviks; neither guilt nor innocence can repair the breach. It was the senseless wickedness of mankind that did it. It was lies and hate and greed and intrigue, and it was stupidity, and it was the war.

There again I suppose, Faith fails. Hope, which, as Carlyle says, is a liar, intervenes and raises up patiently and tenderly the Faith which has fallen, and then Faith stumbles on and falls again and again is lifted up. It is the human way. The things we apprehend are godlike and immortal, but keeping our eyes on them we fall into pits which the enemy has dug in our way. However, we cannot for ever live in these pits and grumble at them, we must rejoice in the vision which has been with us and has not deserted us.

As for Trotsky, may he not now say as he confronts his sixth adversary—

> . . I have set my life upon a cast,
> And I will stand the hazard of the die.
> I think there be six Richmonds in the field;
> Five have I slain to-day instead of him.

But Wrangel is hardly the authentic Richmond, nor Trotsky the real Richard.

STEPHEN GRAHAM.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL

IN this paper I propose to consider the authorship of the Fourth Gospel and of the First Epistle of John, works manifestly from the same pen; also their place in Christian thought and life. These topics, as we shall see, are closely related, and are of utmost importance. A unanimous and unquestioned belief of all the earliest Christian writers, from the second century onwards, attributes these books to John, the son of Zebedee. This tradition we must test by examination of their contents.

In the first three Gospels we find, among the twelve Apostles, an inner circle in more intimate relation to Jesus, consisting of Peter, James, and John, with the occasional addition of Peter's brother Andrew: so Mark v. 37, ix. 2, xiv. 33, and their parallels. In Acts iii. 1–11, iv. 13, 19, viii. 14, Gal. ii. 9, we find John closely associated with Peter, the leader of the apostolic band. In the Fourth Gospel, the only mention of this prominent apostle is in ch. xxi. 2, as one of the 'sons of Zebedee.'

In Jno. xiii. 23, xix. 26, xxi. 7, 20, a man whose name is conspicuously withheld is described as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved.' In ch. xviii. 15, 16, we find 'another disciple;' and in ch. xx. 2 'the other disciple, whom Jesus loved:' cp. *vv.* 3, 4, 8. This careful and repeated omission, and this mention, without name, of another disciple, demands explanation. In the unanimous belief of the early Church (see Eusebius, *Church History*, bk. iii. 23) the unnamed one was 'the Apostle and Evangelist, John': if so, we infer that he modestly concealed his own and his brother's name. This explanation has everything in its favour, and I know of nothing against it.

Much else confirms this tradition. Throughout the

Gospel we have an accuracy of detail which irresistibly suggests a personal remembrance of actual facts. The notes of time are very remarkable. In chs. i. 29, 35, 39, 43, ii. 1, vi. 22, xii. 12, we have events on successive days. The writer remembered (ch. ii. 11) that the water made into wine was the 'beginning of the signs which Jesus did.' In chs. ii. 13, vi. 4 we have two Passovers earlier than that at which He was arrested, as we read in all Four Gospels. This implies that His public ministry lasted more than two years. If we had only the Synoptic Gospels, we should have no information about its duration. In ch. v. 1 we have an unspecified 'feast'; in ch. vii. 2, 8, 10, 11, 14 a 'feast of Tabernacles'; and in ch. x. 22 a feast of 'Dedication,' with mention of the time of year, 'winter.' Other notes of time in chs. xix. 31, xx. 19; and in *v.* 26 ff. a most interesting event, at a definite time. In ch. xxi. 14 we have a 'third' appearance of the risen One; revealing the writer's accurate knowledge of all the facts of the case.

We also find references to persons, and successive references to the same person, with delineations of character, of many who, but for the Fourth Gospel, would be unknown, or known only by name. In chs. iii. 1, vii. 50, xix. 39 we have vivid pictures of *Nicodemus*; also of *Thomas* in chs. xi. 16, xiv. 5, xx. 24–28; in ch. i. 45–50, xxi. 2, of *Nathaniel*, of *Andrew* in chs. i. 40, vi. 8, xii. 22, and of *Philip* in chs. i. 43–48, vi. 5, 7, xii. 21, 22. In ch. xviii. 10, we have the name of the man whose ear Peter cut off in Gethsemane; and in *v.* 26 a reference to a relative of the same man. A remarkable coincidence of character is found in chs. xi. 1–5, xii. 2 compared with Lk. x. 38–42. The preliminary examination of Jesus by *Annas*, before He was taken to Caiaphas, is mentioned only in Jno. xviii. 13–24. The indications of the day of crucifixion in chs. xviii. 28, xix. 31 differ from the plain statement in Mk. xiv. 12, Mt. xxvi. 17, Lk. xxii. 7. But the former is now generally accepted, even by some who deny the traditional authorship of the Fourth Gospel.

The force of these indications, and of others similar, can be appreciated only by close personal study. To me, they are decisive proof that in the Fourth Gospel we have a most reliable and accurate narrative; and the profound harmony underlying many differences, in style and details, attests strongly the substantial historical truth of all four Gospels.

Important light is shed on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel in ch. xxi. 24, where, after a definite mention (*v.* 20) of 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' we read, 'this is the disciple who bears witness about these things and *wrote*' them. The words following, 'and *we know* that his witness is true,' suggest irresistibly that *v.* 24 is by another hand. It is a definite assertion of authorship. That it is found in all ancient copies suggests that it is a part of the original work. The third person singular in ch. xix. 35, 'he who has seen has borne witness,' is a strong assertion that the above words of Jesus were recorded by the beloved disciple to whom He spoke from the cross. Otherwise *v.* 26 is meaningless. In ch. i. 14, the words 'we beheld His glory' put the writer among those who actually saw the Incarnate Son.

That we owe the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John, receives still more decisive confirmation from its theological contents. If we had only the Synoptic Gospels, there would be a great chasm between the recorded words of Christ and the theology of Paul. Of this last, we have an orderly and logical statement in Rom. i.–viii., which is confirmed and developed in his other letters. Its central doctrine, everywhere dominant, is plainly stated in Rom. i. 16: 'the gospel is a power of God for salvation to everyone who believes.'

This conspicuous assertion is implied in words of Christ recorded and frequently repeated in the Fourth Gospel. See Jno. i. 12, iii. 15–18, 36, v. 24, vi. 29, 35, 36, vii. 38, 39, xi. 26, xiv. 12, xx. 31; cp. 1 Jno. iii. 23, v. 1, 4, 5, 10, 18.

In other words, the central teaching of Paul is, in the Fourth Gospel, traced by just inference to recorded words of Christ; to words as conspicuous there as is Salvation by Faith in the letters and recorded addresses (cp. Acts xiii. 39, xxvi. 18) of Paul. Apart from the Fourth Gospel, this great doctrine would be rather the teaching of Paul than of Christ.

Another element common to the letters of Paul and the Fourth Gospel is found in the phrases *in Christ* and *Christ in us*; e.g. Rom. vi. 11, 23, viii. 1, 2, 10, Eph. i. 3–13, Col. i. 14–19, 1 Tim. i. 14. These phrases represent the personality of Christ as the home in which His disciples rest, the fortress in which they are safe, the spiritual atmosphere in which they live, and the guiding and motive power of their lives. This conspicuous teaching is found in Jno. xiv. 20; and still more developed in the phrase, '*abide* in Me, and I in you,' in ch. xv. 1–7. Here we have the same idea in parabolic form, viz.: branches of the True Vine. This thought and phrase are not found in the Synoptic Gospels. But in the Fourth Gospel they are traced to the lips of Christ; cp. 1 Jno. ii. 6, 10, 24, 27, 28. The equivalent phrases *in Christ* and *Christ in you*, are conspicuous in the letters of Paul. On the other hand, the theological use of the word *abide* is found only in the Gospel and two Epistles of John. In Rom. viii. 9, 11, 1 Cor. iii. 16, we have a different Greek word: cp. Rom. vii. 18, 20.

In Christ's great inaugural address, the Sermon on the Mount, a marked element is that they who follow Christ are *sons* of a Father in Heaven: so Mt. v. 9, 45, 48, etc., also Mk. xi. 25, Lk. vi. 35, 36. In Jno. i. 13, iii. 3–8, 1 Jno. ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, 18, this new relation to God is traced to a *New Birth* from God. From the pen or lips of Paul, this great doctrine is found only in Tit. iii. 5, where we have a casual word rendered in R.V. *Regeneration*. In the great exposition of the Gospel in Rom. i.–viii., its place is supplied by another metaphor, viz. the Roman

legal practice of *Adoption*, in which one man took another's son to be in nearly all respects his own son. Some Roman emperors obtained the throne as adopted sons of their predecessors; and sometimes the son of a slave thus became a free man. See Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 5, Eph. i. 5.

These two metaphors look at the same essential truth from different points of view. The one traces our new relation to God as His sons to a new life received from Him, bringing us into a new world, and giving us new faculties fitting us for it. The other calls attention to the great change, when the children of sinful men are recognized as sons of a Father in Heaven, infinitely rich, wise, and loving; and represents this change, which is followed by a new life of victory over sin and devotion to God, as in harmony with the Law of God, i.e. the great principle of Morality.

These metaphors are distinctive of their writers. The beloved disciple remembered his Master's teaching about the New Birth; the pupil of Gamaliel, an honoured teacher of Law, recognized in this great salvation a supreme realization of the purpose of all law. In 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, the first metaphor is found, from the pen, as we may well believe, of another Galilean.

That the righteous and they only are *children* and *sons* of God is taught in Mt. v. 9, 45, Lk. xx. 36, Jno. i. 12, viii. 42–44, xi. 52, 1 Jno. iii. 1, 2, 10, v. 2.

Other teaching peculiar to Paul is the believer's crucifixion, death, burial, resurrection, and ascension, with Christ, i.e. a spiritual reproduction, in his own religious experience, of the great events which closed His life on earth. So Rom. vi. 3–11, Eph. ii. 1–6, Col. ii. 20–iii. 4, 2 Tim. ii. 11. Another important doctrine of Paul, not found elsewhere, is the Church as the Body of Christ: 1 Cor. xii. 12–27, Rom. xii. 4–8, Eph. i. 22, 23, iv. 4, 12, Col. i. 18. The absence of these doctrines from the Gospel and Epistles of John reveals the independence of these books from the teaching of Paul.

Common to Paul and John is the creation of the universe *through* the agency of the Son; cp. Col. i. 16, 17, 1 Cor. viii. 6; Jno. i. 3, 10.

Of at least equal importance is the teaching of Christ, in all Four Gospels, about His relation to God. In Mt. xiii. 41, xvi. 27, xxv. 31–46, and elsewhere, He claims that, when all mankind shall stand to be judged, the Son of Man, who is also the Son of God, will sit on the throne as their Judge, with angels as His servants, and 'give to each one according to his action.' In ch. xi. 28–30, He promises rest to all weary and burdened ones who come to Him; and in ch. xxviii. 19 His name is placed in close relation to that of the Father and of the Holy Spirit. Similar claims are attributed to Him in all Four Gospels, and similar homage is paid to Him throughout the New Testament. In Rev. v. 6, 9, 12 we see a slain Lamb in the midst of the throne, who receives the homage of the brightest in Heaven.

Nothing in human history is more certain than that Jesus of Nazareth left in the hearts of His followers in all ages a confident recognition of Himself as infinitely greater than men or angels, and as holding a unique and most intimate relation to God. All this reveals a personality absolutely unique. At once we are eager to learn all we can about One who in a public ministry of some three years gained the supreme place in human thought and life.

In our search, the Fourth Gospel comes to our aid. Going back to the beginning of whatever began to be, the writer finds 'with God' One whom he at once describes as Himself *God*; and asserts that through His agency was made whatever began to be. From Jno. i. 14 we learn that this mysterious Companion of God was known as *Jesus Christ*; and in *v.* 17 that, whereas the Law came through Moses, through Him came grace and truth, i.e. the favour of God and a knowledge of reality. In the earliest and best copies of *v.* 18, He is spoken of as *God Only begotten*: see R.V. margin. In ch. iii. 16, 18, 1 Jno.

iv. 9, and here only, He is called the 'Only begotten Son.' This asserts plainly His unique relation to God.

The definite assertion, in Jno. i. 1, 'the Word was *God*,' recalls a remarkable incident in ch. xx. 28. We read that, on the evening following His resurrection, the Risen One appeared to some of His disciples and showed them His hands and side. Thomas was not there; and, hearing of this appearance, he expressed his resolute doubt. A week later, in a similar gathering, Jesus again appeared, and challenged Thomas to see and touch His wounded body. Touch was not needed. The doubting apostle at once exclaimed, 'My Lord and my God.'

Now for the first time, so far as we know, there entered the mind of man the stupendous truth that Jesus is not merely the Only-begotten Son of God, but Himself *God*. This great truth is also plainly stated in Jno. i. 1, 'the Word *was God*.' That these words and those of Thomas are found only in the Fourth Gospel, suggests that we owe to his honest doubt these great words of the Evangelist.

Nowhere else in the New Testament, except Jno. i. 1, xx. 28, do we read in unmistakable language that Jesus is God. Appeal has been made to Rom. ix. 5. But here a marginal note in R.V. admits that the rendering is uncertain. If Paul had intended to say in this one passage that Christ is God, he would have done so in language admitting no doubt. He is here thanking God for the great privileges which the mass of his nation were trampling under foot, but which had been to Paul an infinite blessing. That he thanks God for that which condemns his own nation, adds pathos to his words.

Appeal has also been made to Heb. i. 8, but we notice that Bishop Westcott, who has no superior as a commentator, in his note on this passage (taken from Ps. xlv. 6) renders it 'God is thy throne;' quoting Ps. lxxi. 3, 'Thou art my rock and my fortress,' and other similar passages. The meaning is that so long as God lives, the throne of the

ideal King, to whom this Psalm is dedicated, is secure. In neither passage is there any indication of an assertion of the deity of Christ. The meaning is clear without it. To build theology on a doubtful interpretation is always dangerous.

That only in Jno. i. 1, xx. 28 is Christ spoken of in the New Testament as God, is easily explained. Had the apostles gone about asserting that Jesus is God, they would seem to contradict that definite Monotheism which raised the religion of Israel so far above all others. To avoid this serious misunderstanding, Christ, while using language which clearly implied His infinite superiority to all other creatures of God, refrained from asserting plainly His real dignity. In this, the apostles imitated their Master. This topic demands further attention.

A week after the resurrection, Thomas read, in view of the wounded hands and side of the Risen One, the significance of Christ's earlier teaching about Himself. In Mt. xxviii. 19 we find 'the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' And later still, probably, the Beloved Apostle, who doubtless heard and remembered the words of Thomas, wrote, after the devout thought of a long life, when all danger of misunderstanding was past, 'the Word was God.'

We come now to consider the meaning of this great assertion. The words 'in the beginning,' which recall Gen. i., are explained in Jno. i. 3 to mean the beginning of whatever had a beginning. This implies that He, by whose agency all creation began to be, had no beginning; so Jno. xvii. 5, 24; also Col. i. 16, 17: another link between John and Paul. In Jno. v. 19 Jesus asserts that whatever the Father does, 'these things also the Son does in like manner.' In *v.* 20 He adds that to the Son the Father shows all things which He does. This implies, in the Son, an intelligence and a power co-extensive with that of the Father. This may justly be called, as is implied in Phil.

ii. 6, 'equality with God': cp. Jno. v. 18, x. 33. Since this uncreated existence and this infinite intelligence and power are a marked distinction between God and the highest of His creatures, He who justly claims them may be reasonably called *God*.

Yet in Jno. xvii. 3 Christ addresses the Father as 'the only True God,' and Paul writes of Him in 1 Tim. i. 17, vi. 16, as the 'only God . . . who alone has immortality'; in 1 Cor. viii. 4 he says, 'we know . . . that there is no God except One;' and in *v.* 6, 'to us there is One God, the Father.' These assertions re-echo the great words in Ex. xx. 3, repeated word for word in Dt. v. 7, 'there shall not be to thee other gods except Me.' These are Israel's testimony to the Unity of God: cp. Jas. ii. 19.

The explanation of this apparent contradiction is found in the intimate and unique relation of the Son to the Father. This finds remarkable expression in Jno. x. 30, 'I and the Father are one *thing*'; and this is explained in ch. xvii. 11, 20–23, 'that they may be one *thing*, even as we are . . . that they all may be one *thing*, as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us . . . that they also may be one *thing*, according as We are one *thing*, I in them and Thou in Me, in order that they may be perfected into one *thing*.' In these passages, the unity of the Father and the Son is appealed to as a pattern for the unity which Christ desires to be realized in His disciples. The neuter form so conspicuous here is found also in 1 Cor. iii. 8, 'he who plants and he who waters are one *thing*:' i.e. they stand in the same relation to the matter in hand, consequently what is said of the one is true of the other. In Gal. iii. 28, we have the masculine form, 'ye are all one *man* in Christ.' For here there can be no mistake, as there would be if, in the cases quoted above, the masculine form were used.

This unity, of the Father and the Son, and of the perfected disciples, is evidently a perfect harmony, in accord

with reality. But we note this difference: the unity of the Father and the Son is essential and without beginning; that of the disciples is acquired by the grace and work of God.

In the relation of the Son to the Father, we note two distinct elements, absolute Equality combined with absolute Subordination. This is clearly put in Jno. v. 19, in part quoted above, but continued as follows: 'the Son cannot do anything from Himself, except what He sees the Father doing.' So *v.* 22, 'The Father judges no one, but has given all the judgement to the Son, in order that all may honour the Son according as they honour the Father.' Still more conspicuous is *v.* 26: 'Just as the Father has life in Himself, so also to the Son has He given to have life in Himself.' In ch. vi. 38 Jesus says, 'I am come down from Heaven, not that I may do My will, but the will of Him who sent Me.'

This absolute Subordination is very conspicuous throughout Jno. v., vi., xiv.-xvii. It culminates in Christ's plain statement in ch. xiv. 28: 'the Father is greater than I'; and it is a needful counterpart to the Equality of the Son with the Father.

All this explains Jno. i. 1. In the phrase, 'the Word was *with* God,' the word *God* is used distinctively for the Father, even in contrast to the Son, as in ch. xvii. 3, 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6, xv. 28. This definite use is, in the original, suggested by the article before the word *God* as first used in Jno. i. 1. It here denotes the absolute supremacy of the Father, as the ultimate source of all good; so Rom. xvi. 27, 'the only wise God.' The phrase, 'the Word was God,' without the article, calls attention to the Son's absolute and infinite superiority to all created intelligences, as sharing with the Father the uncreated and infinite power and wisdom which distinguish both Father and Son from whatever began to be. This somewhat limited use of the word *God* is determined by the whole teaching of the Fourth Gospel about the relation of the Son to the Father.

That this Equality and Subordination are shared with a Third Divine Person is implied in remarkable words recorded at the close of the First Gospel: 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' Cp. Jno. xvi. 13. But this all-important addition, 'the Holy Spirit,' does not modify anything in this paper, and cannot be discussed here.

In all the Gospels Jesus is represented as using language which claims for Him a unique and most intimate relation to God. All this is recognized with lowly homage by all the various writers of the New Testament; and is specially conspicuous in the Book of Revelation. But the Fourth Gospel goes beyond the other sacred writers by describing Christ as 'the *Only-begotten* Son of God,' thus holding a unique relation to God; and still further by describing Him as Himself *God*.

This teaching is guarded by the conspicuous and repeated assertion of the absolute subordination of the Son to the Father, as sent by Him and doing only His will. The Oneness of the Father and the Son is asserted. But that this oneness is appealed to as an example of the oneness for which Christ prays in His disciples, implies that it involves, not identity, but harmony. The difference is that in them the harmony is acquired; in the Father and the Son it is essential and from eternity.

Along with this uncreated equality and companionship, we find a definite order, always maintained. The Father is always First and Supreme. The Son is sent by, and ever obeys, the Father; the Spirit is sent by both Father and (Jno. xv. 26) Son. In all this, we find an uncreated Archetype of the co-operation and order needful for the best human development.

This complicated conception of God goes far beyond anything in ancient literature, Jewish or Gentile; until the time of Christ. Since His day, it has been confidently held by an immense majority of His followers in all ages

and Churches; and in all Christian countries, to nearly all the best men and women, it has been a powerful stimulus and help for all that is good. In all other nations we see stagnation and decay, except where help has been derived from Christian nations. The history of mankind leaves no room for doubt that through Jesus of Nazareth was given a spiritual impulse which has changed and raised the whole course of human life.

Now all that we know about the teaching of Christ comes to us, directly or indirectly, through the New Testament. All its various writers give, in different degrees of development, one harmonious account of the superhuman dignity of Christ. But in the Gospel and First Epistle of John we notice a definite advance in this teaching. What in others is left to fair logical inference is in these books plainly stated; as is the Subordination of the Son, so needful to guard from serious misunderstanding His Equality with God. Apart from this Gospel and Epistle, the Sacred Record would be essentially defective.

A unanimous and confident tradition asserts that this all-important addition is due to a beloved disciple of Christ, i.e. to the apostle John, who from his own memory gave to the Church a substantially correct reproduction of the actual teaching of Christ. It is infinitely more likely that this tradition is true than that this needful completion of the Sacred Record, this supreme exposition of the relation of Christ to God, should be the work of a man who has left in the history of early Christianity no trace of his name or personality. Such a suggestion cannot be tolerated unless supported by evidence stronger than the abundant proof which confirms the ancient tradition.

This tradition is flatly contradicted by some modern scholars. In Dr. Moffatt's *Introduction to the New Testament*, on p. 559, we read, 'Since John the apostle was martyred early, the only available hypotheses are those which make the historical narrative come from a disciple

of John, and merely the discourses from the apostle himself.' Still earlier, on p. 509, he has 'ruled out,' for the same reason, the apostolic authorship of the Bk. of Revelation. On p. 596 he says, 'It has been assumed provisionally that the tradition is correct which witnesses to an early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee.'

For this assumption, the only proof is that given on p. 602. 'The evidence for the early martyrdom of John, the son of Zebedee, is, in fact, threefold: (*a*) a prophecy of Jesus preserved in Mk. x. 39, Mt. xx. 23, (*b*) the witness of Papias, and (*c*) the calendars of the Church.' But Christ's words, 'The cup which I drink, ye will drink,' by no means assert or suggest that both brothers would die at the same time. Moreover, years later we find John living as a pillar of the Church: Gal. ii. 1, 9.

Nor does the quotation from a lost work of Papias, that John 'was killed by Jews, thus plainly fulfilling along with his brother the prophecy of Christ concerning them.' For if both brothers were at any time put to death, in His foresight they would stand together as martyrs. So with 'the calendars of the Church.' Much more trustworthy is Irenaeus (bk. ii. 22[5]), who says that John 'continued (with the elders in Asia) till the time of Trajan.' Dr. Moffatt says nothing to explain the silence of the Fourth Gospel about the apostle John, and seems unconscious of its infinite theological and religious importance, or of the bearing of this on its authorship.

The above arguments from personal details are strongly and very ably confirmed in a volume recently published by John Murray, and reproducing, after his death, miscellaneous teaching of the late lamented H. Scott Holland, formerly Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, entitled, *The Philosophy of Faith and the Fourth Gospel*. He brings from various incidents in the Fourth Gospel valuable evidence that it was written by the Apostle John. Referring to this evidence, Dr. Scott Holland justly says,

on p. 174, that 'It was only through him that we find ourselves inside the Apostolic circle, and know the men apart and their special ties to one another. It is curious how entirely the Synoptics fail in this. Except Simon Peter, we know no one individually. They are simply "the Twelve." But the Fourth Gospel notes them apart, and takes a peculiar concern in several who are obviously of some special interest to its readers, so that their mutual relationships are fascinating for their own sakes.'

Most heartily I recommend this new volume to our readers. From the same publisher we have also a smaller volume on *The Epistles of John*, by Bishop Gore. Still more earnestly do I recommend to all thoughtful men and women a patient and devout study of the Gospel and First Epistle of John. In such study they will find in these volumes valuable help from two of the ablest and most godly theological teachers of our day.

J. Agar Beet.

FREDERICK LOCKER-LAMPSON[1]

ONE ASPECT OF HIS PERSONALITY

WHEN Swinburne was invited to contribute an article on Chatterton to Mr. Humphry Ward's *English Poets*, he declined on the score that 'without cordiality (which here I do not feel) there can be no thoroughness in such work.' To Mr. Birrell's 'Character Sketch' of his father-in-law, Frederick Locker-Lampson, whom for the sake of shortness he speaks of as 'Locker' throughout, he brings not cordiality merely (no meaningless word since it comes 'from the heart') but something also of spiritual and intellectual likeness to his subject.

Of Locker, Mr. Birrell says, 'No man expatiated less. He never expounded anything in his born days. He very soon wearied of those he called "strong talkers." His critical method was, in a conversational manner, to direct your attention to something in a poem or a picture, to make a brief suggestion or two, perhaps to apply an epithet, and it was all over—but your eyes were opened.'

Said as this is of Locker, it is equally true of Mr. Birrell. No man 'expatiates less,' or 'wearies' sooner of 'strong talkers.' His own manner is 'conversational.' He 'directs your attention to something,' 'makes a brief suggestion or two, perhaps applies an epithet, and it is all over—but your eyes are opened.'

It is so indeed that Mr. Birrell writes of Frederick Locker. His success is due not only to the faithfulness of the picture, but to the all-important fact that our eyes are opened, and we see the man of whom he writes for ourselves, not, as sometimes happens in biographies,

[1] Frederick Locker-Lampson: a Character Sketch. By the Right Hon. Augustine Birrell. London: Constable & Co. 1920.

through the eyes of the biographer. Of Locker's books Mr. Birrell says that 'the character of their author and compiler, shy and elusive, and in some aspects complicated, is exhibited, illuminated, and illustrated by them almost to its last recesses, and what is more, was so exhibited, illuminated, and illustrated intentionally.'

The fact that other authors have distilled the very essence of their personality, drop by drop, into a book as into a vial, may cause some readers too lightly to agree with Mr. Birrell, and to pass on. That would be entirely to miss his meaning. Generalizing about this or that author—Stevenson for instance—one might say that his books are entirely of his personality. Stevenson drew as much upon his personality in writing them, as the artist, in one of Olive Schreiner's parables, painted pictures, the secret of the wonderful colouring of which none could discover, until, after the artist's death, it was found that he had painted in his own heart's blood. What Mr. Birrell says must be read as applying, and in an isolated sense, only to Frederick Locker. I am not sure that I am in entire agreement when Mr. Birrell says that Mr. Locker thus revealed himself in his books 'intentionally.' In a sense of course every artist aims, if unconsciously, at self-expression. But Locker's easy and courtly bearing, his distinction of presence, and of manner, his unerring social taste and tact, were what they were, merely because they were *of himself*. They were not 'intentional.' So with his books. His fine breeding puts self-consciousness (generally an indication either of under-breeding or of lack of social experience) out of court as a possibility, both in himself and in his books. Moreover, he was so casual and so procrastinating, he so habitually followed the line of least resistance, and so shrank from the strenuous, that one finds it hard to picture him as screwing himself up to anything so determined as an 'intention' in writing a book. In any case, not an author's intention, but his achievement

is what counts; and in *My Confidences* he has achieved one of the most perfect and delightful books of its kind in all literature. It is indeed so fascinating, and draws us so irresistibly to be constantly dipping into it, that but for one fact, we should be in danger of doing that which we are told we should beware of doing—forming a habit. That fact is that *My Confidences* is the one and only prose book of Locker's own writing, just as *London Lyrics* is his one and only book of poems. Only that melancholy fact prevents the reader from forming the Locker habit.

What is the quality which most endears our friends to us? We recall, it may be, this man's brilliance, that woman's beauty, another friend's wit, and yet another's wisdom, but there is, necessarily no stirring at our hearts. There are friends, on the other hand, to think of whom is like letting in warm sunshine upon the cold corridors of memory. The quality by which we are drawn to a fellow mortal is, I think, not similarity of views, whether on religion or politics, both matters on which many fall out, nor tastes and interests in common, nor admiration of his abilities or moral character, but a certain temperamental receptivity to impressions, and to the moods and temperamental idiosyncrasies of others, by virtue of which he can interest himself in the things, even the seemingly little things, in which they are interested. Most of all, the quality in our friends which endears them to us is a fine sensitiveness, an exquisitely delicate consideration for the feelings of those with whom they are brought into contact.

Just as plant life, so recent research has discovered, instantly and invariably responds to—is depressed or stimulated by—even so incalculably slight a change as is caused by a passing cloud, so some men and women respond, and are mercurially sensitive to, the mood and feelings of the rest of us.

In himself and for others Frederick Locker was thus sensitive. I have seen him shrink and wince under a boister-

ous greeting; I have seen him, at a reception, turn aside from talking to an exalted personage, or from the most sought-after celebrity in the room, to draw into the conversation some 'forlorn young creature' (to use his own words), a shy or diffident young man or woman, playing wallflower, unnoticed in a corner, or some elderly man or woman, who had fallen out of the running in the race for fame, fortune, or social success, and by a deference, greater and gentler than Mr. Locker would perhaps have accorded to the same persons in the days of their prosperity, so recall to them their former triumphs, as to make them forget the ill fortune which had come in later life.

Nor was it only the elderly 'Has-Been' or the youthful 'Yet-to-Be' upon whom Frederick Locker turned compassionate eye. Shy and sensitive when himself a child, he possibly remembered the martyrdoms and miseries he had endured when accompanying his parents to call upon 'grown ups.' One day when he and I happened to be at the same 'At Home,' there swept into the room, gorgeously gowned, an eminent lady novelist. Her progress from the door where her name had been announced to the table where her hostess was dispensing tea was as impressive as that of a royal barge in one of the old-time state waterway processions. Even her husband, neither a small nor an altogether unimportant man, had the helpless look of a skiff, swept along by the suction of the larger vessel's wake; but the sudden letting down of a flowing train had so caught her small son in the unexpected wash of it, that he bobbed hither and thither, like a cork-float on a fisherman's net. Thence the lad had drifted into a social backwater, afforded by the lee of a large mahogany sideboard, where, no one taking the slightest notice of him, he stood, first upon one leg and then upon another, the picture of shy and awkward self-consciousness.

All this I saw out of the tail of an eye while listening to a detailed account by the lady novelist in question of

how she came to write her last novel. I had not read it, but my fear lest she should ask me whether I had done so was allayed by the fact that she took for granted that all the world was familiar with the immortal work. Then, still out of the tail of an eye, I saw Mr. Locker retrieve a plate of strawberries from a smiling maid, and bear it off triumphantly to the corner where fidgeted the forgotten boy. Inviting the youngster to share—a mere pretence at sharing—the banquet, Mr. Locker had him in five minutes chatting as merrily and as freely about school and cricket and holidays as if the grizzled but distinguished man of letters who had carried a life-line of rescue to him across the social seas had been a schoolmate in his own form.

When, as a shy and diffident young man, I first met Mr. Locker—nearly forty years my senior as he was—I stood in some awe of him. The intimate friend of Tennyson, then to me a demi-god, as well as of Thackeray, another of my youthful heroes, his head was encircled by something like a halo in my eyes. Moreover, my preconception of him was that of a typical 'Society' man, languid, supercilious, cynical in speech, cold in manner, quick to boredom by anything that such as I could say to him, and relieved only when, after the interchange of a few conventional phrases, I had made my bow and withdrawn. When, on my being introduced, he fumbled for and fixed a monocle in his eye through which, and leisurely, to survey me, my demoralization was complete, for, under the eyeglass manner, especially when accompanied by what somebody has called the 'Chamberlain stare,' I had, as a young man, and on other occasions, felt myself shrink to the dimensions of an insect upon a microscopic slide. To my wonderment, Locker set me, in the first half minute, almost in the first few seconds, as completely at ease as if we had known each other for years. A man of the world, in the happy sense of the term, he had also the intuitive perception of a woman, and by the gentle sweetness of his disposition could as

easily win a smile from a child as he could from a churlish old print seller, or a society beauty.

I remember remarking on this characteristic of his to some one known to him, who replied, off-handedly, 'Oh, yes. Locker has the happy knack for that sort of thing, partly inborn and partly acquired. But he is a man of the world who knows that courtesy to others generally pays, and costs nothing to expend.'

The saying was as shallow as it was foolish. 'You will find,' writes wise old John Pulsford, in *Quiet Hours*, 'that just in proportion as one is fitted to comfort, is his own liability to overwhelming distress. To be a real comforter, a person must have profound sympathies, but profound sympathies are always in association with keen sensibilities, and keen sensibilities expose their possessor to a depth of anguish, utterly unintelligible to ordinary souls.' Locker's singular sensitiveness to the feelings of others may have been as was said in the remark I have quoted, 'partly inborn and partly acquired,' but so far from being only 'happy,' and 'costing nothing' it was acquired by experiences the reverse of happy, and at no small cost to a supersensitive nature.

In his early days at least, Locker was something of a self-torturer. Meeting Thackeray after the publication of the second or third issue of *The Newcomes* (Mr. Birrell does not tell the story, so I may recall it here) the novelist inquired: 'What do you think of the last number?' 'I like it immensely,' was the cordial rejoinder. The illustrations, it seems, had been sharply criticised, and Mr. Locker was 'tactless idiot enough'—so he worded it himself—to add: 'But, my dear fellow, perhaps there may be some kind people who will say that you did the cuts, and Doyle the letter-press.'

On this Thackeray's jaw dropped, and he exclaimed bitterly, 'Oh! that's your opinion, is it?' 'I saw at once what a mistake I had made,' adds Locker, 'but I

could only reply: "I spoke in fun, pure fun. You know perfectly well how much I admire your writings and also Doyle's cuts."' But Thackeray would have none of it, according to Mr. Locker, and walked wrathfully away, though when the two met the day after, the novelist was as amiable as ever.

When Locker first told me the story (he has now left it on record for the benefit of, and as a warning to, his descendants) he told me also of the tortures he endured during the twenty-four hours before he again saw Thackeray. It came about in this way. He was warning me against dwelling unduly upon an incident in which I had, if unintentionally, inflicted pain upon a fellow creature; and I am aware that, in telling the story, I may seem to be claiming for myself something of the sensitiveness which I saw in Mr. Locker. In my case, however, the hurt inflicted was so heinous that every reader would have felt as I did. Not to have so felt would write down the narrator as having no heart at all.

I had called to see Mr. Locker one day, and, with his quick insight, he noticed that I was subdued and cast down, 'You are not your lively self to-day,' he said sympathetically, 'I hope you are not unwell or worried about anything?' 'I am worried,' I replied, 'for this reason. This morning at St. Albans we passed a hostelry with a queer name, 'The Cross Keys'! I exclaimed aloud to my companion, and was about to add a word on public-house signs, when, to my horror, I saw shambling towards us, not more than a yard away, and within sound of my voice—how it came about that I, who am, by habit, observant, failed to mark him I cannot think—a young fellow whose legs turned inward at so acute an angle as actually to cross at the knees. He caught the words, 'The Crossed Keys,' as they fell from my lips, and thought they were spoken as a brutal jeer at his misshapen limbs, for he flushed to the forehead, and bent his head to hide the spasm of pain—like

that of a wounded animal—which passed over his face, and . . .'

Mr. Locker raised a hand to stay me from saying more, and on his face was intensified the pain which I had seen on that of the crippled lad. 'Don't pain yourself unnecessarily,' he said. 'Your misery was, I am sure, more poignant than his—and lest I forget it—there is another matter much more important to you and to me, about which I must rate you as soundly as you deserve.' With an assumption of briskness and businesslikeness, which sat oddly on the least brisk and least businesslike of men, the intention of which was to divert my thoughts from what was distressing, he affected to take me severely to task for being at some small expense in procuring and sending him extra copies of an American publication with an article about himself. He had chanced to express regret that he had no more than one, as he wished to send the article to friends, and as I knew where to obtain some I had done so. For this he took me to task about 'wasting my substance,' drawing a picture by way of example, in which I figured as a reckless spendthrift who would come to bankruptcy and he as a penny-saving and parsimonious miser, whereas I was scarcely ever in his company without coming away the richer by the gift of a rare book or a coveted print. Later, when my distress had passed, he reverted to the Cross Keys incident. 'Don't torture yourself about that poor fellow at St. Albans,' he said. 'Much of our vicarious suffering,—the pangs we feel for the pangs we think are endured by others,—is a work of supererogation. I am ready to wager, were there any way of making the necessary inquiries, that your crippled friend's sensitiveness has become indurated—Nature is more merciful to her afflicted children than we are—in the course of years, and that he felt less acutely—has now in fact entirely forgotten it—than you. Take an old man's advice and don't be over-sensitive. I am preaching you a sermon which I have no right to preach

for I have been preaching the same sermon to a congregation of one, myself, all my life, and the congregation continues as unedified as ever, and as confirmed in evil ways, my sermon notwithstanding. But—let me whisper it in your ear—I am glad you felt as you did, for I should heartily have hated you had you not done so.'

That Mr. Locker's gentle sweetness and sensitiveness of disposition, his 'understandingness,' and his ready sympathy—more even than his delightful humour and charm of personality—endeared him to so large a circle of friends, will give no one who reads Mr. Birrell's book cause for wonder. The volume contains intimate, often affectionate letters from Tennyson, Browning, Thackeray, Ruskin, George Eliot, Matthew Arnold, Dickens, Rossetti, and R. L. Stevenson, but in none is the warmth of feeling which all who knew Locker entertained for him more characteristically expressed than in that from his friend, Mr. Elwin, rector of Booton, Norwich. I must find space to quote it in part:

My Dearest Locker,

It seems to my sensation a long time (though I believe by the almanac it is not many years) since we first took you into our hearts, where you have remained ever since. At very short intervals we are sure to *talk* of you, and there is probably not a day in which we do not *think* of you, and always with the same affection and delight. No, not the same, either. I ought to have written with ever-increasing affection and delight. . . . Now comes a note from Dolly to say you are ill, and we are all impatience to hear you are better. I have an irresistible impulse to say that myself to you, and to tell you how dear you are to us, and what a precious part you have been of our lives from the day I first set foot in your house, and you in ours. I know well from the many talks we have had together that illness will bring its own peculiar peace to you, which is an excellent satisfaction to us, but I am craving the enjoyment of your presence among us that obliges me to long for this boon also, and until good news comes it is a relief to give a vent for my feelings by writing them to you. All blessings be with you, my ever-prized friend. Mrs. E. will have spoken for herself. She and I have one identical thought of you.

Always yours very affectionately, W. Elwin.

One letter to Mr. Locker, as Mr. Birrell does not include it in his volume, I transcribe here. It is from Tennyson,

and was penned after hearing of Lady Charlotte Locker's sudden death.

Farringford, *April* 28, 1872.

I scarcely dare to write. The shock must have been too terrible, just when things seemed better. I would we could know how you have borne it. Sure at least I am that even in *this* first anguish of grief, you can think with thankfulness that the weary days of suffering are over for ever with the dearest one, and can trust that she is happy now with the God and Saviour she has loved and served. May He strengthen you to bear your immeasurable loss. Is there not even in its greatness that which helps to make it bearable? Had she been less a creature of light and love you could not have had the beautiful memory or the sustaining help you now have. . . .

Vain words, all, I know: forgive them, as all that one poor human sympathy can do at such an hour.

When you are able to come to us, and it will be good for you to come, you must come. We will do all the little we can for you, you know.

With all true love,

Ever your affectionate ALFRED and EMILY TENNYSON.

Mr. Locker's daughter, Eleanor, became engaged in 1875 to Tennyson's son Lionel. Though she had been for many years almost one of the Tennyson family, the engagement came somewhat as a surprise. Of those who knew Tennyson, the man, as apart from Tennyson, the poet, not many now remain alive, and the younger generation, aware as it is—if only by the castigation which he administered to his critic, Lord Lytton, in 'The New Timon,' which was contributed to *Punch*—that the Laureate had a grimly-sardonic humour, hardly realizes that in his private life the Laureate had his lightly-humorous and bantering side.

Lady Charlotte Locker, I need hardly remind the reader, was before her marriage to the author of *London Lyrics* Lady Charlotte Bruce. Writing to the Duke of Argyll about the engagement, Tennyson said: 'Tell the Duchess, if she do not know, that Lionel, my youngest son, is engaged to Miss Eleanor Locker, who is half a Bruce, and half a London Lyric. The Queen has been very kind about it. We have known her from a child, and approve of her heartily, but as he is only twenty-one, they must wait till he gets some employment, of which, at present, I see small prospect.'

The marriage was celebrated on February 28, 1878, at Westminster Abbey. Dean Stanley, the bride's uncle by marriage, was too ill to officiate. If I remember rightly, Mr. Locker once told me that three such remarkable men as Tennyson, Gladstone, and the Duke of Argyll were present. I am the more sure of this as I still have in my possession (it was given to me by Mr. Locker) the double-page picture of the marriage which appeared in the *Graphic*, and in which Tennyson, Gladstone, the Duke, and Mr. Locker himself are easily recognizable.

'Wherever there is a painter, there is a picture,' writes William Barnes, the Dorsetshire dialect poet, in a letter quoted in Mr. Birrell's volume. With the exception of Mr. Austin Dobson, no one now alive, other than Mr. Birrell, has perhaps the necessary knowledge, the even more necessary inborn understanding and sympathy, to picture Frederick Locker as he was. Only those who knew Mr. Locker personally can realize how delicate is Mr. Birrell's artistry. Not a few painters of to-day are content to give us an 'impression.' They study their subject for a familiar and so easily recognizable pose. If an eyebrow chance to have an upward Mephistophelean twist, a corner of the eyelid or of the mouth to take a downward and melancholy turn; most of all, if there be a mannerism, say in the angle at which the head is carried, or the trick of adjusting an eyeglass—they snatch at, perhaps strain the peculiarity, to give character to the picture; and being either trained in, or born with, the knack of catching a resemblance, they achieve something which may indeed be a 'speaking' likeness of the outer man, but remains obstinately silent in regard to the man within.

Not by such an 'impression,'—by bold broad strokes, the 'slapping-on' of colour, nor by any sort of wash drawing, —can Frederick Locker be pictured. Only by the most delicate and deliberate of etchings—every graving-stroke firm and definite but exquisite in fineness as spun silk

or floating gossamer—could Locker's frail and sprite-like self, his aloof and elusive personality, be conveyed. Even then the indefinable air of distinction; the graceful seeming-negligence he affected in dress; his instant wilting at effusiveness or wincing at under-breeding, and his as instant sympathy for and readiness to succour the young or the diffident when in social distress; his delight in bestowing a gift or bringing a pleasure, and the hesitating, bird-shy way in which he half moved to impart or to invite a confidence, and then, as if fearing to bore, or to take his casual and procrastinating self too seriously, he drew back, —all these were so much a part of the man's personality that no portrait, whether penned or painted, can hope to picture the living Frederick Locker as he was. With that reservation in mind, I do not see how Mr. Birrell's portrait could be bettered.

COULSON KERNAHAN.

ST. PAUL AND THE HISTORIC JESUS

THERE are no signs that the widespread interest in the 'Jesus of history' is abating. If proof is required of this statement, the popularity of Dr. Glover's book which bears that title can be adduced. Indeed, it would almost appear as if the last elements of light and beauty had been extracted from the record to give rounded perfection to the delineation of Jesus of Nazareth. At the same time, the general historicity of the records has not been shaken by critical investigation. Schmiedel's purely subjective reduction of Christ's genuine utterances to an inconsiderable fragment is of the nature of a 'freak,' while the hypothesis of a mythical Christ is universally rejected. The supernormal elements in the story are objects of calm and judicial enquiry to a generation which is becoming familiarized with the conception of the incalculable powers of spirit in relation to matter and the results of psychological research. The modern consciousness does not summarily reject the extraordinary, if the evidence for it is impregnable. On the other hand, nothing is to be gained by refusing to examine the findings of careful critics, who have concluded that varied influences—documentary, ecclesiastical, personal—may have shaped the gospels to the final form which has come down to us. The marvel is that in the telling of so wonderful a story, there is so much self-restraint and reticence, and a naturalness and sincerity so complete. There is nothing in literature that affords a parallel to the beauty and spiritual force of the Gospels. We have only a partial record of Christ's life, but as Jowett of Balliol remarked, upon this basis the idealization of the ages can work. 'It might have been that the character would have been less universal, if we had been able to trace more defined features.'

We have to remind ourselves, however, that the Synoptic Gospels are not our earliest records of the human Christ. These are the writings of St. Paul, and of his epistles the great majority are accepted by modern critics as his genuine utterances.[1] What was St. Paul's view of the Historic Jesus? Roughly speaking, there is no historical record of early Christianity extant between 60 and 100 A.D.; or if we date the Gospels about 70–80, there is nothing between the Pauline letters and the Synoptists. The Johannine gospel is a late production on any hypothesis of its authorship; and as Harnack says, presents us with a Christ 'far more human than the Christ of St. Paul and yet far more divine.' Now, it is simply a common place to observe that in St. Paul's writings there is little said about the historic, human Jesus: there is no reference to His supernatural birth, to His miracles of healing and other works of wonder, and to His contact with the crowd as Saviour in the days of His flesh. The Cross and the Resurrection for St. Paul are the outstanding facts of the human manifestation. If, however, he is silent about the miraculous acts of Jesus, it is clear he knows Him as teacher. Between the ethics of St. Paul and the moral teaching of Jesus there is an intimate parallelism. Jesus as a moral personality and as an example of gentleness and love has evidently moved the heart of the apostle; and if he does not quote the actual words of Jesus he is familiar with His teaching. In other words, he is acquainted with the traditions about Jesus so far as these are related to His personality and ethical ideals. It is to be noted that he much more frequently designates his Master under the terms 'Christ,' 'Jesus Christ,' or 'the Lord,' than the simple human appellation 'Jesus' by itself; nevertheless it is noteworthy that the little creed of two words which finds expression in one of his epistles is 'Jesus is Lord.'[2]

[1] The exceptions, as is well known, are the Pastoral epistles and possibly the Epistle to the Ephesians, with which some scholars also link that to the Colossians.

[2] See 1 Cor. xii. 3.

For St. Paul Christ is the glorified Messiah: He is a transcendent Being, a Heavenly Man, the second Adam, as being in effect a new creative Personality. Also for him the original thing in Jesus is not His ethics but His Person. 'Henceforth,' he exclaims, 'know we no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more' (2 Cor. v. 16). It is as if he admits his thought of the Messiah had been regulated by an external standard and he had conceived of Him as a Jew—an ordinary Jew—might conceive of him; but that standard is now abandoned: He is not an earthly Messiah: He is the transcendent Lord of humanity. Add to this the autobiographic touch: 'It pleased God to reveal His Son in me' (Gal. i. 16), not *to* me as an outward fact of history, but *in* me, as the life of my life; as he remarks elsewhere—'for me to live is Christ.' This is the language of faith, which cannot rest upon a human portrait, but pierces the veil that separates the seen from the unsee and finds its home in the heavenly places. If we ask what led up to St. Paul's historic vision of Christ, what were the psychological causes which dispelled his horror of the idea of a Messiah who had hung on a tree and accordingly had incurred the curse of the law, what were the considerations which induced him to abandon his hatred of the Christians, to devote himself to the preaching of the gospel, and finally to secede from the fundamental tenets of Judaism and legalism, it is not easy to answer. But on the whole it is more likely that the change was wrought not entirely by the weight of the traditions of Christ's teaching, but by the actual influence (which St. Paul had witnessed himself) of the great Teacher upon the lives of His followers—an influence which prepared the Apostle's own soul for the vision which saved him, As he gazed on dying Stephen he might exclaim not only, 'See how these Christians love one another,' but 'See how these Christians die!' Christianity is rooted in historic Fact: but the Christ who appealed to the Roman Empire

was the Redeeming Lord who had died only to rise again. If to the Johannine mystic Jesus was the Word made flesh, the Eternal Logos pre-existing as God and then united as God to a human body, to St. Paul Christ was the exalted Messiah, and therefore the Son of God who existed in eternity with the Father before He 'emptied Himself' and became manifest to the world. If St. Paul's Christology is not easy to formulate into a coherent system of thought, there is no doubt about his ascription of divine and superhuman being to our Lord. Perhaps the germ of this conception of the Messiah may have existed, as some scholars think, in Jewish apocalyptic literature; but be that as it may, St. Paul's conception of Him as a glorified Being colours his whole theology. He thinks of Christ not as Jesus of Nazareth now exalted, but as the mighty pre-existent Being in a divine form who had for a time humbled Himself to become a servant of mankind, and who as a transcendent spirit had delivered man from the tyranny and condemnation of law, had broken the power of sin and death, and was henceforth to enable the believer to enjoy the freedom of sonship. Whatever predisposing causes enabled St. Paul to frame the conception of Christ which is enshrined for all time in his writings, the ultimate analysis will trace it to an act of faith: 'flesh and blood did not reveal it unto him.' It is extremely improbable that he ever saw the human Jesus. He stands where we all stand in relation to Christ, with this difference, that he had no written record of the Lord's life—at least with the possible exception of a collection of sayings—while we have the written Gospels; but both for St. Paul and ourselves the real problem of the soul asks for something more than the history of a human life, however beautiful and unique. We are saved by faith, and faith lives on an ideal. It was a natural issue of St. Paul's teaching and his proclamation of an exalted Saviour who had lived for a time upon earth as a servant, that those who had found new life through His name should

become eager for trustworthy records of His earthly manifestation. The common people hungered for an authentic portraiture of that life; and the picture of the historic Jesus reinforced their inner life of devotion, saved it from a vague and abstract mysticism, and furnished an example of perfect humanity. But we have to admit that the example by itself will not solve our soul-problem, but rather intensify it; the example without faith will not suffice; the attempt to copy, like the attempt to know Christ, without faith, inevitably ends in failure. Hence St. Paul's emphasis on our spiritual identification with a living divine Being: to be 'in Christ' is the condition of our being like Him.

It is a subtle point which has been raised by the question, Did St. Paul's presentation of Christian truth influence the authors of the Gospels? According to Loisy (*The Gospel and The Church*, *E.T.* pp. 45, 129), St. Paul was the first to formulate a theory of Christ; he was compelled to define Christ. Loisy further considers that the 'ransom' passage (of Matt. xx. 28 and Mark x. 45) is influenced by Pauline theology, together with the narratives of the Last Supper. Again, it is almost impossible to conceive that St. Luke, who was in such close connexion with St. Paul, could entirely escape the influence of Pauline thought in his presentation of the Jesus of the Gospels. Without pursuing this highly speculative line of inquiry, suffice it to say that there are two distinct theories about the relation of St. Paul to the teaching of Christ—one, represented by Wrede, holds that there is no connexion and that the Pauline theology is an isolated entity; the other, represented by Schweitzer, regards St. Paul as carrying on the Jewish-Apocalyptic ideas which he considers to have been the basis of our Lord's teaching; St. Paul is the heir to that teaching and its interpreter. Equally distinctive are the views of the critics with regard to St. Paul's susceptibility to the influences of Hellenism. Baur, Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Harnack, Ramsay, and Loisy regard him as the author of a Hel-

lenization of Christianity, which was the result of his contact with Hellenic thought and culture; he was in effect a Jewish scholastic moulded by Hellenic ideas. Against this theory Schweitzer, who is obsessed by the eschatological elements of the gospel, vigorously protested; but he stands alone, and owing to his imperfect knowledge of English shows no acquaintance with the researches of Ramsay, who has shed so much light on this question. (See pref. to his *St. Paul and His Interpreters, E.T.*) No one to-day can possibly ignore the views of those who, like Loisy, believe that it was as a 'mystery' that the Christian religion conquered the Graeco-Roman world. Now it cannot be denied that St. Paul's converts had lived in the atmosphere of the mystery-cults. Asia Minor was the home of magic and enchantment, of religious rites and mysteries, and of conceptions such as mystic union and 'blood-bond with a deity.' It would be difficult to dissociate in their minds the ideas of religion and mystery. No religion could exist without sacrament and mystery. The myths of Osiris, Attis, and Cybele are all based on the idea of a dying god who comes to life again; on the other hand Mithraism supplied the conception of a strong, conquering Hero who triumphs, though not by means of death, over the enemy of mankind—represented by a Bull. Owing their origin to the familiar processes of death and resurrection in Nature at the opening year, these cults transferred the ideas of dying, growth, and rebirth to the soul, and by means of animal sacrifices—sometimes human sacrifices—they conveyed the assurance that the blood flowing from the sacrificial victims, which were eaten by the worshipper, was the source of new life and divine energy to the soul. These mystery-religions had reached the height of their popularity in the opening years of the Empire, with the exception of Mithraism, which only after the second century became a formidable rival to Christianity. They had entered Italy some centuries before the birth of Christ,

and the world was impregnated with their conceptions of initiation, regeneration, and mystical union with the Deity. Their object, which originally was to liberate the worshipper from the power of fate, was steadily raised to a higher ethical plane. Initiation came to mean purification and redemption by virtue of identification with the dying god; while the freedom from moral taint carried with it the pledge of a blessed immortality. How far these ideas influenced St. Paul's setting of the Christian gospel and his conception of the Christian sacraments is a difficult question. Only an attempt briefly to answer it can here be made. It must be generally admitted that St. Paul uses many of the technical terms to be found in the mystery-religions; but this does not imply that he accepts the ideas of those religions. Many of these expressions were the current coinage of the Hellenistic world. It is sufficient to point out that the term 'mystery' itself as used by St. Paul has no esoteric or exclusive implication: it is an 'open secret'—a truth revealed by God Himself in history, and not to be discovered by a laborious ritual of initiation. At the same time there is appropriateness in his choice of such language, seeing that his converts were familiar with the ideas which they conveyed. Even if consciously or unconsciously he is influenced by the ideas and associations of the mysteries, it would appear that invariably his theology rises above the level of paganism and transforms the conceptions of the mystery-cults by giving them a new spiritual setting. For example, the concept of the union of the worshipper with his God is lifted to a vastly nobler spiritual plane by the apostle when he speaks of himself as being crucified and rising with Christ, the divine-human Saviour. And how is the union effected? By means of a sacrament or by means of that inner and spiritual energy called 'faith'? This is a vital question, because it is undoubtedly the fact that the Church's conception of the sacraments was steadily to be influenced by the ideas

which the mystery-rites of paganism expressed. As Dr. Rashdall states in a valuable note in his recent book, *The Idea of the Atonement* (p. 484), 'there were gradually imported into them many ideas which were almost absent from these institutions in their primitive Jewish-Christian form—the elaborate preparation for baptism, the idea of initiation into an organized society, the extreme insistence upon the secrecy of the doctrine and formulae communicated at baptism, the jealous exclusion of all but fully initiated persons from the eucharistic service, the different stages of the catechumenate leading up to the full admission to the Christian society, the tendency to attribute a quasi-magical efficacy to the sacramental rites, and especially to connect the actual attainment of immortality with the due performance of them.' This is generally admitted, but the question is how far is the germ of this sacramentarian development to be traced to St. Paul's teaching? The answer is that there is no evidence that St. Paul held the sacraments to be the sole channels of forgiveness, moral cleansing, and the new birth. He did not create the sacraments; he found them already in existence, and accepted them as rites to be observed by those who sought membership in the Christian community, and were prepared to accept the authority and discipline of the rising Church. He could not conceive of a Christian being outside the membership of the Christian Church. The Christian's salvation in the last analysis was not due to the magical influence of a sacrament, but to the potent energy of faith—faith in a crucified and risen Redeemer. If in subsequent generations the Christian conception of the sacraments was to approximate to the *ex opere operato* or mechanical implication of the mystery-religions—if, that is, Christian institutions had in the fourth century become 'catholicized'—this result was due to other influences than the theology of St. Paul. If the sacraments with their elaborated ritual assumed the character of material and mechanical *media* of regeneration,

it was because the Church had far advanced beyond the teaching of early Christianity, and had materialized in the course of her development what was essentially spiritual.

This discussion of St. Paul's relation to the mystery-cults has carried us beyond the strict lines of inquiry on which we started, but it has its value apart from the interest of the whole question. Christianity captured the Empire by virtue of St. Paul's conception of Christ as a Heavenly Man who had also appeared in history, while the redeemer-gods of the mystery cults were purely mythical and imaginary personages. Again, Christ saved because Christianity was not a religion of recollection, the veneration of a departed Hero, a social Reformer, or a dead Saint. To the modern world the historic Jesus offers a starting-point to faith; but it is possible that thousands of minds get no further than admiration of a remarkable and somewhat mysterious Personality who has powerfully affected the ethical ideal of the race. It may be claimed that this is a kind of faith; but if this is granted, it has to be pointed out that the cause of the Christian religion inevitably suffers if such faith develops no further. We may even idealize Christ as Jowett defines that idealization, but this need advance no further than the conception of a unique historic man upon which the imagination lovingly lingers without producing any marked effect on conduct. Christ the man may leave an impression on the soul, but it is an impression that will fade, unless it leads up to what Ritschl calls a 'value-judgement' or overwhelming sense of the supreme spiritual worth of Christ; and even the 'value-judgement' may remain a subjective emotion, if it does not crystallize into 'the will to believe.' A vague hero-worship is not the Christianity that turned the world upside down, and it will not avail to-day when civilization is passing through an acute crisis of which the issue remains doubtful. The whole system of St. Paul ultimately rests on an act of faith—faith in the power of Christ who is

divine in a sense in which the term can be applied to no other personality in history. The conversion of Sadhu Sundar Singh recalls the historic conversion of St. Paul. Taught in a mission school, he hated Christianity and burned his New Testament. Then 'a restlessness seized him to gain *shanti*—i.e. full satisfaction of soul—and one night he determined to get this peace or else to commit suicide. . . . Just before dawn he saw a vision of Christ on the cross, and from that day he became a Christian.' Donning the saffron robe of a Sadhu or religious ascetic, he has for fifteen years traversed all parts of India and visited Afghanistan, Burma China, and Tibet as a missionary of the faith. He has suffered imprisonments, assaults, robberies, awful exposure and hardships, travelling on occasions barefoot over the snows of the Himalayas to Tibet. His escapes from death have been miraculous. And he has been upheld like a second Paul by the constantly realized Presence of the living Christ. 'Christ walks beside him, talks with him, works and suffers.' It is by a faith like this that India and the world will be transfigured. Perhaps we should never have known the secret but for St. Paul and his 'heavenly vision.' Christianity, as we know it to-day, is largely St. Paul's Christianity,[1] and to the modern mind we have to say that while the Jesus of history is justly and for ever an object of admiration, idealization, and imitation it is the Christ of St. Paul and of the Sadhu Sundar Singh —the sacrificial Redeemer and exalted Lord, who is to be with us alway, even to the end of the world. It is not the pictorially-conceived Brother-man, not the Teacher of a new ethic, however sublime, to whom the erring soul can turn for the secret of inward peace. An age which is losing faith in the spiritual and is obsessed by material ambitions must seek the springs of eternal life and salvation in the ever-living and exalted Lord, whose historic manifestation was but a temporary, though essential, interlude in an eternal existence.

R. MARTIN POPE.

[1] Cf. A. H. McNeile, *St. Paul* (prel.).

THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW AGE

A Letter to a Convocation-Man, concerning the Powers and Priviledges of that Body. (E. Whitlock, near Stationers' Hall, 1696.)

Religion in England: The Church in the Nineteenth Century. By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D.

A History of the Evangelical Party. By REV. G. R. BALLEINE. (Longmans. 1908.)

History of the Church of England. By H. O. WAKEMAN. (Rivington, Percival & Co. 1897.)

ORGANIZATION was never carried so far as in the Caesarian Rome when the Imperial capital and system were dying of atrophy; it is not an infallible symptom of wholesome and vigorous vitality in any part of the body politic. Very different is the case when, as during the present reconstructive period, the motive-spring of organization is not to multiply offices, but, by the processes of amalgamation or readjustment, to prepare institutions for effectively meeting universally admitted and deeply-felt needs, spiritual and secular, social and religious. The twentieth-century years before the war were agitated by much talk and some serious negotiation concerning a reunion of the 'Wee Frees' with the stock from which they had sprung, and towards the close of May came something like an official announcement that the author of the disruption, the State, is actually promoting the return to the parental fold. Mr. Robert Munro, famous far beyond the limits of his fatherland for his research into prehistoric problems, has not allowed his archaeological studies to withdraw him from public service. He has now found an opportunity for bringing his national Communion into line with the reconstructions of the time. As Secretary of State for Scotland, he recently informed an Edinburgh audience of a growing and definite

purpose in ministerial quarters practically to recognize the present season as signally appropriate for actively promoting the reincorporation of the various Free Church sections into the Church of Scotland. There was to be no avoidable delay; however preoccupied the session, facilities were to be found for introducing the necessary Bill to Parliament. For us Southrons the prospective amalgamation of the Churches beyond the Tweed might well seem of happy omen for the progress recently made among ourselves towards fulfilling the dream dear to at least three generations of academic Church reformers, not, as has been ignorantly said, of superseding so venerable a body as Convocation, but of bringing it into closer and more active sympathy with novel, constantly increasing requirements, and so promoting a harmonious co-operation among the doctrinal and devotional varieties, lay not less than clerical, comprised in the national Establishment.

The Scotch Free Church, in its inception, its sectarian progeny afterwards, grew out of similar conditions, is charged with issues, abounds in personal memories or associations, is interwoven with parallel experiences on the part of the national Establishment in England. Great Anglican forces are not necessarily confined within Anglican limits. From the reign of Queen Anne to the French Revolution the national Establishment reached, and long remained at, the lowest point of depression, torn by faction, cankered by worldliness. The collateral rather than dissenting Church of John Wesley gradually began to react on the metropolitan Communion whence it had sprung. On the Isis, about the time that Wesley was Greek lecturer at Lincoln College, St. Edmund Hall offered a nucleus for the gathering round it of opinions and practices, exhaling far and wide a fervid apostolical spirit. At a later period the growing galvanism of a like movement created and extended the spiritual life, permeating all Communions of the time, Established or Free,

through the personal agencies of Dean Milner, Professor Farish, Thomas Babington, and the entire family of Thornton. Almost simultaneously, too, Hannah More and the writers she gathered round her were breathing into literature throughout all its branches the same cleansing and refining spirit that in the seventeenth century had first proceeded from Addison. Thus encouraged, reinvigorated, quickened, and inspired, the Established Church faced successfully a series of severe and searching storms. The fresh supplies of inherent life and force concurred with religious influences like those just named as well as with an instructive and progressively powerful Press in enabling the national establishment to transform the experiences and propaganda of the time into a stimulating and strengthening education. A keen and philosophically impartial observer like Thomas de Quincey, on his early London visits, noted with admiration the rise and progress of a new spiritual life throughout the kingdom from the Tweed to the Thames, his one regret being that the Nonconformist section, which had caught the rationalistic contagion of Locke, belittled, from social jealousy, the great and good work of the 'regular' clergy. At the same time, however, in the resentment against State interference already animating at least the Presbyterians on the one hand and the High Anglicans on the other, De Quincey recognized a temper common to both and likely to have great results in each; while the bitterness of political dissenters, chiefly Unitarians, towards the Church already showed signs of being subdued by the speech and pen of Thomas Arnold, who co-operated with Whately in an effort to promote Christian reunion through the medium of *The Edinburgh Review* under the statesmanlike guidance of its editor (1829–47), Macvey Napier. The twelve years (1833–1845) included disruptions in the English and Scotch national Communions, differing, indeed, in results, but strictly analogous as regards their causes. State inter-

ference in spirituals produced the Tractarianism that involved J. H. Newman's secession to Rome; just as, after the fashion presently to be shown, its Scotch sequel two years earlier had caused the cleavage that founded the Free Church of Scotland.

Before proceeding further in this direction, something should be recalled concerning the novel and profound interest excited in England at an interval of about ten years by the two mightiest orators Presbyterianism ever produced. From the veteran Congregationalist chief whose *Recollections of a Long Life* (1894) are in their way a national monument, I had the privilege of receiving a first-hand testimony to what De Quincey called the unequalled splendour of an appearance which convulsed all London, when Edward Irving entered (1822) on his ministry at the Caledonian Church, Hatton Garden. Dr. Stoughton had not only heard him in public, but, like De Quincey, met him in private, striding in exuberant spirits about the drawing-room before dinner, with an air like that of Jonah when sent to Nineveh, or of Paul on celestial mission to the Gentiles (De Quincey's *London Reminiscences*, p. 122). The same overmastering, demoniac fervour of nature, rather than harshness of temper, explained alike to the Congregational veteran and the English opium-eater the occasionally fierce touches in Irving's manner. No less a critic than George Canning, a regular hearer, pronounced him the greatest living combination of the orator and artist, the only man who realized one's idea of Paul preaching at Athens, or defending himself before King Agrippa. 'Terrific meteor! unhappy son of fervid genius. Sleep now, Boanerges, and let the memory of man settle only upon thy colossal powers, without a thought of those intellectual aberrations which were more powerful for thy own ruin than the misleading of others.' So did De Quincey sum up his impressions of the 'pulpit portent,' ejected in 1832 from his new London church, in 1833 deposed from the

Scotch Church ministry, dying on September 4 at Glasgow, a splendid wreck. Irving's terrific influence drew much of its inspiration and effect from the political unsettlement following the Napoleonic struggle, from plague and famine coming in the wake of war—just as to-day social and political perplexities stimulate and emphasize the homiletic epigrams of Dean Inge.

During the years 1829–1831 cholera, having first broken out at St. Petersburg, travelled across the North Sea from Berlin to Sunderland. Dirt and want established it the next year in London, and soon afterwards spread it throughout the land. The mortality continued to increase. The Edinburgh Presbytery looked to stay the plague by the official appointment at short intervals of days for national penance. The Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, rejoined that the first duty of priest and people was to observe the simple laws of health. The sagacious clergyman, on his promotion, took the hint, preaching on the text: 'Wash, and be clean.' Sanitation was not yet even in its infancy. At Bethnal Green the disease raged and slew like a fire; the local Board of Health had an extraordinary meeting at a public-house, drank themselves drunk and did nothing (*Greville's Diary*, vol. ii. pp. 210–259). At the same time the Reform Bill riots were not without bloodshed. A panic-stricken multitude saw in it all the wrath of God, and in Irving His prophet; there were larger rushes to the Caledonian Church, to hear not only the preacher, but the delirious warnings rising up from his listeners in the unknown tongue (*Greville*, vol. iii. p. 41). Irving's disciples included famous or familiar figures such as Spencer Perceval, son of the Prime Minister assassinated by Bellingham, and Henry Drummond, the banker. These echoed Irving's opinion concerning the close of the present Dispensation, linking by their strongly-defined views of the second Advent's approach the period immediately preceding the Victorian Age with the second decade of

our own neo-Georgian epoch, widely coloured as it is by millennial ideas.

During the three years before going to London in 1822, Edward Irving, at St. John's Church, Glasgow, had been associated with Dr. Thomas Chalmers, already famous on both sides of the Atlantic as the greatest of Scotch theologians. His London sojourn (1884) came soon after, and may have overlapped that of his assistant. The English visit of Chalmers formed the first and strongest link in the chain of experiences, in progress for the best part of a century, that explain the interest felt by serious Englishmen to-day in the announcement of prospective and complete Presbyterian reunion. Chalmers also generally prepared the way for co-operation between the various Evangelical Communions, and in particular helped forward the movement that has culminated to-day in the Enabling Act. 'The tartan,' said Canning, as in his first London sermon, after an unpromising commencement, Chalmers warmed to his theme, 'beats us; we have no English preaching like that.' The visitor personified after a fashion never witnessed before the spiritual forces then beginning to work throughout the whole United Kingdom. From that era may also be dated a movement whose latest chapter now records the great and wholesome success that has secured for Canon Temple congratulations from well-wishers far outside the limit of his own Church. It was in 1884 that not only Canning, but Sir Robert Peel, vied with Thomas Carlyle himself in homage to the genius of the great Scotch preacher, whose championship of religious establishments united all classes in admiration. The disruption subsequently led by Chalmers (1848) was then nine years distant. At Oxford, however, and elsewhere, Tractarianism had already become a power. For some time in advance of the period now reached the restoration on the other side of the Tweed by the Act of 1712 of lay patronage in the Kirk had been producing what is

known as the 'ten years' conflict.' In England the 1832 Reform Bill had been followed by constant State interference in spirituals, grievously irritating to orthodox Anglicanism. Dr. Arnold's Church Reform pamphlet of the same time increased and embittered the fermentation. In 1833 Lord Brougham reorganized and strengthened the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Seventeen years afterwards, recreated or reinvigorated, this tribunal rode roughshod over the ecclesiastical courts till it ventured on the crowning audacity of upholding Mr. Gorham's institution in the living of Brampford Speke, notwithstanding the heterodoxy about baptismal regeneration charged against him by Bishop Philpotts.

Such were the circumstances that, during the first half of the Victorian age, prompted the clerical demand for a revival of Convocation. That demand by no means proceeded exclusively from those who supported the high pretensions of the Bishop of Exeter. On the contrary, as will presently be seen, the Low Churchmen made in this matter common cause with the High. At the same time High and Low, as represented by their more thoughtful members, had grave misgivings regarding the adequacy of Convocation to the duties laid upon it. Not very much less than a century and a half had elapsed since this venerable corporation had last assembled in the Jerusalem Chamber. Neither then nor on previous comparatively recent occasions had the august synod distinguished itself by dignity, statesmanship, good feeling, or sound sense on the part of the most prominent divines composing it. In fact, since the loss of its taxing functions Convocation had retained only the shadow of the power that had once placed it nearly on the same level as the Parliament at Westminster. After the revolution of 1688 its proceedings degenerated into a wrangle between the two Houses, and continued to discredit both until its own entire suspension in 1717. That was the year of its prorogation by Sir Robert Walpole

to suit his political convenience by squashing debate on Bishop Hoadly's sermon on the text, 'My kingdom is not of this world.' Monarchy, government of all kinds, and the Church itself were not, according to the Bishop, the depositories of divinely-delegated power. The Bangorian controversy grew out of the challenge thus thrown down to the High Churchmen. During the year just mentioned Walpole ceased to be first minister; before his retirement he contrived that Convocation should discontinue its sittings rather than cause political and religious commotion by discussing Bishop Hoadly's discourses and views. For more than a century and a quarter the Church, like the rest of the country, tranquilly acquiesced in what a handful of zealots called Walpole's 'Gagging' Act, the general opinion, clerical, if decorously suppressed, as well as lay, being that Convocation had formed the habit of doing nothing in particular and not doing that nothing particularly well. A representative assembly which would be to the Church what Parliament was to the State had become the declared object of the entire Anglican body, first, it would seem, definitely advocated by the examining chaplain of the Low Church Bishop Ryder, who, desiderating a 'national assembly of the Church of England,' anticipated fifteen years less than a century ago the very form of words applied to his great achievement by Canon Temple to-day. The name of that prelate's deputy in the movement was John Kempthorne, one of the C.M.S. secretaries, who in 1835 published a book on the subject highly commended and largely quoted from by *The Record* (March 30, 1837). The one controversial point was the admission of the laity to Convocation. Bishop Samuel Wilberforce and even Mr. Gladstone advocated that step, but doubted its practicability in the then state of clerical feeling, nor was any serious attempt at lay representation in clerical councils made till the authors of the Enabling Bill saw the time to be ripe for it. A place

and a voice in the clerical council-chamber for unordained as well as ordained Churchmen remained the chief reform in that body long after its re-establishment in 1852, periodically demanded by ecclesiastical thinkers so widely separated as Dean Close and Mr. Gladstone, who, on January 1, 1854 (Morley's *Life*, vol. ii. p. 163), wrote to Bishop Wilberforce: 'No form of Church government not distinctly and fully providing for the expression of lay opinion can satisfy the needs of the English Church.'

The innumerable clergymen and laymen who shared that opinion did something towards giving it practical effect by co-operation among themselves, together with a cordial regard for each other's ascertained experiences and ideas in the parochial sphere. The manor-house and the vicarage were still the two great centres of rural life and hospitality: beneath both these roofs hosts with guests from every quarter profited from their miscellaneous and widely differing acquaintance with local needs and views to bring the Church, its ministrations, all the life and activities growing round it, into touch and sympathy not only on Sundays but throughout the week with those who lived and worked under its shadow. As in London and the great provincial capitals, men whose religious views differed as much as their political met amicably on the same platform, deliberated earnestly as well as by their mutual associations to the advantage of all concerned. Meanwhile, Convocation held its meetings as regularly as those of Parliament itself; its debates were now conducted with a moderation and decorum that formed a creditable contrast to the temper so often prevailing before its eighteenth-century suspension. During the fifties the social and political unrest preceding and following the Great Exhibition and the Crimean War were held by its members seriously to interfere with its deliberations. The time, also, allowed for the discussions was complained of as unreasonably short. With a new decade matters improved.

In 1860 the occasional services retained in the Prayer-book for national anniversaries received the consideration invited by Lord Stanhope, the historian, to the subject some years before, with the result that their disuse and disappearance from the sacred manual followed. Whether parents should act as sponsors to their children at baptism, and how to deal with the multiplying scandals disgracing the social life of the clergy brought forth an array of hostile arguments on either side that did not much tend to edifying in hearers or readers. The truth, of course, is that these proceedings were accompanied by a consciousness of unreality or unprofitableness fatal alike to energy and thoroughness on the part of those who conducted them. Only a miracle of sustained genius, eloquence, and power among its leading spirits could have given a body thus constituted the moral and spiritual influence proportionate to its ambitions.

Yet from a period long before Convocation's revival the vision of an ecclesiastical parliament, by whatever name called, had been a favourite one with great and good Anglican fathers. 'Woe is me that I am constrained to dwell with Mesech: and to have my habitation among the tents of Kedar.' The Psalmist's words had served as a sort of refrain with the great Churchmen who had adorned centuries following the ecclesiastical settlement under the Tudors, and who, whatever the advantages derived from it, always resented and were uneasy under their subjection to the State. The succession now recalled, having opened with Laud, Andrewes, Ken, was continued by William Law (*The Serious Call*), Bishop Wilson (Sodor and Man), Robert Nelson (*Fasts and Festivals*), and Alexander Knox, the ultra-High ecclesiastically-minded layman, who was to that age what Lord Blachford became to the age of Newman and Pusey. None of these thought, or at least said anything about the reform of Convocation. They all dreamed of a body whose piety and learning should reproduce the

synods immediately following the primitive Church, watch over the British branch of the Catholic faith, maintain its best, its highest interests, guard it from desecration or attack. So far as machinery and method are concerned is this hope to be fulfilled, centuries after it was first formed, in the composition of the National Assembly of the Church of England? Canon Temple brought to his work not only the keen eye for ecclesiastical needs, the resourcefulness and zeal inherited from his father, but an unprecedented acquaintance with the thoughts, the prejudices, and wishes of the industrial orders, as in purely secular so in sacred or serious matters. Jowett himself never conceived the notion of introducing in the mass working men to University teachers. Mr. Temple has not only done this, but has seen his experiment bear fruit by the good opinion of each other resulting to all concerned in this novel and happy intercourse.

Something has already been said about the extent to which Thomas Arnold would have had the national Church open her arms for all Protestants accepting her views of Christian doctrine. Canon Temple's father was Arnold's next successor but one in the headmastership of the great school which Arnold re-created; his ideas of Church comprehensiveness were scarcely less broad than those of Arnold himself. They have been inherited in all their most receptive aspects by his son, whose scheme has been recognized by its closest critics as purely constructive. No essential part of the machinery now existing for clerical administration is to be abolished. Convocation will still elect its authorities with their time-honoured titles, but, to a degree unknown before, may have the advantage of ascertaining the views and wishes entertained by every section of the Church-going community. Only lay indifference, equally gratuitous and gross, can prevent the house of laity created by the Act from exercising the same influence as either of the two other chambers, that of the clergy or of the bishops.

The foundation on which the new structure rests is, it cannot be stated too strongly, the parochial Church Councils; these, of course, are to a great extent already in existence. They are not, however, universal, and cannot have that animating, straightening, and concentrating sense of responsibility with which they are likely to be invested by their relations to the new Church Parliament, whose legislative proposals, having run the gauntlet of the Privy Council, will then be placed on the table of the two Parliament Houses, and if accepted, may in forty days be transformed into Church statutes.

During Archbishop Temple's life, the time had not come for a reform on anything like the scale which he would have welcomed, and which, directly or indirectly, he did so much to promote, as that devised by his son. With the great, good, and truly statesmanlike Archbishop Tait there had indeed disappeared the last of the ritual prosecutions. The ecclesiastical atmosphere, however, at times still seemed electrical; and even inter-sectarian co-operation for good works had not produced the harmony now obtaining within the fold. The passing of theological polemics from the Anglican pulpit heralded a clerical temper whose prevalence was an indispensable condition for realizing the three centuries' dream of the most thoughtful among Oxford and Cambridge divines. Future possibilities in that direction had taken possession of no clerical mind more strongly than that of the clearest-visioned, most far-seeing as well as highly cultivated nineteenth-century Lancashire bishop, Dr. Fraser, of Manchester. A very short time will now show the results to be expected from the new experiment. Already the parochial councils, or rather those of whom they are likely to be composed, have been for some weeks privately discussing among themselves suggestions for submission to the National Assembly. The programme to which that body will address itself is likely to prove less contentious and more

profitable than some clerical or non-clerical seers have forecast. Questions of ritual, vestment, and hymn-books are not likely to be prominent. Diocesan and parish organization, above all the subsidizing of pauper benefices, and the security of a living wage for an overworked and underpaid clergy, are likely to receive early and practical attention from the local councillors, most of them not extremists in any direction, really concerned for the success of their work, with no propaganda of their own to spread or axes to grind.

The Lambeth Conference Report will in due time show what the remarkable meeting at Queen's Hall on July 22 has sufficiently shown already—that the Enabling Act means a genuine renewal of life and liberty in the nation's ecclesiastical and spiritual polity. That gathering was picturesquely representative not only of English Churchmen, and it should be added Churchwomen also, but of Christianity in its episcopal organization throughout the habitable earth. Thus the Bishops of Kampala and Pretoria stood near each other to support Miss Knight Bruce in her account of the unity which should not only knit together all believers, but which by its action on different minds should strike out new ways suited to existing needs of putting old truths. Not less important was the note struck by the Pretorian prelate fresh from the Lambeth Conference when he dwelt on the world-embracing connexion to which we belong as inadequately expressed by such a phrase as the Church of England.

Meanwhile some words are due about the work actually done by the National Assembly of the Church during its recent session. In the first place the powers of the parish councils have been definitely formulated. Secondly a plan for diocesan decentralization will soon be ready for submission to the Privy Council. Of these two projects the latter will also deal with clerical salaries. That is at least a happy co-operation of ecclesiastical zeal with practical reform.

T. H. S. Escott.

THE CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT ELEMENTS IN CHRIST'S TEACHING

EVERYWHERE in the gospel, throughout Christ's recorded teaching, so scanty and yet sufficient for guidance and the clear perception of principles, we find the *coincidentia oppositorum* or the coincidence of opposites. This is the fundamental Dialectic, this is reality—according to Hegel and Croce and all the best thinkers. We meet on all sides the fact of contradiction and the expectation of the same. This kills at a breath 'the turbid waters of Pragmatism, which is a little of everything, and above all chatter and emptiness.' Accordingly, we soon are confronted in the complete gospel with the union and the antithesis of two distinct elements, the Catholic and the Protestant, a message for the world and a message for the individual—*urbi et orbi*, 'for the disciples,' and Peter, 'for the religious community' and 'Quartus a brother.' There is latent or patent a synthesis and also an apparent discord, between the particular and the universal, the individual and the Church, the special and the general. Christ addresses Himself to both of these rival and yet complementary factors in the vast and vital Whole. Without both the totality would be most imperfect. He evidently looked upon each disciple as a symbol of the entire Church, when He said, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build My Church.' He would have said the same of each of the disciples—and probably He did on other unchronicled occasions. For in the Gospels we have but meagre samples of His words and works. They were not merely representative men, but actual societies as well as individuals, in whom He saw the glorious body to be, as well as the members of the body. He was the living head

of this grand cosmic brotherhood to be. We need not confine ourselves to the *ipsissima verba*, or the words that are given as such in the four Gospels, we may seek for what we want in the Epistles as well. And we know that our Lord uttered many more immortal sayings than those we meet with in the evangelical compositions. Take one only for instance, 'It is more blessed to give than to receive.' Besides, we have the famous Logia, unearthed by Grenfell and Hunt, of the Egyptian Exploration Society, at Oxyrhyncus, which might well have been delivered by Christ Himself. They are by no means unworthy of Him, and speak with the accent of immortality. For instance, 'Wherever there is one alone I am with him.' 'Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood, and there I am.' 'Let not him who seeks cease until he find, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and having reached the kingdom he shall rest.' 'He, who wonders, shall reign.' 'Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye make the Sabbath a rest Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father.' 'Thou hearest with one ear, but the other thou hast closed.' To these specimens of our Lord's supposed Lost Sayings, more could have been added, but these we have given amply answer our purpose. Not one of the Gospels is more than a sketch, a mere skeleton of what might have been written down, a bare hypotyposis. But in the Epistles, especially in St. Paul's, we read doctrines and dicta which we cannot at first sight trace or detect in the Gospels. Of course, in St. Mark's, which looks like a manual for teachers or catechumens, we do not anticipate more than the baldest outlines. It is the fashion of some critics, especially Germans, to declare that St. Paul's Gospel (the fifth as it has been termed but chronologically the first) clashes with that of our Lord—with the Protevangelium. A friend of the present essayist, a very able and distinguished man,

the late gifted historian and *Times* writer, E. J. Payne, believed this and expressed his belief in an epigram.

> Poor Jacob Boehme! Seldom reason's gleams
> Shed pitying light through thy wild, wandering dreams;
> But this clear insight was nor dream at all,
> That Christ taught one thing and another Paul.

This does not flatter the colossal Boehme, of whom E. J. Payne knew little or nothing, and it is not in the very faintest degree in accordance with the facts. St. Paul was not the author of Christianity, if in a sense he was its founder, because he developed in his own peculiar and passionate style the utterances of our Lord, as only a mystic like himself could. But he built upon Christ's foundations. There is literally nothing in the whole range of the fifth (really the first) Gospel, which has not been based upon, or elicited from, the Saviour's own words with their 'living gestures.' Even the cardinal assumption of 'Justification by faith' finds plenty of support in the sentences of Christ. St. Paul's acquaintance with Aristotle and the Greek philosophy, his Rabbinical studies and training, his knowledge of the late apocalyptical books in which his mind was soaked, his betrayals of Oriental religions, no doubt had their effects on him, but his true inspiration came from our Lord alone and referred back to Him alone. He simply worked out what the Master wisely left untold in so many words or merely adumbrated with hints here and there for fuller and further expansion—when the right hour arrived. The writers of the Epistles, whenever we find anything different from the gospel's teaching, which is very seldom, may, we can fairly surmise, have alluded to unrecorded sayings of our Lord and to what they knew was His doctrine. They derive always directly or evidently from His words.

The Rev. F. G. Gmelin suggests that St. Paul was a student of the Greek philosopher Aristotle and thinks it possible to discover in the description of the Church's

creation the existence of the four Aristotelian principles or canons, ἀρχαι or αἰτίαι, which enter into the cognition of any object. There is firstly the material cause or element out of which a thing is created, secondly the efficient cause or means by which it is created, thirdly the formal cause or expression of what it is, fourthly, the final cause or end for which it is. And when we remember that St. Paul was plainly a man of wide culture, and certainly familiar with the science or philosophy of the Stoics, as we have shown elsewhere, it is not difficult to believe this. He was assuredly abreast, and as a Christian ahead, of the foremost knowledge of his time. His Epistles display the marks of an acute and accomplished intellect, in addition to their wonderful spiritual gifts.

In all that follows then we shall assume that the gospel of St. Paul's Epistles or the fifth (really the first) Gospel, St. Peter's, and St. John's, are more or less one harmonious body of evidence for the teaching of Christ. Of course, we must include Luther's 'Epistle of Straw' (*epistula straminea*) or that attributed to St. James. Even if we may not be able to prove that the Gospels and the Epistles rest upon precisely the same source of the Master's teaching, nobody who believes can doubt for a moment that the Spirit of Christ as He promised, controlled, and directed the writers of the Epistles. It has been asserted that our Lord discovered the individual, as before His time the society was everything and the private person nothing. The solidarity of tribes or nations at the outset of civilization or history was such that it superseded all personal rights, which were merged in those of the particular society. An insult or injury done to any individual was an insult or injury done to the community, which resented it when possible and insisted on retaliation in kind. The member who suffered lost himself in the greater ego or self of his city or tribe or State, and so he was sure of a redress or an attempt at redress for his wrongs. The private wrong grew into

a public scandal. But the Saviour did not merely discover the individual, and endow him with definite rights, such as the right of private judgement, liberty of speech, and liberty of action; He did very much more. He went on to socialize the individual, to make him an active and efficient member of an organized religious community, bound to it and every other member by the closest of relations, and by adhesion or loyalty to Him as the Head. But we may add, that He also practically discovered and defined the whole as well as the part, and then proceeded to individualize it again, as only He could. With Him the particular and the universal were always embraced in a living complete synthesis. He never seemed to separate them, to isolate either, or to consider them in entire disjunction. When He spoke of the one He had the other in view at the same time. This was sound philosophy, no less than real religion. To Him all who loved and served and followed Him, who took up their daily cross, were universals alike and particulars. It was a blessed brotherhood that He established on earth; a Church that had foundations, whose Maker and Builder was God. As a Catholic Creator He said, 'I if lifted up from the earth will draw all men unto Me.' 'Him that cometh to Me I will in no wise cast out.' 'For the grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men, hath appeared.' 'Who willeth all men to be saved and to come to a (higher) knowledge of truth' (epignosis). Here we have splendid and spacious testimony to the catholicity of our Lord's great teaching. It carried always the universal note, the eternal accent. He spoke, whenever He did speak, to all space and time—not merely to the Roman Empire or the Graeco-Roman world, big as they were. Many of His words read like imperial rescripts or as charters of freedom for the human race. They are at once challenges and revelations, so astounding that they must be divine. God alone, or one with all the attributes of God, could have promulgated them, as the inalienable inheritance of

humanity, the title deeds of the new world to be the kingdom of God.

On the other hand Christ proclaimed the gospel of individualism, which is practically the Protestant principle on one side, though on the other side it is the very spirit or temper of science—as we have often showed. He dealt separately with all His disciples, while selecting three for more intimate work. He chose also particular classes for the operation of His ministry, the Jews more conspicuously than the Gentiles—though He did not deny these. He healed the daughter of a Syro-Phoenician woman, yet He made it abundantly clear that He put the Jews first. 'I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel.' And again, 'I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.' He summoned to His side, to His infinite mercy, the sick and the suffering, the palsied and paralysed, the lepers, the demon-possessed and demon-ridden, the deaf and dumb, the blind and halt and maimed, the poor and needy, and the dead—that they might live. He was at once, and we say it with all proper reverence, a general practitioner and a specialist. Man, at his best and utmost, may know something of everything and everything of something, but our Lord knew everything of everything. And when He had cured a particular case, He lifted it immediately up to the level of the universal and the highest possible place of existence. So to speak, Christ employed both the inductive and deductive methods, while at the same time He both analysed and synthesized. And, in His terrible denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees, He stood forth as the earliest and greatest Protestant protagonist for all time. In unmasking and stigmatizing as He did the many outrages on liberty and the stupid adherence to stereotyped and fossilized traditionalism, He laid the corner stone, the bedrock foundation for future development and ultimate victory. It has been thought and said

that Christ's treatment of the Pharisees was unjust and intemperate, that they were zealous religious patriots, and possessed of many excellences of their own, and their faults were but the defects of their good qualities. But in His exposure of their flagrant hypocrisy, Jesus rendered a service for ever to the human race and to the Christian Church which He established upon truth. Two of His disciples displayed pre-eminently the Protestant temper, the scientific spirit—namely Philip and Thomas. While the Pharisees did not practise what they preached as the Sadducees did, with whom our Lord must have had most sympathy—despite the Sadducean opposition of the High Priesthood. He could respect the straightforward adversaries and the most hardened sinners with their '*Pecca fortiter*,' but not the hypocrites, double-faced and double-tongued. *Ambiguos Troas metuo, Tyriosque bilingues.* Philip and Thomas, more than all the other apostles, revealed a habit of inquiry, a reasoning and reasonable criticism, of which our Lord approved, as He freely criticized the Old Testament Himself. Philip and Thomas were for ever putting things to the proof in the true Protestant and scientific manner. They demanded a practical consideration and discussion of everything. They wanted a test, and though this was an appeal to the senses, it was on the right line and in the right direction. Christ never asks us to take things for granted or on trust. Christianity craves for experience, the experimental argument, it bids us 'Taste and see that the Lord is good.' 'Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.' And so our Lord told His followers to fix their attention on the fruits of the Spirit, on the conduct which could not deceive. Though He cautioned them against judgement and condemnation, so often precipitate and harsh, He encouraged an open mind as well as an open heart, and He revealed an open Heaven, which the Pharisees with their poisonous doctrine had shut up against the poor and ignorant—while taking away the key. 'Be ye wise as serpents.' He called on His

hearers to examine their ways thoroughly, to consider, to 'strive,' to 'labour'—even to 'agonize,' and He showed them that the road to reality lay along the track of reason, no less than faith and love. As the one Universal Man, Christ naturally invoked the whole man, alike the head and the heart, the intellect, the will, the feeling. One-sided positions were never His teaching. He saw every side from every point of view, the negative and the positive, and He made allowance for all. He welcomed honest doubts, and found room for the agnostic in His society and friendship.

We have seen that both the Catholic and the Protestant principles were associated, while happily opposed by their relations and consequences, in our Lord's teaching. He was the very first Catholic and was also the very first Protestant, for this reason—that His doctrines were all-comprehensive. There was a place for each in His Church, in His family, in His heaven. He rejected utterly the partisan tone, the exclusive aspect, and He opened wide His arms, His heart, His sheltering love to all. Bigotry, intolerance, He disowned and denied. The so-called Catholics in England are really a bad type, a degraded example of bastard Protestantism. Even the Pope seems too liberal for them now. And one of these spurious Catholics recently resented some act or speech of the Pope, saying that he had 'grown so Protestant'! The Established Church, in spite of its name and history, probably displays much more catholicity than the nominally Roman Catholic. The only perfect system of religion, though of course He never systematized it, will be found undeveloped in our Lord's universal teaching. And in that highest and broadest and deepest and most spiritual religion we meet with the most perfect philosophy. Here we have discovered the *coincidentia oppositorum*, the coincidence of opposites, that master key which unlocks every difficulty, and explains all that can be explained or ought properly to be explained—the

solution that is a real resolution, and not as with so many pretended answers a fatal dissolution. We here can take our stand with our Lord and Master, on the very summit of things, the tops of thought, the mountain peaks of imagination, and see how, from the heavenly sources He laid bare, all contradictions can be reconciled in His Love, that embraces Catholic and Protestant, High Sacramentalist and heretic, and answers every objection by nailing it to the Cross. For the life of service, the life of suffering, the life of sacrifice is the one and only test of truth.

As we said in the *Keeper of the Keys*, we are all, whether we like it or not, whether we know it or not, both Catholic and Protestant. This is a psychological fact, a psychological necessity, to which we are born, which ignorance may deny, but cannot escape. There can be no doubt that we are in the best sense double, we see at the same time both thesis and antithesis, and however inconsistent we virtually contrive to unite them in a working synthesis.

F. W. Orde Ward.

MILTON'S PROSE WORKS

THE life of Milton divides itself into three periods; it does this more naturally than the most tractable text that ever came to the hand of a conventional preacher. Thus we have (1) the period of scholarship, of early poetry and travel, 1608–1640. Milton was then recalled from Italy by the prospect of civil war at home. He declared that he esteemed it dishonourable to be lingering abroad while his fellow citizens were contending for their liberty. (2) The period of political action and prose writing, which spread over 20 years until the Restoration of 1660. High poetry does not flourish in the atmosphere of fierce controversy. The true laureate of England was lost in the pamphleteer or in the Latin Secretary of the Commonwealth. (3) The closing period of poetry, 1660–1674; the years of *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*.

Of these three periods, the middle one would seem to offer the least interest. The early poetry of Milton surely reaches the highest levels of classic beauty of which the English language is capable. One of our great critics has said, 'It is impossible to conceive that the mechanism of language can be brought to a more exquisite degree of perfection.' Yet the voice of the Puritan reformer is not silent, and breaks out in raucous tones in the very middle of that greatest of elegies, *Lycidas*. Milton went to Cambridge with a view to enter the Church. He discovered during his stay at the University that this was an impossibility. The policy of Archbishop Laud and the mixture of corruption and indifference which was unable to cope with the Romeward tendencies of the leading bishops made Milton a drastic ecclesiastical reformer.

> The hungry sheep look up, and are not fed,
> But swoln with wind and the rank mist they draw,
> Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread;
> Besides what the grim wolf with privy paw
> Daily devours apace, and nothing said.
> But that two-handed engine at the door
> Stands ready to smite once, and smite no more.

Already he is looking to Parliament for reform. One discerns latent possibilities in our great poet which will not allow him permanently to remain in the countryside singing his elegies or his songs of joy and sadness, 'with eager thought warbling his Doric lay.' You are quite prepared to find him in the busy haunts of men and on the battlefield if need be.

> At last he rose, and twitched his mantle blue:
> To-morrow to fresh woods, and pastures new.

Again, the pathos and beauty of the third period has in it an appealing power. The strong partisan has apparently suffered shipwreck with his cause. Blind and lonely, in the midst of a world of foes, the principles of liberty and morality for which he contended so fiercely are trampled underfoot. It is natural that his thoughts should turn to that great Israelite patriot whose eyes were put out by the Philistines and who ended his days in glory and tragedy.

Samson Agonistes should be re-read under the new title, *Milton Agonistes*. To get the proper setting for his drama we must live again in the atmosphere of the Restoration. The powerful if somewhat prejudiced words of Macaulay may bring something of it back to us. 'Then came these days,' he says, 'never to be recalled without a blush, the days of servitude without loyalty and sensuality without love, of dwarfish talents and gigantic vices, the paradise of cold hearts and narrow minds, the golden age of the coward, the bigot, and the slave. . . . The Government had just ability enough to deceive and just religion enough to persecute. The principles of liberty were the scoff of every grinning courtier and the Anathema Maran-

atha of every fawning dean. . . . Crime succeeded to crime, disgrace to disgrace, till the race, accursed of God and man, was a second time driven forth, to wander on the face of the earth, and to be a byword and a shaking of the head to the nations.' Strong words! the more one knows the history of the Stuarts the more inclined one is to listen to Macaulay. Not all the false sentiment that lies gathered round their name, nor the high chivalry that spent its life-blood in support of them will finally rescue their name as a family from the highest dishonour due to any in English history.

In his prose works Milton was the spokesman of England against all that the name of Stuart stood for—and a good deal more. He is the first and greatest of our radical thinkers. He is the chief of our political pamphleteers. Not even Swift nor Defoe can equal him. The rhetorical ardour of Edmund Burke is to the glowing periods of Milton,

> As moonlight unto sunlight and as water unto wine.

To quote Macaulay again. 'The prose works of Milton abound with passages compared with which the finest declamations of Burke sink into insignificance.' It may seem at first sight that nearly 20 years of the life of England's greatest poet were wasted in these violent controversies over questions which are now forgotten and deal with personalities which are better buried. Milton did not think so. He would have set his title to fame rather on the *Defence of the People of England* than on *Paradise Lost*. He willingly sacrificed his sight in his great task of defending the Commonwealth of England against her many detractors on the continent of Europe. 'When I was publicly solicited to write a reply to the defence of the royal cause, when I had to contend with the pressure of sickness, and with the apprehension of soon losing the sight of my remaining eye, and when my medical attendant clearly announced that if I did engage in the work, it would be

irreparably lost, their premonitions caused no hesitation and inspired no dismay. I would not have listened to the voice even of Esculapius himself in preference to the suggestions of the heavenly monitor within my own breast; my resolution was unshaken, though the alternative was either the loss of my sight, or the desertion of my duty. . . . But if the choice were necessary, I would, sir, prefer my blindness to yours; yours is a cloud spread over the mind, which darkens both the light of reason and of conscience, mine keeps from my view only the coloured surfaces of things, while it leaves me at liberty to contemplate the beauty and stability of virtue and of truth. . . . There is, as the apostle says, a way to strength through weakness.'

> So much the rather thou celestial light
> Shine inward . . . that I may see and tell
> Of things invisible to mortal sight.

In the Miltonic orations you are at once impressed with a startling confidence and dogmatism. Milton believed intensely in himself, in his country, and in his cause. There is no mock modesty about the great poet; he is well aware that he stands head and shoulders above his contemporaries. In an age of great classical scholarship he is the peer of the most learned. Grotius, Salmasius, Casaubon, Bellarmine are but his equals in knowledge. In expression he excels them all. When the war broke out he did not participate in its toils and dangers; he says, 'For since from my youth I was devoted to the pursuits of literature and my mind had always been stronger than my body, I did not court the labours of a camp in which any common person would have been of more value than myself.' His work was to prove that the pen is mightier than the sword. 'Much as I may be surpassed in the powers of eloquence and copiousness of diction by the illustrious writers of antiquity, yet the subject of which I treat was never surpassed in any age in dignity or in interest.'

His passionate defence of the action of the army in the execution of Charles I is of necessity in Latin. It made a profound impression on the mind of the continental peoples, but Milton was too keen a patriot not to love his own language best of all. 'Our English,' as he calls it, 'the language of men ever famous and foremost in the achievement of liberty.' The very name of his country is invariably sufficient to kindle a fire. Perhaps the most famous passage is in the *Areopagitica*. 'Lords and commons of England! consider what nation it is whereof ye are, and whereof ye are the governors; a nation not slow or dull, but of a quick, ingenious, and piercing spirit; acute to invent, subtle and sinewy to discourse, not beneath the reach of any point the highest that human capacity can soar to. . . . Why was this nation chosen before any other, that out of her, as out of Sion, should be proclaimed and sounded forth the first tidings and trumpet of reformation to all Europe? . . . Now once again by all concurrence of signs, God is decreeing to begin some new and great period in His Church, even to the reforming of reformation itself; what does He then but reveal Himself to His servants, and as His manner is first to His Englishmen.' His view of England in those great days was that idealized picture which has become the most familiar quotation from his prose works. 'Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep and shaking her invincible locks.' He is thinking of Samson once again, not the poor victim of Delilah but the saviour of his race and the destroyer of Philistines. Our modern prophets cannot talk like that, not merely because they have lost the grand manner, but because they are so obsessed by Delilah that they forget the lions that have been ripped asunder and the gates of Gaza that have been torn down. But Milton believed not only in himself and his country, he believed absolutely in his cause. He would never dream that it could be ultimately defeated. The

motto of all his controversial writings is the same, 'Let truth and falsehood grapple: who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?' Truth, needless to say, was the cause of British Radicalism as represented by its most learned exponent, John Milton.

Mr. G. P. Gooch, in a valuable thesis which has now gone out of print (*Democratic Ideals of the Seventeenth Century*), has demonstrated the importance of this period to all who would go to the origins of democracy. References to the Roman republic and the Greek city states are really beside the mark in this inquiry, except as seventeenth-century classical studies influenced the formative political thinkers of the day. What is of interest is that the Reformation of the State proceeded from attempts to reform the Church and not vice versa. Laud and the Star-Chamber had more to do with provoking the Civil War than Hampden's resistance of ship-money. When Milton, therefore, appeared in the lists in 1641 with his first pamphlet of *Reformation in England* it was a reformation of the Church of which he was thinking. A year later he appeared in support of the five Puritan preachers who were attacking episcopal prelacy under the transparent pseudonym of Smectymnuus. It may not be transparent to us, but the ecclesiastical world of 1642 soon detected in that grotesque name the initials of Stephen Marshall, Edmund Calamy, Thomas Young, Matthew Newcomen, and William Spurstow. In their controversy with Bishop Hall and Archbishop Ussher they had no stouter supporter than Milton. He continued his attacks on prelacy with growing bitterness until in 1659 in his tract on *The likeliest Means to remove Hirelings out of the Church* he attacks the whole idea of a separated order of clergy and would go back to what he regards as apostolic simplicity. It was not in Church government alone that Milton became more radical as he grew older, in theology the same tendency was apparent, though Milton as a theologian is much less interesting than Milton as an

ecclesiastical reformer, in spite of the profound influence which *Paradise Lost* has had on popular theology. His treatise on Christian doctrine was written in Latin, and did not see the light of day until 1823. It remains the dullest and least inspired of his prose writings, and would be consigned to oblivion but for the name of its author.

It was in 1643 that Milton made his unfortunate marriage with Mary Powell, and the same year he startled the public with his *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*. This tract and the others that followed on the same subject bear traces of bitter experience, but the true history of that married life will never be written. He was twice the age of his seventeen-year old bride, who left him after a month's fellowship not to return until two long years had passed away. Milton's view of the situation is reflected in his writings; it would be helpful to know what she had to say on the subject. Milton's chief weakness is a lack of humour. We find wit and satire in abundance in his declamations, but the humaner note of the humorist who can smile at *himself* is never there. How pathetic is this confession of the stiff and intense Puritan, 'It may yet befall a discreet man to be mistaken in his choice; and we have plenty of examples. The soberest and best governed men are least practised in these affairs; and who knows but that the bashful muteness of a maiden may ofttimes hide all the unliveliness and natural sloth that is really unfit for conversation. Nor is there that freedom of access granted or presumed, as may suffice to a perfect discerning till too late.' Milton's contention was that unsuitability of temper and mental correspondence was a more reasonable ground for divorce than any sin of the body. He does not deign to draw up the scheme for a new divorce bill, but discusses all the Scripture passages on the subject and summons all the authorities to his side that he can muster. With his contentions our present Report on the Divorce Laws would find itself largely in agreement. His great weakness is

that in every case the husband is to be the judge. He reveals the strange paradox of regarding the wife as in the highest degree the helpmeet, the mental and spiritual companion of her husband, while holding a thoroughly oriental view of the superiority of the husband in all points of law. He cannot see that the woman could ever have any ground of complaint against a husband who wished for divorce. 'If she consent, wherein is the law to right her? Or consent not, then it is either just and so deserved; or if unjust, such in all likelihood was the divorcer; and to part from an unjust man is a happiness and no injury to be lamented.' So it would be if all men were cast in the Miltonic mould; but men and women are so illogical and unaccountable. His hypothetical propositions remind us irresistibly of Dogberry's charge to the watch,

> You shall comprehend all vagrom men; you are to bid any man stand in the prince's name.
>
> *Watchman:* How if a' will not stand?
>
> *Dogberry:* Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go; and presently call the rest of the watch together and thank God you are rid of a knave.

Milton does, however, command our respect by the reverent liberality of his attitude towards the New Testament teaching on the subject. It would have been well if his age could have learned the truth of his great dictum: 'The gospel enjoins no new morality save only the infinite enlargement of charity.' Neither Calvinist nor Arminian could tolerate such dangerous breadth, and his quotations from Protestant divines were all in vain. He provoked the censure of the Westminster Assembly, and was fortunate to escape so lightly; by the orthodox he was never acquitted for what they considered the wild licence of his talk on divorce; the immoralities of the Court of Charles II were trivial in comparison. Milton himself never forgave the Presbyterian divines for their censure. He soon declared his belief that

> New Presbyter is but old Priest writ large.

If we sympathize with the man and hear the cry of a wounded heart in his expression about 'a living soul bound to a dead corpse,' we shall find much of permanent value in his writings on this subject without pretending to agree with him in all. It was the next year (1644), however, which was to see the publication of his first classic in prose. '*Areopagitica*: a speech for the liberty of unlicensed printing, to the Parliament of England,' should be the *vade mecum* of all liberal thinkers. 1644 was the critical year of the Civil War. A year that witnessed the victory of Marston Moor and the publication of *Areopagitica* deserves no mean place in the annals of our country. It has been said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Milton declared that civil liberty could only be assured if complaints were freely heard, deeply considered, and speedily reformed. He proceeded to make known to the world his complaints against all attempts to muzzle the press. When he speaks of books as not absolutely dead things, he approaches the humanity of Charles Lamb; in fact he seems to handle his folios much more tenderly than he was wont to handle his opponents. 'As good almost kill a man as kill a good book.' The cry of battle is heard in every part of his splendid oration. 'I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies forth and seeks her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be run for, not without dust and heat.' The key-words of Milton's writings are those great trumpet-calls of humanity, Liberty and Truth. They have ever been the chief stock-in-trade of the orator, and by their very abstraction are for ever begging the question at issue. Milton's unquestioned sincerity and elevated idealism saved him from the pitfalls into which a meaner demagogue would have fallen. Would this commercial age listen to his plea that our richest merchandise is truth or feel the passionate indignation of his appeal: 'Suffer not these licensing prohibitions to stand at every

place of opportunity, forbidding and disturbing them that continue seeking, that continue to do our obsequies to the torn body of our martyred saint (truth.)'

The same year he published his *Tractate on Education*, with its curious disparagement of the Universities. Milton is ever the reformer, but he is here looking back to the schools of Greece for his reform rather than forward to Mr. Fisher. There is little to satisfy the democrat in this scheme of academies for 100 or 150 boys, who shall become leaders and generals in the service of their country. There is little doubt that he followed his own counsel for teaching the classics in his own work as a tutor; but the surprising part of the scheme is the emphasis which our great scholar gives to learning the art of war; Our army authorities might be persuaded to consider his suggestion that music should be taught in the 'interim of unsweating' after violent exertion. There is, alas, not one reference to music in the Army Manual of Physical Training.

While Europe trembled with horror at the execution of Charles I, and even the Presbyterians of Scotland declared their disapproval, Milton vindicated the action of the Parliament with characteristic boldness in his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*. His appointment as Latin Secretary followed and he speaks now as a Government official rather than as the learned but eccentric partisan of an extreme party. His first official tract was the *Eikonoclastes* (1650), which was a reply to the popular Εικὼν βασιλικὴ of Bishop Gauden, which professed to be the work of the 'martyred king,' and by a mixture of prayers and other pieties captured the sympathies not only of the Stuart adherents but of many who had supported the Parliament during the Civil War. Milton named his tract after those emperors of Byzantium who 'after long tradition of idolatry in the Church took courage and broke all superstitious images to pieces.' He is very ironical over the claim of the Cavaliers that they represented the gentlemen of England.

'Gentlemen indeed! The ragged infantry of stews and brothels; the spawn and shipwreck of taverns and dicing-houses.' Incidentally he brings out very clearly the fact that the beginning of the struggle found both parties totally unprepared. Milton assumes throughout that the Εικών was what it purported to be, the production of the late King, though once or twice he hints that he has doubts on that subject. He scored heavily by the discovery that one of the King's prayers was lifted bodily from Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*. The heathen woman Pamela and the most Christian king on the eve of his execution may have had similar aspirations, but it was a most singular coincidence that led them to give exactly the same verbal expression to their emotions. Beyond this Milton says in his most urbane manner, 'With his orisons I meddle not, for he appeals to a high audit.' What does rouse his indignation, however, is the hypocrisy which assumes too intimate a knowledge of the Divine Will and purpose. 'No evil can befall the Parliament or city but he positively interprets it as a judgement upon them for his sake; as if the very manuscript of God's judgements had been delivered to his custody and exposition. But his reading declares it well to be a false copy which he uses and to counterfeit the hand of God is the boldest of all forgery.' There is a violence in Milton's controversial manner which is partly the fault of his times and partly the expression of his own intensity. This alone would prevent him from being considered the model of controversialists or from taking rank in effectiveness with Swift, Burke, Halifax, 'Junius,' or Pascal. His massive learning also sits in places too heavily upon him. When he forgets his spleen and his erudition he often soars in eloquence above them all, but he never achieves the steady clarity of the *Provincial Letters* or the ironical felicity of *The Tale of a Tub*. The strength and weakness of Milton appear in their completest combination in what he would certainly have regarded as his

greatest work, *A Defence of the People of England* in answer to Salmasius's defence of the King. It was, perhaps, inevitable in seventeenth-century controversy that opponents should discover opprobrious epithets for each other, but we could wish that our English prophet should have found some better way. 'You silly loggerhead,' 'slug,' 'most loathsome beast,' 'vile mercenary foreigner, 'Burgundian slave,' are phrases applied to the Leyden professor in the English translation. There is little to be gained by going back to the Latin original, for Milton has a unique command of abusive Latin. He is not content with personal attacks on the professor, but presses into the home circle with violent words to Mme. Saumaise; 'a barking she-wolf at home that domineers over thee most wretchedly.'

These are blemishes in a great argument which powerfully influenced the Continental mind in favour of the Commonwealth. It may be that the efficiency of Cromwell's administration of English affairs in their foreign relations was a stronger argument than Milton's *Defence*, but that detailed examination of the actions of the Parliament with its mass of parallel instances has a permanent place among national manifestoes. There is one great passage in which all Milton's characteristics as a political writer came out at once. We have there his historical sense, his passion for liberty and justice, and his profound belief in his country which had so nobly risen to the challenge of a present crisis.

"I think I have sufficiently proved what I undertook by many authorities and written laws; to wit, that since the commons have by very good right to try the King, and since they have actually tried him and put him to death for the mischief he had done both in Church and State . . . they have done nothing but what was just and regular . . . according to the laws of the land. And I cannot upon this occasion but congratulate myself with the honour of having had such ancestors, who founded this

government with no less prudence and in as much liberty as the most worthy of the ancient Romans or Grecians ever founded any of theirs; and they must needs, if they have any knowledge of our affairs, rejoice over their posterity, who when they were almost reduced to slavery, yet with so much wisdom and courage vindicated and asserted the state from the unruly government of a king.'

In many of his opinions Milton was in advance of his age; in some of them he was behind it. He had to pay the penalty which original genius so daring and outspoken must ever pay. He bore himself proudly and courageously to the end. As we part with him it shall be in the closing words of his last poem—

> His servants God
> With peace and consolation hath dismissed
> And calm of mind, all passion spent.

A. W. Harrison.

MONOTHEISM AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY

DR. W. P. PATERSON, referring to the objection to which the doctrine of the Social Trinity is exposed that if we are in earnest in accepting it 'we fall into the fatal error of Tritheism,' makes the suggestion that 'probably some fresh thinking requires to be done in regard to Tritheism.'[1] Now fresh thinking in regard to Tritheism implies fresh thinking in regard to Monotheism. The latter is an elementary doctrine which we are inclined to accept too easily, without any exact inquiry into its meaning. The conception of the Divine Unity is assumed to be so simple a conception that any study of it is regarded as quite unnecessary. Every one, it is said, understands what is meant by the statement, 'God is One,' or, 'There is One God.' This assumption is surely wrong. Monotheism, like any other doctrine, is open to criticism and discussion and further investigation. And unless we know exactly what is meant by a monotheistic faith and wherein its value consists, we have no right to condemn any conception of the Godhead because it comes into conflict with a doctrine into the validity of which we have not taken the trouble to inquire. It is necessary, therefore, that we do some thinking, whether it be fresh thinking or not, with respect to Monotheism.

Let us commence by asking, What are the advantages of a Monotheistic as contrasted with a Polytheistic faith? Why should we adhere to the former so strictly, and guard it so jealously? The answers, though fairly obvious, are worth restating in view of the enquiry we are to prosecute.

(*a*) First of all, a monotheistic Faith means a distinct gain so far as experimental religion is concerned. Its

[1] *The Rule of Faith*, p. 223.

practical advantage is evident. Any missionary or any convert from heathen polytheism will bear witness to this. As Dr. Paterson puts it, 'a multiplicity of gods implied a multitude of diverse policies and of conflicting wills, and consequently undermined confidence in the world as a cosmos and as the seat of a divine government.'[1] Or, to quote one of many such testimonies, 'I was now taught,' writes a modern Japanese Christian, Utschimura by name, 'that there was only one God, and not many—over eight millions—as I had formerly believed. Christian monotheism laid its axe at the root of my superstition. . . . One God, not many—that was a glad message to my soul.'[2] This practical advantage is so well recognized that there is no need to dwell on it at any length.

(*b*) But further, the monotheistic idea is of value so far as our philosophical thinking is concerned, our attempt to form a rational and satisfactory conception of the universe as a whole. And this advantage calls for special notice.

Monotheism is the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Now the term 'Unity' may signify a kind of oneness which we shall call 'arithmetical singularity,' illustrations of which are to be found in the expressions, 'There is one tree in the field,' or 'There is one book on the table.' Personal unity in this sense denotes a single centre of thinking, loving, willing activity. And this kind of unity is self-explicable or self-conditioned: there is no need for us to get behind or beyond the one centre of personal being, e.g. in order to explain how or why it is one. The very inquiry is absurd, as absurd as to ask, Why is the numeral one and not two? What makes it one, and not two or three? Here then is the advantage to which we wish to direct the reader's attention. When the expression, 'There is One God,' or 'God is One,' is understood as signifying 'He is one Person,' i.e. when we

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 223.

[2] Warneck's *Living Forces*, p. 211, quoted by Dr. T. R. Glover, *The Christian Tradition*, p. 150.

predicate of the Divine Being such arithmetical singularity as the one self-centre denotes, we reach an ultimate unity beyond which there is no need to go, no need to seek for an explanation as to what makes this one centre one; we reach, that is to say, a satisfactory resting-place for our thought. If we may so put it, the doctrine of the Divine Unity which affirms arithmetical singularity of God takes us back to the numeral one, to a form of unity which is self-conditioned and self-explicable. A polytheistic faith, on the other hand, fails to do this: it implies either a number of discordant deities, or else a community of divine members concerning which we find ourselves compelled to ask, What makes these many one? They do not represent ultimate unity as the arithmetical singularity of a monarchical faith does. It is interesting to observe that there is something peculiarly alluring to men's minds in the particular form of oneness which we have named arithmetical singularity. Human thought ever aims at reducing the complex to the simple, the manifold to the one; its goal is to discover that ultimate entity of which all forces and heat and light and matter are but the varied manifestations. The intellectualist, at any rate, regards this as a goal worth striving after: he has the conviction that there is considerable value in this idea of arithmetical singularity. Whether it possesses similar validity in other realms than that of the strictly intellectual is doubtful. According to æsthetic standards, e.g. there is more of beauty in the complex and the manifold than there is in the absolutely simple and singular. It is therefore quite possible to exaggerate the value of this idea of arithmetical oneness. But none the less it must be acknowledged that the human mind seeks for such ultimate unity, and desires a final resting-place for all its thinking. And Monotheism, with its conception of the One Personal Deity, the one centre of thinking, loving, willing activity, supplies this demand.

Such is the worth of our monotheism. Can these

advantages be retained if we accept the doctrine of the Social Trinity? Must they all be retained at any cost? Let us consider in the first place the value that monotheism has for philosophical thought.

1. It is quite evident that a conception of the Godhead which regards the Persons as persons in the modern sense of the word must part with the idea of arithmetical singularity. For the latter is conditioned by the one centre of thinking, loving, willing activity; the Three Persons, on the other hand, if They are persons in the modern sense, must represent three such centres. Here the old objection holds good: God cannot be One in the same sense in which He is Three: there cannot be one centre and yet three centres of the same kind in the Divine Life. So the idea of arithmetical singularity must go.

But if this particular kind of unity is sacrificed, what sort of oneness is implied by the doctrine of the Social Trinity? It may be said, The only unity possible if the Godhead is thought of thus is unity of a social order. Exactly so; but this criticism need not distress us overmuch. For what is social unity? It exists in more forms than one. It is something more than class unity, when several members are grouped together as sharing common characteristics. It is something more than co-operative unity, when individuals band themselves together in an alliance or partnership in some enterprise or task. It is even something closer than ethical unity, such as we find in the affectionate relationships of the family. There is a more intimate association than any of these, a kind of psychological unity between self and self, only dimly apprehended by us. It has been described as 'a sort of mutual or inter-incorporation of being . . . such an interpenetration of two beings that whatever lives in the one or happens to him becomes a matter of real, vivid, personal experience to the other.' Human friendships sometimes supply us with instances of it. Montaigne, for example, writes thus concerning his relationship

with La Boëtie, that 'having seized all my will (it) induced the same to plunge and lose itself in his; (and) likewise having seized all his will, (it) induced it to plunge and lose itself in mine, with a mutual greed and with a like concurrence.' Reference may also be made to such incidents as that recorded by the writer of the introductory memoir in the *Letters of James Smetham*: 'For myself I may add our friendship was warm and faithful, of that kind of which a lifetime rarely offers more than one example. So enduring and deep rooted was it, that the time of his departure was marked to me, ignorant of his illness and many hundreds of miles away, by profound mental disturbance otherwise unaccounted for; thus furnishing one more instance of the loving lives which in death are not divided.' And something of the same sort is hinted at in one of the stanzas of *In Memoriam*. Tennyson says of his friend,

> Whatever way my days decline
> I felt and feel, though left alone,
> His being working in my own,
> The footsteps of his life in mine.

Another illustration may be found in a well-known work of fiction, which though it is fiction is appropriate to our purpose in so far as the author was one of the most subjective writers of her class. In *Wuthering Heights* the heroine, referring to Heathcliff, says, 'He's more myself than I am . . . I *am* Heathcliff! He's always, always in my mind: not as a pleasure any more than I am always a pleasure to myself, but as my own being.'

We do not claim that this intimate relationship gives us the unity of arithmetical singularity, that the many selves thus related become one self. But we do claim that Social Unity comprises not simply the unity of a class, or of a co-operative partnership, or of ethical relationships, but also a form of oneness of a far closer and more intimate order than any of these; a oneness which in a higher life than ours may be much more perfectly developed than is the case among ourselves; a oneness which we can only im-

perfectly and dimly conceive. When, therefore, the objection is urged against the conception of the Trinity which represents the Divine Persons as persons in the modern sense of the word, 'Your doctrine implies a Unity which is only of a social order,' it may be appropriately replied, 'But we take exception to the word "only." For Social Unity is not simply the unity which exists between the members of a class, or of a partnership, or of a family; it represents also an "inter-incorporation of being" more complete than is realized in the most perfect and affectionate of human relations, a form of oneness which may be conceived of as transcending anything known in our experience, but which is shadowed forth in such relationships as those referred to above.'

'Still, though this is true,' some one may argue, 'the fact remains that you have given up the unity of arithmetical singularity, that final and satisfactory resting-place for our thought.' We acknowledge that we have, but have we not gained something in exchange? Here we would remind the reader of the distinction to which Dr. T. B. Strong calls our attention between 'generic unity' and 'organic unity.'[1] The former is represented by the statement 'there is one God'; as a conception of unity Dr. Strong pronounces it 'dead and abstract.' The latter, 'organic unity,' which he calls 'living and concrete,' is represented by the statement, 'God is One'; it consists in the unifying or relating of various elements, and is 'a far higher and fuller notion than the abstract unity belonging to members of a class.' Now the scientist, or the philosophical thinker, or any one who is interested primarily in the created universe, is satisfied with discovering in the Divine Being that form of unity which suffices to explain the oneness of all things. His conclusion is that there is one force, or one mind, or one vital principle operative in all, and of which the many are the varied manifestations. Having affirmed this, i.e. having

[1] *A Manual of Theology*, p. 188.

affirmed generic unity of God, or as we have called it arithmetical singularity, he rests content. But can this conclusion satisfy the theologian? Concerned as he is with the Divine Being and Nature, must he not demand that God in His oneness shall represent the highest of all conceivable unities? If there are different kinds of unity, if the unity of the universe, e.g., is of a higher order than that of an undifferentiated, indivisible atom; if organic unity, 'living and concrete,' is of a higher order than generic unity, 'dead and abstract;' then surely the theologian cannot rest content with a theory which predicates only the lower form of unity of God. The question with which he is concerned is, 'If God is One, what kind of oneness is His? What is the unity proper to the Divine Life?' In arriving at his conclusion he may come into conflict with the scientist or the philosopher, but he has the right to maintain that his question is as important as any that the latter can ask; and though he may and ought to pay heed to the scientist's possible objections and criticisms, he must not be expected to make an unconditional surrender so far as his own demands are concerned.

Now whatever criticisms may be levelled against the doctrine of the Social Unity of the Godhead, there is this to be urged in its favour; it does affirm of the Divine Life that oneness of the highest order is realized in it. Of course, if we think of God as a single person we are not precluded from predicating of Him some kind of organic unity. It may be said, 'He is One, and organically One, so far as His various attributes are concerned; He is One in thought and love and purpose.' And He is One in this sense because thought and love and purpose belong to, or emanate from, a single self-centre. It is a kind of organic unity which is explicable by means of the generic unity of the one self-centre. But what sort of organic unity is it? Certainly not the highest known to us. For the organic unity of several selves is of a higher order than that of several expe-

riences or attributes. And so we find ourselves face to face with this alternative: either we must be content with predicating of the Divine a lower form of organic unity which is explicable by means of the generic unity of the single centre; or we must be satisfied with a higher form of organic unity which is not so explicable, i.e. we must sacrifice our desire for that resting-place of our thought which we have called arithmetical singularity. We cannot have it both ways. In other words our choice lies between that which is inferior, and that which is mysterious and beyond our comprehension. Now to the theologian it is more important that God, even in His Unity, should represent the highest of all modes of existence, than that He should be, even in His Unity, comprehensible and fully explicable. And the doctrine which attributes to the Deity the highest form of organic oneness, i.e. social unity, may claim to possess a certain advantage as compared with the other doctrine which provides us with an explanation of the Divine Oneness, as well as of the oneness of the Universe, in the single centre of thinking, loving, willing activity, but does so at the expense of ascribing to the Deity a unity of an inferior order than that realized in human experience. The theologian, at any rate, will judge it better to be able to say, 'The Divine Unity is of the highest kind conceivable, though we do not know how it is achieved,' than to say, 'We understand why God is One, but His Oneness falls short of such unity as is known to us.'

2. We turn now to the practical advantages of Monotheism, to the consideration of which we need not devote quite so much space.

What does Monotheism in this sense connote? What do we mean when we say, There is One God?

(*a*) In the first place, monotheism predicates the *uniqueness* of the Deity. It affirms that God is not one of a class, that there is and can be only one Divine Being. Is the doctrine of the Social Trinity monotheistic in this sense?

Surely it is, in so far as it implies that the Divine 'Society' is unique, that it is the only one of its kind. This implication is evident when we take into account the relationship of perfect, mutual penetration existing between the Divine Three, such penetration as is impossible to human selves. The Persons of the Trinity are not separate and shut off One from Another, as the individual members of a human community are; and this feature of inter-penetration is the essential, or one of the essentials, of the Divine Life. There cannot, therefore, be two such 'Societies,' or Trinities, in the realm of the Divine. For if there were two, and the two did not penetrate, but were shut off one from another, then the Divine would be imperfect in its own essential characteristic: and if they did penetrate, they would be one and not two, united and not separate. God may be regarded as a 'Society' of Persons rather than as an Individual, but this does not preclude us from affirming that this Divine 'Society' is unique; that it is the only one of its kind; that there is, and can be, but One God.

(*b*) Monotheism further predicates the *indivisibility* of the Divine. The doctrine which conceives of the Divine Unity as of an individual order asserts an indivisible, arithmetical singleness of God: He is One Person. And the doctrine of the Social Trinity affirms an equally indivisible organic oneness: God is One 'Society,' which, it is maintained, cannot be broken up into parts, its members cannot be separated One from Another. The early Church expressed the truth thus: it insisted again and again that the Father is in the Son and the Spirit, that the Son and the Spirit are in the Father; that no one Person acts by Himself; that no one Person can exist in and by Himself; that where one Person of the Trinity is present All are present. The Three are not separate, or separable, individuals as we are. This indivisible organic oneness is emphasized by that relationship of perfect mutual penetration to which reference has just been been made. Such a relationship signifies a closeness of

intimacy and a mutual dependence of being such as exists in no human society. In a sense which we can only dimly apprehend the Father is 'in' the Son, and the Son 'in' the Father. The psychology of the Divine Life, if we may so speak, is such that the Three cannot be sundered One from Another. In so far as monotheism implies indivisibility, the doctrine of the Social Trinity is monotheistic.

(*c*) Again, Monotheism asserts this oneness and uniqueness in direct opposition to polytheistic notions of a multiplicity of deities, capable of coming into conflict one with another, often acting in opposition, and actuated by different motives and tempers. The easiest way of contradicting this polytheistic faith is to affirm that there is only One Divine Person, whose oneness is presented as of an individual order. But though it is the easiest, it is not the only way. A perfect social unity, transcending anything known to our experience, represents the antithesis of this polytheistic hierarchy of deities, divided in power and motive and temper, just as the One Divine Being of a monarchical faith does. The doctrine of the Social Trinity conceives of Three Divine Persons, persons in the modern sense of the term, but so related that the thought of One is the thought of All, and the will of One is the will of All; Persons not existing apart as human beings do, but in and through Each Other; Persons always acting conjointly and never separately. Such a conception is evidently in direct opposition to any polytheistic idea of a crowd of divided and warring deities, even as unanimity is the opposite of discord.

In so far, then, as it preserves these features which constitute the practical value of Monotheism, the doctrine which represents the Divine Unity as of a social rather than an individual order has the right to be described as monotheistic. For it affirms that there is One God, not one Individual Divine Being, but one unique Divine 'Society,' the only one of its kind: it asserts that God is One, not one centre of personal activity, but one indivisible whole; and

its idea of a Divine fellowship, more intimate than we can describe, is the exact opposite of the separate and discordant deities of a polytheistic faith. If this is not monotheism, it is certainly not polytheism; some other third term must be invented to describe it. And if this third term is Trinitarianism, then the problem arises, What is its relation to Monotheism and Polytheism? In what order should the three be grouped? Evidently the argument can no longer hold good, You must be either a polytheist or a monotheist. For with the invention of the third term there is a third alternative to be taken into account. But rather than add to our theological nomenclature, it is probably preferable to claim that the doctrine of the Social Trinity is as monotheistic as is the other doctrine of the Individual Oneness of the Deity.

We venture to say that instead of being, as it is often supposed to be, one of the simplest of our religious ideas, no conception of the Divine Unity is entirely satisfactory. The doctrine of individual oneness is, as we have seen, open to criticism, and so is also the modern doctrine of the superpersonal unity of the Godhead. Neither can it be claimed for the conception of a Social Unity with which we have been concerned that it supplies us with all that we need, or that it is altogether free from difficulties. One of the chief objections to it is to be found in the criticism, 'How then are we to think of God, or to conceive of Him? We use the singular term in reference to Him, and the very name "God" suggests a Person. But the doctrine you have been defending seems to rule this out, and to leave us in the dark as to the conception we should form or employ in our ordinary thinking with respect to the Deity. This is a serious drawback to its acceptance.' We believe that even such an objection can be satisfactorily dealt with, but the present article is already long enough, and we have no space to indicate what our answer would be.

ARTHUR T. BURBRIDGE.

THE EGYPTIAN PROBLEM

I

NO one in authority in this country has spoken of the Egyptian problem so honestly as the Rt. Hon. Winston Spencer Churchill, the Secretary of State for War. In the course of a recent statement[1] in the House of Commons he acknowledged that a 'disastrous breakdown' had occurred there. He described this 'disastrous breakdown' as 'absolute rupture between the British administration and the people of the country.'

These words by no means exaggerate the present situation in Egypt. Though outwardly order has been restored by the British Field-Marshal who, under the title of 'Resident and High Commissioner,' exercises supreme authority under the British Crown in that country, the temper of the people is sullen, if not frankly hostile. Though disorders have ceased, the tone of the Egyptian press is unfriendly, and the Egyptian Nationalists refuse to have any dealings with the British officials. Such Egyptians as can be found willing to assume office do not pretend to do more than merely to serve as administrative instruments.

The visit recently paid to Egypt by the British Mission under the Rt. Hon. Viscount Milner, Secretary of State for the Colonies, revealed how far the rupture between the British and Egyptians had extended. Provincial legislatures, which had been suspended since the outbreak of hostilities and the establishment of the Egyptian Protectorate, met of their own accord and in defiance of authority, and passed resolutions against having any dealings with Lord Milner and his colleagues. Individual members of the

[1] *Parliamentary Reports, House of Commons*, Vol. 101, No. 94, July 8, 1920.

central legislature advocated that policy in signed communications to the press. Other Egyptians followed this lead so faithfully that the Mission returned to London without a single Egyptian of any note laying his views formally before it. The common people, most of them illiterate, so sided with the Nationalist leaders that even in the remotest villages the Mission was given the cold shoulder.

Ingenious attempts have been made in the press to give the impression that though publicly Egyptian leaders were not willing to appear before Lord Milner and his colleagues, some of them privately and informally discussed matters with them. Such aspersions on Egyptian character are baseless. So far as I have been able to discover, no responsible Egyptian leader followed such a devious course.

It goes without saying that nothing would have more delighted the bureaucracy in Egypt than the appearance of a schism in the Egyptian ranks. While the Milner Mission was preparing to go to Egypt, we were given to understand that such a fissiparous movement had actually occurred. Telegrams poured in from Cairo bringing news of loyal demonstrations held in various parts of the country, assuring the Mission a welcome. Whoever engineered this attempt reckoned without the solidarity of the Nationalist sentiment, which made it impossible for Egyptians to negotiate with the Mission so long as it insisted that Egyptians must not make any suggestions incompatible with the continuance of the British Protectorate over their land.

Had the boycott of the Mission not been a complete success, it is impossible to conceive that Lord Milner and his colleagues would have conferred with the Egyptian delegation headed by Zaghlul Pasha after their return to London. Though no authoritative announcement on the subject has been made, it is to be presumed that the Mission

must have permitted the delegation to state its case in its own way, without insisting upon the limitations regarding the Protectorate previously imposed.

That Lord Milner did not permit any considerations of prestige to prevent these negotiations shows that he truly is endowed, in no small measure, with the gift of statesmanship. He has, however, laid himself open to criticism from that school of British politicians who believe in the good old doctrine of determining the policy that they consider good for a nation under their tutelage, and imposing it upon that nation. They have been further offended by Lord Milner permitting the negotiations to extend over several weeks, and of late have not hesitated to express their impatience. It must, however, be patent to all right-minded persons that Lord Milner could have followed no other course without laying his people open to the charge of professing principles which they failed to apply in the case of their own subject-nationalities.

While the Milner-Zaghlul negotiations are proceeding, a study may be made of the causes that have brought about the present *impasse* in Egypt, and of the Egyptian Nationalist demands, with a view to determining how the situation can be improved.

II

The 'absolute rupture between the British Administration and the people of' Egypt is due to a series of causes, immediate and remote. The Egyptians were told, at the time the British occupied their country, that the Occupation was temporary, and since then more than once they have had statements from responsible British statesmen making them hope that the day of their independence was not distant. For almost forty years, however, they have waited in vain for the fulfilment of that hope. In the meantime, the country has been administered by a system which outwardly gave Egyptians authority while actually

all power was vested in British agents and exercised by them. Any effect this illusion may have produced was destroyed by the statement made early in the Occupation by Lord Granville, who wrote, in the course of a dispatch: 'It is essential that in important questions affecting the administration and safety of Egypt, the advice of her Majesty's Government should be followed as long as the provisional occupation continues. Ministers and Governors must carry out this advice or forfeit their offices.'

Anyone who knows aught of Egypt does not need to be told that this instruction has not been a dead letter. If any Egyptian appointed to an office refused to bend to the will of those whose nominee he was, he had to go. It needs no stretch of the imagination to realize the demoralizing nature of such a system. It has stung the self-respecting Egyptians to the quick, and made it impossible for some of the ablest among them to accept office.

It is claimed that the system has not been entirely fair to the British agents in Egypt. As there has been no line of demarcation between their responsibility and that of the Egyptians, they have often had to shoulder blame for action which they did not initiate or sanction, and, in some cases, of whose very existence they were unaware. These disadvantages have not, however, led Britons to boycott the Egyptian service. On the contrary, such meagre information as has been permitted to leak out shows that the number of British officials in that country has been steadily increasing—increasing quite rapidly during recent years. While at first the avowed intention seems to have been to employ only British experts in positions of responsibility, gradually places have been found for callow youths from Britain, even in outlying districts.

This tendency has exacerbated feeling in Egypt. So long as more 'jobs' were found for young Britons, no Egyptian could believe in the sincerity of the profession that Britain was in occupation of that country in order to

educate and to train the sons of the soil to manage their own affairs.

Such faith had already been undermined by the parsimonious attitude of the British advisers towards education, no attempt having been made by them to provide funds for starting a real university, and such institutions for higher learning as existed having been starved. So little effort had been made in the direction of elementary education that after forty years of British occupation, 92 per cent. of Egyptian men and more than 99 per cent. of Egyptian women were illiterate at the time the last census was taken. What else could be expected when only two per cent. of the Egyptian revenue was devoted to educational purposes?

Little has been attempted by way of technical and agricultural education. No wonder that the result is that no industries have been started by the Egyptians, while the *fellaheen* (peasants) conduct farming operations with primitive implements and methods. No encouragement has been given by the State to Egyptians to establish banks and mercantile houses. Banking and commerce are controlled by foreigners, who, under the 'capitulations,' enjoy special privileges. The Greeks, Italians, French, and other foreigners, belonging altogether to fifteen nationalities, are not only able to evade any attempt that the Egyptian State may make to repress crime, but they are also able to evade bearing their proper share of the burden of taxation, which falls almost entirely upon the poorer classes in Egypt.

The war added to the difficulties of these classes. The methods pursued by the British agents in obtaining supplies and impressing Egyptians into the labour corps created grave unrest. But for these sufferings, the masses would have remained apathetic towards the political movement, and would not have joined in the boycott of the Milner Mission.

Had the representative assemblies, such as they were, not been suspended on the outbreak of hostilities, the popular grievances would have found vent. But the authorities feared that the assemblies would embarrass them in the prosecution of the war. While it is true that the Councils, as reconstituted by the late Lord Kitchener in 1913, were dissatisfied with the powers given to them and were pressing for greater rights in a manner that gave umbrage to British officials, it is exceedingly likely that a definite promise of generous treatment must have induced Egyptians to back up the British efforts to secure the defeat of Germany and her Allies.

III

It is no doubt a matter of pride for the British to be able to take nations under their protecting wing. But the feelings roused in the 'protected' nations, if they have a grain of self-respect, are those of humiliation and even resentment.

The Egyptians accepted the Protectorate for the duration of the war, because—it would be charitable to assume—they did not wish to make complications for the British. Two days after the armistice had been signed, however, Saad Zaghlul Pasha, accompanied by some of his colleagues, repaired to the Residency at Cairo and formulated the Egyptian demand for independence.

The Egyptian Nationalists ask for independence primarily because they believe that every nation has the inalienable right to govern itself according to its ethnic, moral, and material conditions. They point out that they have always cherished this ideal, and never ceased to claim independence. They consider that their victories on the battlefields actually won full sovereignty for Egypt, and insist that their country would have had the full benefit of those victories had not the concert of the Great Powers in 1840–41 compelled Egypt to put forward minimum claims and content herself with autonomy bordering upon

dependence. To-day, however, they feel that they have shaken off the shackles of Turkish suzerainty, which cannot be replaced by Britain because of Turkey being crushed by her defeat in the great war, and they are, therefore, determined to achieve the independence for which they have waited so long, and for which some of them have sacrificed their lives.

While declaring that they will be satisfied with nothing short of independence, the Egyptian Nationalists are fully prepared to formulate their constitutional government so as to safeguard the peculiar situation of the country in respect of foreign interests. In initiating the economic, administrative, and social reforms they are, moreover, willing to invoke the aid of the enlightened nations of the West. They are even willing to maintain the privileges of foreign residents, with such modifications as will ensure the progress of the whole country and safeguard all established interests. They pledge themselves to provide measures of financial control which, from the point of view of interested countries, will not be inferior in efficacy to the system preceding the agreement of 1904, agreeing, if necessary, to permit the *Casse de la Dette Publique* to remain the main organ of financial control. They are not averse from accepting any measures that the Powers may suggest to secure the neutrality of the Suez Canal.

Egyptian Nationalists, however, insist that they shall be freed from all tutelage. They desire to have their independence guaranteed by the League of Nations, and, in that case, promise to contribute as much as the resources of their country will allow to the realization of the new ideas of Justice and Right.

IV

If the policy that the Rt. Hon. Earl Curzon of Kedleston outlined on the eve of the departure of the Milner Mission is still the policy of His Majesty's Government, it is easy to see why the negotiations with the Zaghlul delegation

have been so protracted. The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs stated quite definitely on that occasion that Great Britain 'is unable to give any encouragement to the claim of complete national independence.'

Lord Curzon expressed the opinion that no one who had 'followed the history of Egypt for the last forty years and seen the astounding advance that she had made' under the British auspices, would question the necessity of British supervision. Egypt, if left alone, he declared, could neither protect her frontiers against aggression from the outside nor guarantee a strong, impartial government at home. She stood at the gate of Palestine, which country, he predicted, would before long come under British protection. Egypt's position at the doorway of Africa and on the high road to India rendered it imperative that Britain should maintain her Protectorate in that country. The British Empire could not, with any regard to its own security and connexions, relinquish its responsibility for maintaining a stable government in the Land of the Nile. Lord Curzon did not attempt to deny that Egypt was primarily an Egyptian interest, and that the good government, prosperity, and happiness of her people were the first concern. But the fact remained, he declared, that Egypt was also a British interest of capital importance, and, indeed, a world interest, and the world interest would be best secured by leaving the country under the aegis of a great civilized Power.

One *via media* suggested is for Britain to signify her willingness to become the mandatory of the League of Nations for Egypt. The solution that commends itself as the best in the circumstances is that Britain should secure Egyptian consent to the creation of a Suez Canal zone, after the manner of the Panama Canal zone. While she should have full authority in that zone, Egyptians should have control of their administration, subject to the necessary safeguards for foreign financial and economic interests.

ST. NIHAL SINGH.

Notes and Discussions

DR. HEADLAM'S BAMPTON LECTURES

THE Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford chose as the subject of his Bampton Lectures for 1920: *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion.* (Murray. 12*s.* net.) He thus fulfilled a design which had been in his mind for more than thirty years. Shortly before Dr. Headlam went up to Oxford Dr. Hatch had delivered his Bampton Lectures, which stirred up renewed interest in a problem which has always been keenly discussed in the Church of England. Just after he took his degree Dr. Lightfoot published his edition of the Epistles of St. Ignatius. Dr. Headlam's first years as a college tutor were mainly devoted to lecturing on the text of Eusebius and the problems of Early Church history, and since then he has kept himself in touch with almost everything of importance which has been written on the subject. He was able to present his views in some lectures at Westminster Abbey and in a series of articles in the *Church Quarterly Review.* In the Bampton Lectures he deals with the historical problem: What is the origin of the Christian ministry? and then faces the practical question of religious reunion. The lectures appeared before the Lambeth Conference of Bishops, and were therefore singularly opportune. They follow the purely historical method, which seeks to construct a history of things as they were, and then ultimately to draw conclusions from that evidence. 'During the first century of the Christian era the old conception of a national religion peculiar to a city or people and distinct from that of any other nation had ceased to be really tenable, and with it passed the identity of the religious and secular organization. A universal State needed and created the conception of a universal religion, and a government, which, by the necessities of the case, was mainly secular and normally intolerant, fostered the growth of the idea of a Church as a religious society apart from a State.' Judaism never ceased to look forward to a restored Jewish State. It remained exclusive, isolated, unchanging. Christianity used the word *ecclesia* to embody a 'new conception for which the world was ready, which was the spiritual fulfilment of principles innate in Judaism, and awaiting development; which only came into being in the new life and revelation through Jesus Christ.'

Dr. Headlam next asks, In what sense and to what extent did our Lord found a Church? It was in His purpose and plan. He prepared for it; He collected round Himself a body of disciples and apostles; gave them a commission which implied an extension of

work after He was taken away. The simplest way to interpret the words of Christ to Peter is to take it that they mean exactly what they say. Peter, who had best understood his Master, was to be the one through whom in a particular way the new community was to be built up. He was to fill exactly the position which, according to the history of the Acts, he did fill.

Dr. Headlam proceeds to consider the Apostolic Church as seen in the Acts of the Apostles and the catholic epistles. From that survey it seems clear that not one of the rival systems of Church polity which prevail at the present day can find any direct support in the New Testament. We have the name episcopacy, but its signification is different. 'There is no definite Biblical authority for episcopacy.' We next come to the development of episcopacy and the organization of the Catholic Church. The organization was not based on specific apostolic rule. The church of the apostolic age was 'governed by a body of presbyters with a chairman. Starting from this, monepiscopacy was quickly and early developed. Then after the Apostles had passed away and the first great missionary impulse had ceased, the bishops took their place as the force which welded the Church together, and represented the corporate authority of the whole body.' The Church in her first ages exhibited a swing and an advance which has not always appeared since. One secret of her power was that she never allowed the dead hand of the past to spoil the freedom of her action. St. Augustine's teaching forms the subject of the fourth lecture. Had he known Greek his logic might have become his servant, not his master, and the oversubtlety of his speculations might have been checked by humanism. His identification of the Church with the Kingdom had a far-reaching influence in building up the Mediaeval Church as a world-power. The epochs of the great divisions of the Church are studied, and the conclusion is reached that to repair the breaches of the past the modern Church must learn the simplicity of the gospel which is in Christ, lay aside all spiritual weapons, and restore to the world that conception of unity in one universal Church which represents most truly the mind of Christ.

The last three lectures are constructive. Professor Headlam brings out the meaning of the Creed as to One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Church. That Church is the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world. Schism is a division in the body the sin of which lies with those who are the cause of the division. As to the 'Wesleyan Schism' there were two elements. 'On the one side was a Church which, however much it may have possessed traditions of personal piety, had lost much of its spiritual life. On the other side a religious movement full of spiritual life, with some of the self-assertion and want of discipline which often accompanies a spiritual revival. A Church which was sufficiently spiritual might have absorbed the new movement; a Church which was partly dead and hampered by secular traditions could not. There is no need to be too anxious to condemn ourselves—a fault

to which, perhaps, we are somewhat prone, but we cannot doubt that the Wesleyans who separated themselves were not the only schismatics. There was a breach of the unity of the Church in England, a schism was enacted, and the guilt of schism does not lie only on one side.'

Dr. Headlam holds that the Christian Church consists of all baptized Christians who believe in the Lord Jesus, and that it is our duty to do all that in us lies so far as is consistent with Christian truth to break down the barriers between ourselves and other Christian bodies. He believes that the historic episcopate presents a basis on which we can unite. It is older than our divisions and comes to us with some real authority. Anglicans have exaggerated episcopacy; Presbyterians have set undue emphasis on presbyters; Congregationalists are beginning to feel that they are much too independent. 'We have to aim at restoring the broken unity of Christ's Church, and at combining' in a reunited body all the severed strands of a complete tradition.' Our duty is to be loyal to the religious society to which we belong, and to make it as truly represent as possible the apostolic ideal. As to a valid ordination Dr. Headlam holds that according to Scripture all that is necessary is the laying on of hands with prayer. 'No other form or ceremony can be considered essential.' Christ ordained two sacraments, and instituted a ministry for His Church. 'In the present divided and imperfect state of the Church all those who celebrate the sacraments according to the command of our Lord and with the full intention of fulfilling His will, and who appoint their ministers as His Apostles did with prayer and the laying on of hands must be held to have valid sacraments and orders, but to create a united Church, which shall be a real organic union, we must follow that which became the universal rule of the whole Church, and is even now accepted by the vast majority of Christians, and accept the traditional ministry of episcopacy, and episcopal ordinations, and administer them in a careful and orderly way.'

The last lecture is on Reunion. The undivided Church was a living, organic whole. It had no excessive uniformity. A bishop or priest from any one part of the Christian Church could take his place in any other church that he visited on terms of equality, without doubt or hesitation. That Dr. Headlam regards as the real unity we should aim at, and to him it implies a conscious unity of faith and a common form of organization. He thinks that the proposed corporate communion and the interchange of pulpits will not promote reunion so long as we are not agreed on the fundamental principles of faith and order. As to a policy of reunion, the Churches which have episcopacy should solemnly and formally recognize one another's Orders as valid and give them authority for the Church of England. 'Our Orders have all been imperfect; they have none of them been really catholic because they have been the Orders of a divided Church.' The National Churches which have not an episcopal organization and the Church of England should formally and solemnly

recognize the Orders of each other as valid, and each give the ministers of the other Church authority to minister to its people.

That is Dr. Headlam's practical scheme for reunion. He would recognize the validity of all Orders conferred by the laying on of hands with the intention of fulfilling the command of our Lord and the teaching of His Apostles, and would accept 'all other sacraments thus performed as valid.' Then he would establish episcopacy and the rule of episcopal ordination and consecration as the recognized common basis of Church order.

It is certainly the most broad-minded and promising scheme that has yet been proposed, and coming as it does from the Regius Professor at Oxford it has peculiar significance. The frank recognition of the Orders of other Churches would go far to produce an atmosphere in which the solution of other problems would be possible, and if that recognition is made we do not see why any Church should be required to accept episcopal government. If it is the most venerable and most efficient mode of government it might well be trusted to make its own way to general acceptance. Dr. Headlam's view of its history and claims will certainly go a long way to disarm prejudice and give the subject a candid and favourable consideration from all branches of the Church. The last sentences have an application for all. 'The world needs that we should strengthen spiritual principles against materialism and selfishness. To that end we must put aside self-will and self-assertion; we must be ready to listen and to learn, as well as to teach. Faith, humility, and charity must be the weapons with which we attempt to recreate the sense of brotherhood and of divine things in the world.'

JOHN TELFORD.

THE ARMENIANS IN INDIA

WE generally think of the Armenians as a strange, picturesque, and much persecuted people; whose geographical situation has exposed them, through long centuries, to the fanatical hatred of their fierce oppressors. Their deep miseries, and the fact that they suffer because of their Christian faith, have given them a special claim both on our human sympathy and our religious regard. We have felt it a reproach to Christendom that it has not been able to do more for the protection of this unfortunate people, whose ancient Church was once known as 'Sentinel of the Faith and the advance guard of Christianity.' At the same time, we have felt them to be a remote race, having nothing but their religion in common with ourselves.

But if we turn to the records of our own connexion with the more distant East, we find that the Armenians were very closely associated with us in our earlier adventures in India, and that they were, in general, our firm and faithful allies. They are there with us to this day, though few in number; and though their political importance has passed away, they are still a somewhat notable people from a commercial point of view.

About 1704, Shah Abbas, the Persian, overran and conquered Armenia. He behaved with the most cruel ferocity, stripped the country bare, plundered the sacred places, and finally transported large numbers of the people to Persia. It is said that some 12,000 families were thus torn from their ancestral home. These he settled in the neighbourhood of Ispahan, and to this day the wealthier Armenian families from that locality have been sending their sons to India for a better education than they could obtain at home. The story of the Armenians in India is, on the whole, peaceful and prosaic. Except in isolated cases they do not figure in military or political spheres, and have been content with the substantial rewards of commercial life. Their history is obscure because they did not conduct campaigns, dethrone dynasties, nor set up new kings; but they had wealth, sagacity, and enterprise, and they were good friends of ours in many an anxious hour. They built no cities and founded no fortresses, and their story is not embodied in brick or stone. It is written chiefly in old account-books and in the veracious 'Minutes' of the 'Honourable Board.'

We may first mention the days of the Mogul power, the splendour of which was presently to fade before the rising might of Western lands. The fame of the Great Mogul had spread far and wide, and had in no wise diminished in its journeyings, and adventurous spirits from many lands found their way to the place of untold wealth and boundless opportunity. The shrewd and patient Armenian merchant was not likely to be out of the way at such a time, for he had, and still has, the eye of a hawk where business chances are concerned. Shah Abbas was as observant as he was ferocious, and he stimulated the ambitions of his new subjects to share in the spoils of trade with India. It was, no doubt, his high estimate of their value as colonists which led him to transport them to Persia.

From Bunder Abbas, in the Gulf of Ormuz, these busy traders first found their way to Surat and Bombay. At the former place, once the site of an important English 'Factory,' they cheerfully allied themselves with the Company's servants. They made themselves very much at home, and soon the Englishmen had good reason to be grateful for the aid of those who had a much greater facility for understanding their neighbours, and entering into their life and thought, than they had themselves. So the Armenian became a sort of middleman between the European and the Indian. It was not long before the English were largely forsaking Surat and finding their way to the north and to the east, and as they went their Armenian friends went with them. These semi-oriental people seem to have been peculiarly able to win their way to the confidence and esteem of the native powers. They established their position with the Moguls; some coming to hold responsible official appointments, while others prospered exceedingly in commercial pursuits, as many of them do to this day. But they did not attach themselves exclusively to the English. In 1645 they formed a permanent colony at Chinsurah, on the Hooghly, with the Dutch traders, building a good

church about the year 1696. They also established friendly relations with the Musalmans at Murshidabad, and settled on land granted them by the Emperor Aurangzib. Here, at a place then called Saidabad, they were an important people, and here their first church in Bengal was built.

In 1688 a formal agreement was entered into between the Armenians and the English, of which a copy lies before us. It is very quaint, but too long to reproduce. The alliance was very clear and well defined. It was brought about largely by the influence of one Coja Phanoos, from the old Persian headquarters, who had come to be regarded as a representative of his race, and was held in honour by the Directors in London. His people had suffered in India under disabilities which they resented. They had not the benefit of claims on either Mohammedan or English law, and they had no military power wherewith to secure or defend any position they had. The Directors said that Coja had proposed 'particulars for carrying on a great part of the Armenian trade to India, Persia, and Europe, by way of England, which will redound greatly to His Majesty's advantage in his customs, &c.' So the Armenians were to have equal share of all benefits and indulgences the Company should grant to English merchants; liberty to come and go in the Company's vessels; should be capable of holding property and all civil offices and preferments as if they were Englishmen born; also liberty to trade to China and other lands on just the same terms as Englishmen. Wherever forty of them could be found they should have land provided, and the Company would build them a temporary church, and give fifty pounds a year for seven years to support a minister. This document was signed and sealed in 1688, and to any one who is acquainted with the arbitrary and jealous character of the usual proceedings of the Company in India, it is somewhat astonishing, and shows that the Armenians were of high value to the British merchants.

In 1692 the Company, hard put to it for soldiers, tried to get Armenians from Ispahan: 'that is, if we could get them as good as the English. Not that they have altogether the same courage that Englishmen have, but because in conduct they are now so united to the English nation, and we and they have one common interest.' And 'in the absence of European troops they are the very best men to be trusted.' In 1694 the Directors said, in view of proposals for 'up country' trade, that if their agents endeavoured to establish it 'otherwise than by Armenians, they should infallibly come off with great loss.'

In Calcutta they found a congenial sphere, and made themselves extremely useful to the English. They knew the natives and their little ways, and dealt with great fairness by us; and wherever they went they showed themselves much more concerned about providing for the public worship of Almighty God than did their English allies. In 1724, dissatisfied with the building in Calcutta provided by the Company, they brought an architect from Ispahan, and built

for themselves the Church of St. Nazareth, which remains to this day.

In 1715 the patriotic unselfishness of Hamilton the surgeon, who had earned the gratitude of the Emperor, secured for the English very solid advantages at the Court of Delhi. But it was Coja Sarhand, an Armenian merchant, who piloted the adventurous traders to the imperial city. They met with many difficulties, but the tact and skill of this mediator and interpreter were of great value, and their successful negotiations owed much to him.

The Bengal 'Records' give many glimpses of this people. In 1749 much ill-feeling arose over the seizure by the British, in the Persian Gulf, of Armenian goods on an enemy ship, and the astute Nawab of Murshidabad came in as mediator. A very curious compromise was effected, but the English still talked of driving the Armenians away. When they found, however, that the French authorities awaited them with open arms, they thought better of it, and became good friends again.

In the dark days of Suraj-ud-Daulah and the Black Hole, unhappily, some of the Armenians, who had done us very good service, went over to the enemy. They received posts of trust and importance, but did not really represent their people, who, in general, were always loyal; and while old Governor Holwell and other survivors of the Calcutta tragedy were in durance vile at Murshidabad, they received much kindness from the Armenians there. Our allies suffered so much as a community, in Calcutta, in the disturbances of the time, that Clive extorted seventy lakhs of rupees from the Nawab, by way of compensation to them!

One Armenian traitor, Coja Wazeed, planned an alliance of the Musalmans and the Dutch against us; but the battle of Plassey put an end to his schemes and nearly put an end to him. Certainly the Nawab had some very capable and courageous Armenian officers in his cavalry and artillery, but the bulk of the people were true to their alliance, and linked their fortunes with ours.

In 1789, on the recovery of King George from a serious illness, a wealthy Armenian in Calcutta set free all the prisoners for debt then lying in the city jail. An admirable way, this, of joyful celebration! The King heard of it and sent the good man his portrait in miniature. At about the end of that century a sum of money was left to found an Armenian school. This and other benefactions made up a sum of £20,000 by 1821; and so the Armenian Philanthropic Academy began a long, honourable, and useful career. There was once housed what was proudly and patriotically called the 'Araratian Library.'

Claudius Buchanan, in his *Asiatic Researches*, and Heber, in his *Journal*, have interesting things to tell us about the Armenians in India. Heber once met one of their archbishops at Dacca, in Eastern Bengal. With a suffragan, he was visiting the Armenian Churches in India, and these strange ecclesiastics made a great impression on the Bishop of Calcutta. 'The archbishop,' says he,

'has every appearance of a mild, respectable, and intelligent man; he of Jerusalem seems shrewd.'

Probably less than a thousand Armenians are resident in Calcutta, but they are widely scattered in other parts of India, and they are excellent and thrifty business men. Where jute grows, where coal is mined, where estates call for management, there you find them. They are good lawyers, and some of them have climbed high in their profession. The Gaspers and Gregorys and Pogoses of Calcutta are Armenians, and they are not only good men of affairs, but of much kindness of heart. In religion, in loyalty, and in commercial and professional life the Armenian community in India has a record of which it has no need to be ashamed, and we and they have mutual obligations of gratitude and regard.

WILLIAM H. HART.

A CRITIC OF THE EVANGELICAL REVIVAL

MR. BARING-GOULD has been engaged for many years on the History of the Church and of Religion in England from the Reformation to the Oxford Movement. He has now published the part 'dealing with the final period,' which is 'of more immediate interest to the present generation, dealing as it does with the rise of Evangelicalism, in the Calvinism of Whitefield and the Evangelical Fathers in the Church, and in Lutheranism, which found its apostle in John Wesley.' The volume is published by Methuen & Co. (16s. net) and fills 378 pages. There is no need to add that it is pungent and highly spiced with amusing anecdote and incident, nor that it reveals a certain sympathy with Wesley's work. We cannot say, however, that it is well-balanced or well-informed on many points of the history. The Introductory pages on the action and reaction which marks our religious history reach the conclusion that out of Latitudinarianism, of which Bishop Hoadly was the most outspoken and able advocate, 'by the swing of the pendulum, arose Evangelicalism, inside and outside of the Church.' Mr. Baring-Gould holds that the effort of the Latitudinarians was to screw up the nation to the key of Probity. The gospel of probity rang throughout England, but 'it was an imperfect gospel, for it did not say a word as to the duties, that are chief of all, but not so obvious as those owed to country and fellow men—the duties owed to God.' A forcible contrast is drawn between that gospel of probity and the teaching of Liguori on lying in his system of Moral Theology approved by the Pope. Latitudinarianism 'failed as spiritual regenerator.' It left the heart out of consideration. 'It brought no message to the weary and heavy-laden, no comfort to the broken-hearted, no hope to the sinner burdened with the consciousness of his transgressions. The Atonement was, to the Broad Churchman, nothing but an awkward doctrine to be explained away. That Jesus Christ lifted up on the Cross could draw all men to Him was a figure of speech only. That the

Divine Spirit was an energizing presence leading to holiness was not in the thoughts of a Latitudinarian. In the vessel of the Church, Jesus Christ was conceived to be always asleep with His head upon a pillow. Should they rouse Him? God forbid. Let Him sleep on. Cover Him with a tarpaulin, lest the cries of the perishing reach His ears.' Mr. Baring-Gould points out the inadequacy of the organization of the Church of England to meet the needs of the people, and the lack of zeal in the bishops. No Methodist historian has been more emphatic as to the needs of the time than this critic. 'The people were perishing. The poor souls were like those drowning after a shipwreck. The crew of the official lifeboat were either drunk or asleep, or else could not find the key to the padlock that chained up their vessel. Were not these unauthorized volunteers justified in pushing out their own private smacks and flying to the rescue?' The critic allows that 'Wesley and Whitefield were sent to rouse Christian people from sleep, but not content therewith, they led them, whilst drowsy, into schism and error.' 'Wesleyanism absorbed into its body thousands and tens of thousands of simple, earnest souls, which the Church had been unable to attract or to keep; and this, because the appeal was made to the heart and not to the brain; to the spiritual nature in man, not to his intellect.'

This is true and well put, though it does not sufficiently recognize the appeal Wesley made to reason. But Mr. Baring-Gould astonishes us when he adds, 'The fatal blemish in Wesley's teaching lay in his making Instantaneous Conversion to be accepted as self-absolution from all sin, much like a plenary absolution as accorded by the Pope, with this difference, that in the latter case it was given by one who pretended to be the Vice-gerent of Christ, whereas in the former, every man was qualified to absolve himself. Moreover, the ebullition of excited feeling producing Conversion carried with it a tendency to be regarded as an end in itself, instead of being treated as a starting-point in a renewed spiritual career. This Wesley did not desire, but it was a consequence inevitable from the proclamation of his doctrine.' He says that 'the Romanist and the Anglican appreciate as sincerely as the Methodist the value of Conversion, but they regard it as the awakening of a sleeping, the rousing of a somnolent soul, to the responsibilities of life.' Mr. Baring-Gould can never have read the Rules which Wesley drew up for his Societies in 1742; or have studied his teaching as to holiness, which he described as the love of God ruling all the thoughts, words, and actions.

He has fallen into many errors. We have yet to learn that 'Wesley's personal power as a preacher passed away, having lost its novelty.' Nor did Wesley's followers, save perhaps a few wild enthusiasts, say, 'This doctrine of yours is not good enough for us. We want Assurance. Having tasted Conversion, we demand something more than certainty that our past sins are forgiven, we need to be convinced that we have no further concern about our future. We do not relish the prospect of endless battling against sin so as to reach Heaven.' That is indeed a travesty. Wesley was chary of

the word Assurance, but he believed that no true penitent who believed in Christ as his Saviour need be without the consciousness of God's forgiving love. He enjoyed it himself, and he never ceased to encourage others to expect the same blessing. Nor is there paucity of matter in Wesley's Sermons. He had no narrow view of his message. It included good temper and good manners; it meant redeeming the time from sleep and worldly amusement. It covered every side of life and of citizenship. What a strange thing also it is to speak of the Watch-night Service and the Covenant Service being 'instituted as sensational stimulants.' The Church of England in our own time has adopted the first, and Mr. Baring-Gould describes the latter as 'an admirable institution.' The famous story of the spell which Whitefield's oratory cast over Benjamin Franklin is, oddly enough, transferred to Wesley. Justice is done to his magnetic power as a preacher but not to his 'Appeals' to men of reason and religion. We wonder also what the great Evangelist would have thought of this criticism: 'Wesley lived on excitement, on producing excitement in those who heard him, and the excitement he provoked unsteadied both his own reason and that of his hearers.' Coleridge's grotesque critique about Wesley's 'rooted ambition, restless appetite of power and primacy' is endorsed. Southey himself was convinced by Alexander Knox of his error in bringing this charge of ambition against the Evangelist who gave up everything to win men for Christ.

Mr. Baring-Gould says, 'Wesley's gospel was imperfect. It was one-sided. It consisted of but a single vital truth, the need of conversion. But of another great truth, that the converted must progress to worship, to join with angels and archangels and all the company of Heaven in eucharistic adoration of Christ—of that he had no conception.' Had he not indeed! Let the critic read Wesley's Sermons on the Lord's Supper, and think of the protracted sacramental services held at West Street and at City Road, and of the way that Wesley led his people to the Church to share in the Sacraments. The passage headed 'Heaven regarded as a religious Botany Bay' is an outrage. The labours of the Wesleys and their early followers among condemned malefactors are among the brightest glories of Methodism. Sin was neither condoned nor trifled with, but Jesus Christ was set forth as mighty to save the true and humble penitent. His prayer was

> Remember, Lord, my sins no more,
> That them I may no more forget;
> But sunk in guileless shame adore
> With speechless wonder at Thy feet.

The letter quoted on pp. 86–88, from Lackington's *Appeal and Remonstrance*, with the comment 'If genuine, its admissions are invaluable,' is an acknowledged forgery. Wesley never wrote any such letter. John Annesley Collet confessed in 1801 that it was 'fictitious, being the invention of my own disordered imagination.'

Mr. Baring-Gould has been led astray by Lackington's 'vile' *Memoirs*, which he himself lived to regret. Southey gives a long note in the second edition of his *Life of Wesley* as to these fabrications. Collet declared that the originals were open to the inspection of any one who would call at a given place to examine them. Those who called could never see them. He was engaged or from home or the letters had been lent for the inspection of others. Lackington himself makes a similar statement in the second edition of his *Confession*.

It is quite misleading also to speak of Wesley's evangelical followers as singing

> Doing is a deadly thing,
> And doing ends in death,

'as though the leading a godly and a moral life incapacitated a man for heaven and precipitated him into hell; good acts themselves were vitiated by original sin, and reliance upon them was unpardonable.' James Proctor, the writer of the hymn, was a Scotchman who became a Congregational minister at Hawick, and died in 1860. We do not like the hymn, but the Rev. James Mearns explains the writer's meaning as 'Do not attempt to work out a righteousness of your own and refuse the free salvation offered you by Jesus Christ, for that is a deadly and dangerous course of action. Submit yourself to Jesus Christ, accept His offer, and you will find in Him all you need.' It is another mistake to say that Toplady's 'Rock of Ages' 'was written in a fit of controversial heat with Wesley, *who in return, composed* "*Jesus, lover of my soul.*"' That hymn was written by Charles Wesley a generation earlier.

Nor was it under Wesley's preaching that his mother found a peace that she had not known before. It was while her son-in-law, Hall, was giving her the Sacrament. The statement that where 'Methodism is allowed fully to develop itself, as among the negroes of the States of North America, Antinomianism runs riot,' is altogether unwarranted. We are sorry that Mr. Baring-Gould should have committed himself to such statements, and should have garnished his pages with so many unsavoury anecdotes of doubtful authenticity.

THE EDITOR.

WHAT ARE 'OUR' DOCTRINES'?

IN the July Number of this Review, the Rev. T. F. Lockyer appropriately asks the above question; and seeking an answer, he turns to the 44 sermons to which the 'First Four Volumes' have now been reduced. He wisely leaves out of view the 'Notes on the New Testament' on the ground that all we need is to be found in the sermons. A still simpler and more effectual way is to read carefully Sermon 48, now unfortunately excluded from our standards, in which John Wesley himself answers the above question. It was published by him in 1765 as a pamphlet, entitled 'The Scripture

Way of Salvation,' of which I have seen a copy, as a sort of manifesto in a time of theological unrest. In it we have his mature thought about the message of Christ to men.

The answer consists of two great doctrines, *Justification by Faith* and *Sanctification by Faith*. Of these, the former was already sufficiently expounded in earlier sermons; and in the above sermon, with conspicuous and repeated emphasis, John Wesley asserts again and again that 'exactly as we are justified by faith so are we sanctified by faith.' With great clearness and power he describes the nature of sanctifying faith, and urges his readers here and now to claim and obtain, by faith, this great blessing. His line of argument is practically the same as that in Rom. iii. 21–vi.

The contrast between this sermon and that on Christian Perfection in 1740 reveals the immense progress he had made in the interval. This doctrine is the most distinctive element in Methodist Theology. It is found, in Wesley's writings, so far as I know, only in this sermon. Consequently, its exclusion makes our standards to be a very imperfect statement of the teaching which evoked the Methodist Revival. In the providence of God, it finds permanent and abundant expression in Charles Wesley's hymns, e.g. Nos. 557-588. Through these it has reached the hearts and lips of unnumbered Christian men and women.

This happy result must not obscure the great value of the arguments and appeals of this sermon, more valuable than all else we have from Wesley's pen. It deserves to be read by every godly person every year. For this purpose it can be had in convenient form from the Epworth Press for a few pence. Its great value is recognized by the late Dr. Shaw Banks, in a fine quotation on p. 215 of his *Manual of Christian Doctrine*. But, to the mass of our ministers, it seems to be almost unknown, even to the writer of an article in the last issue of this Review.

It is high time that the phrase 'Four Volumes of Sermons' should be abandoned except for legal purposes. In the excellent 'Third Edition, with the last corrections of the Author,' it is used only once, describing the 'First Series consisting of Fifty-Three Discourses, published in four volumes, in the year 1771;' and is there printed in very small type. It would be much better, in questions to candidates, and other matters, to speak only of the First Fifty-three Sermons: a phrase which could not be misunderstood. This would save from oversight some good sermons, Nos. 13, 14, 48, which are well worth special attention.

J. Agar Beet.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I. The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. I. Prolegomena I. The Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds. (Macmillan & Co. 18*s*. net.)

THE leading idea of the Series of which this is the first volume is to continue the work begun by Bishop Lightfoot in editing Christian documents historically as well as critically. It opens with three volumes on the Acts of the Apostles, of which this is the first; a second volume, which is passing through the Press, will be devoted to the literary criticism of the Acts, and a third to the text and commentary. The series is to be extended down to the day when the Church obtained official recognition by the Roman Empire, and the help of experts on both sides of the Atlantic will be enlisted. For the present volume the editors are mainly responsible. Mr. C. G. Montefiore writes on the Spirit of Judaism; Professor Duckworth, of Toronto, on the Roman Provincial system; Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard, on Life in the Roman Empire at the beginning of the Christian Era. The volume is divided into three sections: The Jewish World, The Gentile World, and Primitive Christianity. The editors say in their Preface that it becomes 'increasingly certain that Christianity in the first century achieved a synthesis between the Greco-Oriental and the Jewish religions in the Roman Empire. The preaching of repentance and of the Kingdom of God begun by Jesus passed into the sacramental cult of the Lord Jesus Christ.' The Acts of the Apostles, in its early chapters, is our sole authority for this period. Without it we 'would be compelled to wander without a guide in the trackless forest of conjecture as to the way in which the Church organized itself and began its work.' To understand the actual character of the Christian faith at its outset, we have 'to go far afield in order to gather material, which, though at first sight irrelevant, bears directly on the problem.' In accordance with that scheme, the survey begins at Jerusalem, which may be compared to Durham, as owing its 'importance to the strength of its strategical position as well as to its sanctity. Just as in our northern city, the castle and the cathedral were almost equally difficult to attack, so in Jerusalem the Temple was as formidable a fortress as the great towers in its vicinity.' A survey of Jewish history is followed by Mr. Montefiore's study of The Spirit of Judaism. He thinks that the fundamental difference between the

Jew of 350 B.C. and of 50 A.D. would be that the first believed that so far as bliss was concerned, death was the end; the latter believed that for the righteous, at any rate, the higher happiness would only be experienced beyond the grave. In 50 A.D. also, Judaism had begun 'to suffer from the burden of an inspired and perfect book, of the authority of which its teachers were beginning to feel the overwhelming weight.' Mr. Montefiore feels when he reads any early Rabbinic document that one advantage of Christianity over Judaism was that it had a fresh start. This illuminating study is followed by another on 'Varieties of Thought and Practice in Judaism,' which is a mine of information as to sects and parties. The Dispersion is shown in a detailed survey to have been 'a world-wide organization of a nation and a religion, permeating an immense empire and extending far beyond its frontiers.' Then we turn to the Gentile world which around the Mediterranean at the beginning of the first century was unified by habits of thought and expression and almost of language; philosophy of every school had become primarily religious and moral. Hellenistic life contended with Judaism. Neither conquered. Judaism survives, 'changed, and in some ways purified, but still essentially the same, in the synagogue; and radically altered, yet vigorously alive, in the literature, ethics, and hopes of Christianity.' The section on 'Primitive Christianity,' for which the editors are responsible, is an attempt to show the development of thought and practice which produced the Christian Church of the middle of the first century. The editors say it is clear that St. Mark's Gospel was 'composed partly to show that the deeds of Jesus during His ministry prove that He was the Messiah, though He never made the claim.' The evangelist's interest was the same as that of the disciples in the early chapters of Acts, whose preaching was 'Jesus is the Messiah.' This treatment of St. Mark is unsatisfactory, and so is the discussion of the title 'Son of Man,' with whom the editors hold that Jesus 'did not openly identify Himself.' His identification with the Davidic Messiah 'was the belief of the disciples: it may have been, but probably was not, the belief of Jesus: it was not part of His "gospel," though it was the centre of theirs.' That will show the tendency of the discussion and the way in which the editors are inclined to minimize many passages of the Gospel. It detracts seriously from the value of the volume. The effort to explain everything by the influence of Paul has been dwelt on too exclusively, and the writers ask what account the Synoptic Gospels and the Acts offer as to the subject when analysed in the light of the results established by nineteenth-century scholarship. It is a new treatment whose results will be more clearly seen when the other volumes are finished.

Tutors unto Christ. By Alfred E. Garvie, M.A. (Oxford University Press. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The Principal of New College has found in his work among missionary students that there is need of such an Introduction to the study of

Religions as he has here produced. He is Chairman of the Board of Directors of the London Missionary Society, and believes heart and soul in foreign missions. He begins with methods of study and then reviews the history of opinions, hostile and favourable. Rationalism represents religion as an artificial and arbitrary product of human thought and life; intuitionalism insists that the belief in and worship of God is inborn in the mind of man. Theories of the origin of religion form the subject of an instructive chapter. After laying the foundation with scholarly care, Dr. Garvie proceeds to compare 'Christianity and other Faiths.' He selects Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, and asks How is the reality of God represented in them? What is the ideal that is presented to man? How is the relation between God and man conceived? What in this relation is promised for the future life as well as performed for this life by God on behalf of man? Lastly, how do Buddha, Christ, and Mohammed compare as regards character? He justly states: 'No argument for Christianity remains so convincing and no appeal so constraining as Christ Himself. Later speculation does not need to transform Him into something other than He was, as the Mahayana had to do with Buddha; nor need any adherent of His faith to-day make an apology for Him, as is now felt to be needful for Mahommed. By this test alone Christianity can be proved superior either to Buddhism or to Islam.' Some practical suggestions are offered as to the attitude of the missionary in reference to other religions. It is a masterly survey of a great subject in small compass.

An Outline of the Religious Literature of India. By J. N. Farquhar, M.A., D.Lit. (H. Milford. 18*s*. net.)

This volume belongs to the noteworthy Series—'The Religious Quest of India'—of which Dr. Farquhar is one of the editors. It has grown out of the fact that whenever the author has tried to think his way through the history of any one of the chief Hindu sects or philosophies, he has found his path barred, because the religious literature is so imperfectly known. The object of the volume is to give a clear survey of the literature so far as critical inquiry, translations, &c., have made it known. It deals only with religious literature and ends with the eighteenth century. To bring together all that is known about Hindu, Buddhist, and Jain literature, in Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit, or the modern vernaculars, and exhibit it as one historical development, is extremely illuminating. This is done in seven chapters which begin with the early Vedic religions, as seen in the hymns of the Rig-Veda; Transmigration and Release; The movement towards Theism; Philosophies and Sects; The Sakta systems; Bhakti and Muslim influence are traced in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism. That is the framework of the book. The date at which transmigration and karma made their appearance is not known even approximately. There is no trace of transmigra-

tion in the Vedic hymns, and the Brahmanas have only a few traces of the lines of thought from which the doctrine arose. 'In the Upanishads, however, and in all later Hindu literature, the doctrine is universally accepted, and enters as an active force into almost every element of Hindu thought. Through the spread of Buddhism the doctrine was accepted by the population of the centre, the east, and the south of Asia.' It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this change. The doctrine seems to have met a need of the time, for it spread steadily among cultured men in North India. It gave all conduct a moral meaning and made every man realize his individual responsibility. Its evil effects were not evident at once, and for centuries it sufficed for thinking Hindus. The Hindu movement towards Theism—200 B.C. to 200 A.D.—shows two distinct stages, and in Buddhism there were also two unfoldings at the same periods. Great political changes formed the background to these religious movements. Between 200 A.D. and 550, the three religions set themselves to give the best possible expression to their philosophies. Peace and prosperity provided the conditions under which religious literature and culture could do their best. The early Puranas and a great series of Buddhist Mahayana Sutras were written in this period. The Syrian Christian Church of Malabar probably now came into existence. The Sakta systems began to appear about 550 A.D. 'The exaltation and the adoration of goddesses is manifestly the first characteristic of these new theologies; but other forms of faith and practice were very prominent: an immense extension of the use of magic spells, a belief in the existence of occult channels and ganglia in the human frame, and in the presence of the goddess herself—coiled up like a snake and asleep—in the chief ganglion; a new type of hypnotic meditation believed to be potent to wake the goddess; and, in the sects, the inclusion in the cult of foul, gruesome, and degrading practices.' Each sect was expected to possess an Upanishad to prove that its teaching had come by revelation and was in full consonance with the Vedanta; and a manual to provide a statement of the theology of the sect and directory of conduct and ritual. The survey is one of the deepest interest for all students of Indian religions.

What Religion is. By Bernard Bosanquet, D.C.L., LL.D. (Macmillan & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Dr. Bosanquet's hope and desire in writing this little book has been to help those who feel the necessity of religion but are perplexed by the shape in which it comes before them. To the question—Does religion make my life more worth living? he says the answer might be: 'It is the only thing that makes life worth living at all.' No man is so poor, he believes, as not to have a religion, though he may not, in every case, have found out where it lies. The man who on the whole gets nearest the truth is the sincerest. Dr. Bosanquet begins with what he takes to be 'the central knot and need of all

religion: 'What must I do to be saved?' When we are saved 'we are at home in the universe, and, in principle and in the main, feeble and timid creatures as we are, there is nothing anywhere within the world or without it that can make us afraid.' The old phrase 'Justification by Faith' sums up the whole point and meaning of religion. 'Nobody is anything except as he joins himself to something.' Union with God is the soul of religion. That unity involves unity with man and nature. The religious man has a solid grasp of hope and progress as elements in life. He has them in himself and can see the supreme values at work, cleansing, organizing, ordering the world. The little book has much to say about sin, suffering, and prayer, and it is always suggestive. The last chapter is on 'The Religious Temper.' 'To be one with the supreme good in the faith which is also will—that is religion; and to be thus wholly and unquestioningly is the religious temper. . . To be as a little child means to keep hold, so to speak, of the direct handclasp; to remain in touch with the centre; not to go wandering after this clever notion and that.' 'If one could maintain this simplicity, supreme *bona fides*, sincerity of mood, and temper, and care about one's religion, mainly and especially with reference to those features in it which are truly and strictly religious, I believe the gain would be great.' Whatever a man's religion this little book will certainly fulfil its purpose and help him to find more in it and get more out of it.

Public Opinion and Theology. By F. J. McConnell. $1.50 net.
The Eyes of Faith. By Lynn H. Hough. $1.50 net.
The Church and World Peace. By R. J. Cooke. $1 net.
The Demand for Christ. By James W. Bashford. $1.50 net. (New York; Abingdon Press.)

Bishop McConnell's lectures were delivered on the Earl foundation in the University of California. He asks what limitations must be placed on the power of God to make the idea of a Sovereign God acceptable to present-day thought. The answer is that the divine power must be exercised under a sense of responsibility to the Christ in God. His rule over men must have friendship in it and provision for the rescue of those who go astray. The second part of the volume discusses 'Some Steadying Factors,' which may check the play of sudden gusts of feeling and bring man back to solider human values. Foremost among these are the teachings and life of Jesus and the belief in a Christlike God. The lectures are freshly put and full of insight. Principal Hough deals with that view of life which appears to Christian faith as it inspects the contents and the relationship of its own experience—The Moral Sanctions, The Christian Religion as St. Paul, and Augustine, Luther, and Wesley lived and taught it, The Holy Spirit, The Trinity, The Cross—these are some of the subjects treated in forty-two epigrammatic and suggestive papers. Bishop Cooke, whose ill-health recently led him to retire, writes on the rela-

tion of the Church to the purposes sought by the League of Nations. He shows the need and the possibility of such a League, and argues that a league of Christendom supplementing the political League of Nations will do more to prevent the recurrence of war than any coalition of governments or peace leagues ever organized. Intercourse between Europe and the United States, education and the Christian press all have their part to play. 'The opportunity of the Church to become the leader of humanity was never so inviting as now.' *The Demand for Christ* is a volume of sermons and addresses by the late Bishop Bashford on such topics as The Gospel and the Cross, Christianity and Education, Revivals of Religion. From first to last they are uplifting and inspiring.

The Shepherd of the Sea. By W. L. Watkinson. (Epworth Press. 6*s*. net.)

These are sermons that help one to think, and to think on great themes which lie at the root of religious faith and life. On the first page we learn that belief in a special providence is essential to our peace of mind. The difficulties attending such a belief are faced, and we are left waiting for the music that will grow into what now seems frightful discord; striking use is made of W. H. Hudson's experience in the church tower with a peal of eight bells. Mr. Watkinson draws his illustrations largely from science and travel, but he weaves them into the thread of his argument and shows the harmony between all the ways of God. There is a wealth of thought and reading in these sermons which stamps them as pulpit masterpieces, and one cannot read them without reaching firmer faith and larger hope.

The Spiritual Body. By C. E. Rolt. (S.P.C.K. 6*s*. net.)

This essay was sent to the S.P.C.K. after the author's death and Dr. Sparrow-Simpson was requested to edit it. He describes it in his Introduction as the reflections of an independent thinker of unusual philosophic power, on one of the difficult problems of Christian eschatology. In some respects it is distinctly conservative, in others it makes startling deviations from the accepted view, regarding Lazarus as not dead but in a swoon. Its purpose is to show that the natural body and the spiritual are intimately related; that the human spirit will never be bodiless, and that the body of the intermediate state will be followed by the body as the perfect expression of spirit in the life of heaven. The germs of the intermediate body and the spiritual body are, it is maintained, already contained within the natural body. St. Paul's experience, as described in 2 Corinthians xii., suggests that 'in that moment of ecstatic vision the spiritual body, which had grown strong within its sheltering prison, broke loose for a time and performed its spiritual functions unhampered by the grosser body of the flesh.' That experience of the spiritual body, Mr. Rolt suggests, lies at the root of his teaching in

the fifteenth of First Corinthians. It is a very ingenious study, and though at some points one cannot accept its conclusions, they are suggestive and sometimes illuminating.

The Temptation of Jesus. By W. J. Foxell, M.A. (S.P.C.K. 6*s.* 6*d.* net).

The subject is viewed in reference to the personal life of Christ and its relation to the moral conflict inseparable from man's spiritual life in this world. The text of the narratives; the Fact of the Temptation, the Sinless One, are studied in the first three chapters; then a chapter is given to each temptation and Jesus is shown to be tempted as representative man. It is a well-balanced, scholarly, and devout study of a subject that never loses its interest or its application to ourselves.

The Resurrection of Christ. By J. Mackintosh Shaw, M.A. (T. & T. Clark. 9*s.* net.)

This is an enlargement of the article on 'The Resurrection of Christ' in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.* The opportunity has been taken to expand and amplify at different points, especially as to the nature of our Lord's resurrection body, with a view to greater clearness and explicitness. The Resurrection holds the place of centrally determinative importance in the Apostolic Church. Prof. Shaw examines the evidence for it in the Apostolic writings and in the Gospels, and brings out clearly the difference in Christ's body after His resurrection. The significance of the resurrection is impressively discussed, and two chapters are given to 'attempted naturalistic or semi-naturalistic explanations of the Apostolic belief.' The swoon theory, the theft, the vision, the psychical research, the mythological, and the spiritual significance theories are met in a convincing manner. Many will feel it a boon to have such a careful study of the whole subject in one compact volume.

King's College Lectures on Immortality. Edited by W. R. Matthews, B.A., B.D. (University of London Press. 6*s.* net.) These five lectures were delivered at King's College in the Michaelmas term of 1919. Dr. Bethune-Baker's subject is 'The Religious Value of the Idea of a Future Life'; Dr. Caldecott presents the argument from the emotions; Dean Rashdall deals with the moral argument; Dr. Brown with Immortality in the Light of Modern Psychology; and Dr. Relton brings out the Christian contribution to the conception of Eternal Life. Prof. Bethune-Baker holds that the belief in a future life is the construction of a long process of moral and spiritual experience, and if the universe is rational it is a theory so securely based as to become convincing. Dean Rashdall finds the ethical demand for immortality to be based on the unrealized capacities of human nature. Dr. Brown holds that the verdict of modern psychology is in favour of the possibility of a future life, though scientific proofs of its certainty are still to seek. The five candid,

well-balanced essays show that faith in the future life is a rational faith and may be held the more strongly when purged of some of the fancies which fear and hope have woven round it.

The Great Church Awakes. By E. J. Palmer, D.D., Bishop of Bombay. (Longmans, 5*s.* net.) By the Great Church is here meant the various churches which make up the Universal Church. Dr. Palmer traces the history of the ministry and the Sacraments, and reaches the conclusion that 'God has raised up many men who have been able ministers of the Word, and the Free Churches rightly recognized them as such, and I recognize them as such.' But he does not think it a true inference that, therefore, these men were entitled to minister the Sacraments. By drawing that inference he holds that the Free Churches threw away one divinely-appointed bond of unity, and greatly increased the divisive forces which the Puritan theory of membership always introduces wherever it is accepted. He believes that 'the undoubted graces and powers of Free Church ministers represent the refusal of God to be defeated by evil men and evil times,' but do not show that God intended the ministry of His Church 'to have an indefinite number of sources unconnected with each other.' The bishop dwells on the keen desire felt in India for unity, but his book is by no means so catholic-spirited as that of Dr. Headlam.—*The Hymn-Book of the Church.* By Frances Arnold Forster, S.Th. (S.P.C.K., 8*s.* net.) This is an attempt to describe the growth of the Psalter through its analogy with the compilation of a modern hymnal. The war made the Psalms alive, as they had been to Jewish pilgrims and Christian apostles. The evidence of the Psalms as to their own origin is well brought out, and the chapters on their religious temper, musical setting, their poetry, and the Creed in the Psalters are fresh and suggestive. All who love the great Jewish Hymn-Book will welcome this study.—*The Inner Meaning of the Four Gospels.* By Gilbert T. Sadler, M.A. (C. W. Daniel, 8*s.* 6*d.* net.) The writer thinks it needful to get 'behind the Four Gospels to the Gnostic idea of the Christ-Logos not as a man, but as a divine Life ascending and descending.' His aim is to show what the Gospel stories meant, and 'how nobly they contribute to the World-Religion of the Infinite crucified in the finite.' It is a weird business to watch these Gospel stories shorn of truth and reality.—*Gregory Thaumaturgus: Address to Origen.* By W. Metcalfe, B.D. (S.P.C.K. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.) Gregory's address on leaving the circle which had gathered round Origen at Caesarea gives the most graphic sketch we possess of that master. Gregory belonged to a heathen family in Pontus, and became bishop of the province. In the address he describes Origen's methods of instruction, and laments over his departure from that paradise to the far country of secular life. This neat edition, with its ample Introduction, will be greatly appreciated by students.—*The Church and Rural Life.* (S.P.C.K. 1*s.* 3*d.* net.) The Archbishop of Canterbury appointed a Committee to deal with the new situation which the Church of

England has suddenly been called on to face. A new independence has come to the community. The tenant-farmer has become owner; the labourer is freed from his shackles, and a new world has opened to him. He needs freedom to express his personality and to choose such forms of co-operative effort as will conduce to the contentment and prosperity of the local population. The report deals with the village home, leisure, and education. It has also much to say about the village parson and his relation to the people. It is difficult to exaggerate the value of the personal factor at the vicarage and the work that the clergyman's family can do to bridge over some wide gulfs in village life.—*The Seeker.* (Abingdon Press, 75 cents. net.) This is a pageant drama on Comparative Religion produced during the Centenary Exposition by the students of the Ohio University. The writer, Clarice V. McCauley, gives directions for reproducing it (25 cents. net). Mr. Kraft supplies original music to the interesting and instructive pageant.

The Meaning of Holy Baptism. By C. H. Boughton, B.D. (Longmans & Co. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) The Vicar of Calverley seeks to explain the inner meaning of baptism in simple and untechnical language. He discusses the subject of regeneration, describes the rite of baptism and the way in which it was administered on Easter Eve in the Early Church. The service for the baptism of infants is explained and the Anglican doctrine expounded. The unconscious infant cannot be regenerate in the ordinary sense that spiritual life has been begotten by the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit broods over it from its earliest days and begins to do His quickening work. The statement is reasonable and persuasive.—*The Revelation of Jesus Christ.* By Robert Caldwell, F.R.G.S. (Morgan & Scott. 5*s.* net.) This is an attempt to grasp the principles underlying the Apocalypse, though the writer cannot escape from the spell of numbers. The way in which his theories work out is seen on p. 155, where it is held that at the sixth trumpet one-third of the population of the earth will be 'smitten for the sins of the earth'! We may well exclaim in the writer's words 'Oh, friends, what a picture!'—*Modern Stewardship Sermons* (Abingdon Press, 75 cents net) and *Adventures in Stewardship* (75 cents net) are books that will suggest much to all who have to deal with church finance. They are full of good counsel and good sense.—*Making Missions Real* (Abingdon Press, 75 cents net) gives facts about the chief mission fields for use in schools and study circles. It is practical and instructive.—*Building the Congregation* (Methodist Book Concern, 50 cents net) has much to say about preaching, pastoral visitation, religious publicity, and methods for reaching the people. It will help many a minister in his work.—*Christianity and Democracy.* By S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 6*d.* net.) After dealing with government in general, the dangers and weaknesses of democracy are shown, and Dr. Prideaux reaches the conclusion that Christianity provides just the inspiration and moral power needed to avert these evils. The huge machine

of democracy presents the supremest opportunity for self-sacrifice, and Christianity precludes the party spirit and covetousness which would wreck the scheme. It is a forcible and well-timed pamphlet. —*The Stuff of Life*. By A. Alexander, M.A., B.D. (Allenson. 5*s*. net.) These forty-two brief talks on daily duty and religion are just what one needs for an hour of meditation. They are beautifully written and full of comfortable and inspiring thoughts.—*The Truth of Christianity*, by Lt.-Col. W. H. Turton (Wells, Gardner & Co. 2*s*. net), is now in its ninth edition, and deserves that marked success. It is a lucid, candid, and singularly complete survey of the whole argument.—*Documents bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship*, 1916–1920. (S.P.C.K. 2*s*. net.) Eighteen important documents bearing on this subject are given here in a form that will be very convenient for those who are considering the subject of Reunion in connexion with the Lambeth Conference. The Bishop of London's proposals for reunion between the Church of England and the Wesleyan Methodist Church are included.—*Fifty-two Talks to Young Folk*. By James Learmount. (Allenson. 5*s*. net.) This is Mr. Learmount's seventh volume of Addresses. We do not wonder at their popularity. He always has a message and he knows how to make it impressive and to fasten it on the memory.—*Studies in Faith*. By E. H. Sugden, M.A., D.Litt. (Melbourne: Student Christian Movement.) These studies have been arranged to cover every day for five weeks. Scripture passages are given for special reading, and a page or a page and a half is devoted to various aspects and instances of faith. The seventh day of each week has questions for review. To use the booklet carefully will be a valuable discipline of mind and heart.

Our English Sunday, by Frank Cox and H. S. Seekings (Epworth Press. 8*s*. 6*d*. net), is divided into two parts: Biblical and Historical; The Modern Situation. It is a most compact and complete survey of a vital subject, and gives many wise suggestions for those who are seeking to stem the tide of desecration which threatens the day of rest.—*The Coming of our Lord*. By H. Mudie Draper. (Epworth Press. 2*s*. net.) A careful study of the Scripture evidence bearing on this much-debated question. Mr. Draper reaches the conclusion that the idea of Christ's personal reign is altogether erroneous. His study deserves close attention.—The Methodist Book Concern, New York, issues *The Sunday School: An Evangelistic Opportunity*, by E. W. Hannan (75 cents net), which is a practical survey of urgent importance. It ought to stir up pastors, Sunday School workers, and parents to new endeavour.—*Great Characters of the New Testament*, by D. A. Hayes (75 cents net), gives studies of Judas Maccabaeus, the Baptist, Jesus Christ, Simon Peter, Paul, the Unknown Apostolate, and John the Beloved. It is a beautiful book for Bible readers.—*Little Messages for Shut-in Folk*. By C. W. McCormick (50 cents net). Twenty-nine brief meditations, followed by briefer prayers, make this a Godsend for sick-rooms.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

The Lollard Bible and other Mediaeval Biblical Versions. By Margaret Deanesley, M.A. (Cambridge University Press. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.)

This is the first volume in 'Cambridge Studies in Mediaeval Life and Thought' under the skilled editorship of Mr. G. G. Coulton. It deals with the absorbing problem of the Middle-English Bible. Sir Thomas More said in his *Dialogue concerning Heresies* that he had seen English Bibles, fair and old, in the houses of his friends, and that licences had been given for their use by the bishops. More wished to make such diocesan licence requisite for each reader of an English Bible but his friend Erasmus desired to have the Scriptures made accessible to all. Miss Deanesley says More would have been surprised to learn that the English Bibles he had seen in his friends' houses were merely the Wycliffite text, with the prologue omitted. Careful research brings her to the conclusion: 'There is almost historical certainty that, though found in the houses of the faithful, they were the Wycliffite texts, and that there was no important biblical translation, whole or partial, made in the fourteenth century before the days of Wycliffe's influence.' A vivid light is thrown on the history of Bible translations in England by the efforts made on the Continent by the thirteenth and fourteenth century inquisitors to suppress Bible translations. 'From the end of the fourteenth century, lay people of the upper classes could usually obtain licence from their confessors to use translations of parts of the Bible, as they could obtain other minor dispensations; but, broadly speaking, those who desired to obtain such dispensations were few, since Bible reading was not recommended as an ordinary pious practice for the laity, till quite the close of the middle ages. Till that period, the broad distinction remains that the Church took no notice of the making of biblical translations as such, but forbade all attempts at their popularization, and this from quite worthy motives and deliberate judgement as to the inexpediency of such a course.' A careful investigation of Continental conditions forms a background for the study of biblical translations before Wycliffe as known to his contemporaries and as known to us. A mass of information is given on this subject. Graduates who proceeded to the degree in theology were usually familiar with the text of the Bible, though more stress was laid on knowledge of the *Sentences*. Friars from their training were more familiar with the Bible than others; monks sometimes had great knowledge of Scripture but sometimes were almost completely ignorant of it. Priests were supposed to be able to construe the Vulgate and service books, but there are many indications that

this standard was never reached universally. As to the laity, even those who were well born and could read were 'almost as dependent as the illiterate upon services, plays, and the coloured windows and carvings of churches, for their actual knowledge of the Bible. Some dealt mainly with elementary Christian dogma, and with the virtues and vices; but the miracle plays sometimes represented biblical scenes chosen from the whole of the Old and New Testaments.' Wycliffe 'never included the need of an English Bible among the aims for which he openly and principally contended, but those for which he did contend led him almost inevitably to produce such a Bible.' There are two versions of the Wycliffite Bible. John Purvey, Wycliffe's secretary and literary executor, seems to have written the general prologue and to have edited the second version. The Synod of Oxford, in 1408, ordered that no one was to translate, or use the translation of any text of Holy Scripture until it was approved by the diocesan bishop or the provincial council. No translation received official sanction, but kings and nobles were allowed to possess English Bibles. Nuns were also sometimes licensed to use them, though the evidence is only found in connexion with Sion and Barking. At Sion especially, the nuns were drawn from the noblest and best educated classes. Miss Deanesley reaches the conclusion that the attitude of the mediaeval Church to biblical translation was one of toleration in principle, and distrust in practice. It is a mistake to suppose that there were mediaeval English Bibles before Wycliffe, and that the late fifteenth-century manuscripts of the English Bible were copies of that and not of the Wycliffite version. In England, as in the rest of Europe, the great majority of those familiar with the text of the Bible in English were Lollards, and Sir Thomas More recognized the general state of affairs when he made his messenger complain that 'the Bible is in so few folks' hands.' The study is one of unusual interest and importance.

Letters of Travel. (1892–1913.) By Rudyard Kipling. (Macmillan & Co. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The first of these three groups of letters—'From Tideway to Tideway'—appeared in *The Times* in 1892. They are descriptions of the United States, often caustic but always illuminating. The severest passage shows how lightly New York then thought of human life, of justice, and of good roads. 'If all the streets of London were permanently up and all the lamps permanently down, this would not prevent the New York streets taken in a lump from being first cousins to a Zanzibar foreshore, or kin to the approaches of a Zulu kraal. Gullies, holes, ruts, cobble-stones awry, kerbstones rising from two to six inches above the level of the slatternly pavement; tramlines from two to three inches above street level; building materials scattered half across the street; lime, boards, cut stones, and ash-barrels, generally and generously everywhere; wheeled traffic taking its chances, dray *versus* brougham, at cross roads;

sway-backed poles whittled and unpainted; drunken lamp-posts with twisted irons; and, lastly, a generous scatter of filth and more mixed stinks than the winter can carry away.' That is plain speaking, and Mr. Kipling says what he thinks wherever he travels. In Yokohama his mind turns homewards: 'London is egoistical, and the world for her ends with the four-mile cab radius. There is no provincialism like the provincialism of London.' But if he is severe he always makes us see the scenes through which he moves, and makes us share his zest in this earth of ours which 'is full of wonders and miracles and mysteries and marvels, and, in default, it is good to go up and down seeing and hearing tell of them all.' The 'Letters to the Family' were written after a trip to Canada in 1907. The picture of the lady waiting for her train is a little masterpiece, and one sees British Columbia with Mr. Kipling's eyes as 'the richest and the loveliest section of the continent.' The spirit of 'sane and realized nationality' filled Canada from end to end, but Mr. Kipling felt that when it came 'to taking thought, better thought, for her defence, they refuge behind loose words and childish anticipations of miracles—quite in the best Imperial manner.' 'Egypt of the Magicians' is the subject of the last set of letters, dating from 1913. To-day the Sudan has 'taken its place as one of those accepted miracles which are worked without heat or headlines by men who do the job nearest their hand and seldom fuss about their reputations. But less than sixteen years ago the length and breadth of it was one crazy hell of murder, torture, and lust, where every man who had a sword used it till he met a stronger and became a slave.' Only Mr. Kipling could have written these letters, and every page shows what unwearying study of men and things has gone to the writing of them.

Bishop Moorhouse of Melbourne and Manchester. By Edith C. Rickards. (Murray. 14*s.* net.)

The Dean of Melbourne paid high tribute to Dr. Moorhouse when he said 'The Bishop is all gold,' but no one can read Miss Rickards' memoir without endorsing it. His father held the office of Master Cutler in Sheffield, and hoped that his son would become his partner and successor in his extensive cutlery business. The son was on the best of terms with the workmen, but he hated trade and money-making, and asked that he might be sent to college with a view to being ordained. At the age of twenty-three he entered St. John's College, Cambridge. After taking his degree he passed a few months coaching a pupil at Bexhill. He was then greatly exercised by doubts, but when the struggle was keenest he prayed most earnestly for divine guidance. That night he awoke 'filled with the most marvellous happiness.' For about a fortnight that sense of direct communion with God and 'of being possessed by the personality of Christ' remained, and all his life long it gave him strength to stand up and fight battles for the truth. He did splendid work

among men in St. Neots and in Sheffield, and when he became Vicar of St. John's, Fitzroy Square, his preaching made a profound impression on such hearers as Lord Robert Cecil, afterwards Marquis of Salisbury, Sir Charles and Lady Eastlake, and others. Sir Oliver Lodge spent a winter with his aunt at 41, Fitzroy Square, attended the Vicar's Confirmation class, and felt his 'native gift of eloquence quite extraordinary.' After five years in Fitzroy Square he was appointed Vicar of Paddington in 1868. In 1876 he was made Bishop of Melbourne, and exerted a wonderful influence. His weekly courses of lectures in the Town Hall were every autumn attended by audiences of four thousand. He found religious teaching forbidden in the State schools and many children growing up heathens. He had a hard fight, but was able in 1881 to report that the prospect was much brighter and that with steady pressure it was quite possible that the study of the Bible might become one of the regular school lessons. In 1886 Lord Salisbury offered him the see of Manchester in succession to Bishop Fraser. For seventeen years he proved himself a worthy successor of that noble man. He had not Fraser's gift of expressing his sympathy, but he could say, 'I have loved you with a great, silent love,' and his diocese knew it. He was a wise leader who 'carried most weight in Convocation and in public affairs generally.' His years of retirement at Poundisford, near Taunton, were very happy, and there his long and devoted life closed on April 9, 1915. Miss Rickards has told the story simply and with never-failing taste and sympathy.

The Hittites. By A. E. Cowley, M.A., D.Litt. (H. Milford. 6*s.* net.)

The publication of the Schweich Lectures for 1918 has been somewhat delayed by difficulties about the strange characters and by the other occupations of the lecturer, but they admirably fulfil Dr. Cowley's purpose to arouse interest in a fascinating subject. Material for fuller investigation is only beginning to be accessible, and various statements may have to be modified, but there is much material here for the student, and the illustrations are of extraordinary interest and are wonderfully produced by the Clarendon Press. The first lecture is on the History. Forty years ago, or even less, the Hittites were regarded as an insignificant Syrian tribe, unknown outside the Bible. In 1870 two American explorers found inscribed stones at Hamath. Tyrwhitt Drake got copies of the text for the Palestine Exploration Fund and interest was thoroughly aroused, and by degrees the story of the rise and fall of the Hittite kingdom down to the capture of their southern capital Carchemish, in 717 B.C., by the Assyrians, became known. It was a trade centre in touch with the vast resources of Mesopotamia. The Hittites came from the East, probably from the Caucasus, and first established themselves at Boghaz-kani, and then spread westward. Dr. Cowley draws out the evidence of the monuments as to the religion of the Hittites and their physical

appearance and language. The last lecture deals with the decipherment of the Hittite hieroglyphic inscriptions, as distinguished from cruciform Hittite. The only real advance so far is due to Professor Sayce, who has worked at the baffling problem for forty years. We have two unknown quantities in hieroglyphic Hittite, 'a system of signs which we cannot read, and a language which we do not recognize. It is, therefore, a problem worth solving, but it requires some optimism.' Every one who looks through the closing lecture with its array of signs will feel what a task scholars have set themselves, and will not wonder that they are diffident as to their conclusions.

The Worcester Liber Albus: Glimpses of Life in a Great Benedictine Monastery in the Fourteenth Century. By the Rev. James M. Wilson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 15*s*. net.)

The Liber Albus of Worcester Priory is a heavy folio of 497 large leaves of vellum. It was originally bound in boards of white sycamore, whence its name. It covers the years 1301 to 1446, but Canon Wilson's selections of letters is taken solely from 1301 to 1388. It opens with a protest against the return of John de Dumbelton to the priory, which would 'disturb the quiet of our whole community.' The monks are willing to pay for his maintenance at some other house of the same Order, but plead with the Archbishop of Canterbury to prevent his return. 'We reverently fall at your fatherly feet, and with heartfelt sobs we pour out our earnest prayers, and pray that in this matter you will provide for the salvation of many souls, which in the event of an adverse decision will manifestly be imperilled.' The Bishop of Worcester invites the prior to dine with him on 'good fat and fresh venison, and an equally fat crane, which chance to have been sent us, and which we do not like to eat without you. It will be a pleasure to us both. Farewell in the Lord.' The correspondence about the tomb of this bishop, which encroached on the place where the sedilia should be prepared for the priest and other ministers of the altar, gives a picture of the times that one would be sorry to miss. The testimonial to a boy who had been 'well mannered, peaceful, quiet; in fact a boy of good disposition and praiseworthy life' forms a pleasant page in the old book, and there are many other vivid pictures of the time for which we owe Canon Wilson our hearty thanks.

The Influence of Puritanism on the Political and Religious Thought of the English. By John S. Flynn, M.A., B.D. (Murray. 12*s*. net.)

This volume attempts to appreciate the tendencies, making for righteousness and freedom, which have taken deep root in the English mind, and changed from time to time the course of politics and the outlook of Churches. The Puritan revolt is not difficult to understand. 'Folly surpassed itself in the handling of those strong-willed, righteous, narrow-minded men of the seventeenth century.'

Pym aimed at securing a constitutional monarch, a freely elected Parliament, and the supremacy of the House of Commons, and to that extent his policy triumphed. Mr. Flynn shows how England expanded under Puritan rule, describes the relation of Puritanism to art and literature, and the way in which it affected English-speaking people overseas. How Puritanism influenced Wesley and the Clapham sect and has left its mark on philanthropy through Earl Shaftesbury and others forms a very interesting study. He says the characteristic note of early Methodism was its joyfulness. Charles Wesley's hymns were sung by multitudes. 'All the nation broke into song, and the songs—a rare thing—contained "the whole counsel of God"—a whole body of sober, sound, Scriptural divinity.' For the moment Puritanism seems to have lost its savour. England's greatest need is a great apostle. 'A twentieth-century Wesley, a new Puritan, with a message suited to the age and with a key to England's heart would set us right in Church and State; since we may not doubt that a nation standing right with God could not fail to be right with man. A union of Christian forces could be brought bout by the Puritan parties in all the Churches, and from that union much might be hoped in winning the masses to a recognition of essential Christianity, in reconciling capital and labour, and permeating politics with a spirit of righteousness.

St. Patrick: His Writings and Life. By Newport J. D. White, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 6*s.* 6*d.* net.)

Any study of St. Patrick must begin with the little Latin tracts called *Confession* and *Letter*, which claim to be written by Patricius, an Irish bishop. Dr. White says they 'bear the stamp of genuineness upon them as plainly as does the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians or the Second to the Corinthians.' A study of their numerous Bible quotations is entirely favourable to the hypothesis that the writings belong to the middle of the fifth century. Translations are given of them, with valuable notes and brief introductions. The famous *Lorica* or breast-plate hymn is also given with three Sayings of Patrick and Muirchu's *Life of St. Patrick*, of which the first book must have been published before A.D. 699. The general introduction is of great interest, and the volume is the most complete and scholarly, in small compass, that we have on the famous saint of Ireland.

The Portrait of a Scholar, and other Essays written in Macedonia, 1916–1918. By R. W. Chapman, R.G.A. (Oxford University Press. 5*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The war took the Secretary to the delegates of the Oxford University Press into a strangely different world, but his essays, written in camps, dug-outs, and troop-trains, take from that fact an added interest. The title-piece is a delightful tribute to Dr. Ingram Bywater, who had once to confess that he had not known that *Sicilicus*, the forty-

eighth part of an *as*, meant by metonymy, a comma. 'Proper Names in Poetry' was suggested by the Poet Laureate's *Spirit of Man*, and there is a suggestive essay on 'Rhyme.' 'When I read poetry, poetry which pleases or moves one—and if it do neither I had rather be skimming the daily paper—I read with my ears open. If I am alone, or sure of my audience, I read aloud; if not, I declaim imaginatively, as a musician reads a score.' That confession forms a fit introduction to the next essay on the forgotten art of 'Reading Aloud.' Mr. Chapman quotes sentences which were not made for the eye to glide over. They must be spoken to be heard. He holds that to read as fast as the eye can travel is to miss much. 'The speaking pace is the true pace for degustation.' 'Old Books and Modern Reprints' dwells on the cult of first editions. A book co-eval with its author has a quality in common with his genius. 'It is a slender bridge across the ages, a faint clue to the past.' 'The Textual Criticism of English Classics' and 'The Art of Quotation' have their own interest, and 'Silver Spoons' is an amusing glimpse into a collector's mind. We are glad Mr. Chapman has gathered up the essays into this lively volume.

Our Smallest Ally. By W. A. Wigram, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.)

In an introductory letter, Brig.-Gen. Austin speaks of the special knowledge that Dr. Wigram has gained by his work among the Assyrians in Kurdistan and Urmi and the affection in which he is held by them. His pamphlet describes the fortunes of this people during the Great War. They were scattered over the region from Baghdad to Urmi and Diarbekr with Mosul as a centre, and are Nestorian Christians. These Assyrian mountaineers consented to fight for the Russians, and defeated the Moslems in fourteen distinct engagements. It is a story of rare heroism and devotion.

Reunion and Lambeth. By Sir Henry Lunn. (Epworth Press. 2*s.* net.)

Sir Henry Lunn's attempt to show what Wesley's attitude would have been to the present relation of the Church of England and Methodism was well timed in view of the Lambeth Conference, and his own Introductory Letter to the bishops shows the 'problems that confront a loyal Methodist who desires to live in that relation to the Church of England which was John Wesley's original intention for his people.' He describes his work as general editor of *The Review of the Churches* and his Conferences at Grindelwald. This leads up to Wesley's views on the Enabling Act, which means 'that those who have been baptized and confirmed, so long as they remain members of the Methodist Society, cannot be members of the Church of England.' Wesley is extraordinarily up to date. Sir Henry has put his points with force and knowledge, and we hope the bishops will give him a patient reading.

GENERAL

Enslaved, and other Poems. By John Masefield. (Heinemann. 6*s.* net.)

'ENSLAVED' is a long poem, but the story holds one's attention from the first line to the last. The lover who goes in the early April morning with flowers for his lady finds her house burnt down and sees the Moorish pirate ship in the distance bearing her away to the Khalif's harem. The lover follows in a little boat and gives himself up as a slave that he may be near her and rescue her. He finds a friend and escapes with his sweetheart, but the Khalif himself captures the three fugitives and has doomed them to a horrible death when the friend defies him to his face and wins their pardon and liberty. They are sent home in a swift felucca with a scarlet sail, and the story ends with rejoicing:

> All early in the Maytime, when daylight comes at four,
> We blessed the hawthorn blossom that welcomed us ashore,
> Oh, beautiful is this living that passes like the foam,
> It is to go with sorrow, yet come with beauty home!

'The Hounds of Hell' tells how St. Withiel freed the countryside from a horrible pack of demon dogs. Twice did the saint yield to panic as the hounds closed upon him; then the birds taught him how to get victory.

> Open the doors, good Saint! they cried,
> Pass deeper to your soul;
> There is a spirit in your side
> That hell cannot control.
>
> Open the doors to let him in,
> That beauty with the sword;
> The hounds are silly shapes of sin,
> They shrivel at a word.

'Animula,' a twelve-fold sonnet sequence, has its tragedy told with vivid force. 'Cap on Head' is another demon story, grim but powerful. The wife of O'Neill welcomes him back after his long wandering, little dreaming that it is a demon lover.

> His wife went happy in the lane
> And singing in the tower;
> The sweet of having him again
> Had ended all the sour.

'The Passing Strange,' 'On Growing Old,' and the beautiful 'Lyric' with which the volume closes strike a more pleasing note, but every piece is the work of a true poet whose gifts are ripening and whose art is maturing.

A History of English Philosophy. By W. R. Sorley. (Cambridge University Press. 20*s*. net.)

Professor Sorley's 'lucid and untechnical' account of English philosophy in the Cambridge *History of English Literature* laid the basis for the present survey. He has studied the leading English philosophical writers down to the end of the Victorian era in their lives and their books, and has sought to express what was essential in their contribution to thought. The philosophy of the Middle Ages attempted the systematization of knowledge according to the conceptions and methods of Aristotle. The chapter on the beginnings of English philosophy gives a clear view of the teaching of Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham, who was equally remarkable for his philosophical and political writings. The English language may be said to have become for the first time the vehicle of philosophical literature by the publication of Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* in 1605. His real contribution to intellectual progress does not consist in scientific discoveries or in philosophical system. 'He did more than anyone else to help to free the intellect from preconceived notions and to direct it to the unbiassed study of facts, whether of nature, of mind, or of society.' Locke, who may be regarded as, on the whole, the most important figure in English philosophy, is the subject of an illuminating chapter. Others excelled him in genius, but he was surpassed by none in candour, sagacity, and shrewdness. The chapter on the Victorian Era gives estimates of the work of Sir William Hamilton, Mill and Spencer, T. H. Green and Bradley, whose *Appearance and Reality* has 'probably exerted more influence upon metaphysical thinking in English-speaking countries than any other treatise of the last thirty years.' We have no estimate of English philosophy so lucid and so likely to interest and guide the ordinary reader as this, and the Comparative Chronological Table, giving the dates of the chief works in English philosophy with the dates of some other writings, English and foreign, and of some leading events, will be much appreciated.

India in Conflict. By P. M. J. Young, M.A., and Agnes Ferrers. (S.P.C.K. 8*s*. 6*d*. net.)

Mr. Young is an experienced teacher of Indian boys. He dwells on the antagonism between the educated section of Indian life and the official government, and shows that India may be no place for the high-minded, but it is the place for the great-minded and the great-hearted who are willing to give sympathetic co-operation and comradeship in rule, not domination, to the best Indians. The account of Indian Islam and the reason why it remained loyal to

us during the Great War is illuminating, and the chapter on the Intelligentsia helps one to understand the Indian student better. Miss Ferrers has worked among girls, and her part of the little volume deals with present conditions among the women. The Christian children of India present problems enough, but the parents are infinitely more difficult to teach. There is room for all kinds of workers, 'provided that they have the essential qualifications of sympathy, courtesy, and kindliness—parts of that virtue whose professors inherit the earth, be it East or West.' It is a book that will repay attention.

Brothers in Art. By H. W. Shrewsbury. (Epworth Press. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.)

The writer's fine volume on G. F. Watts has had a gratifying reception, and these studies in Holman-Hunt and Millais will not be less popular. A delightful chapter of biography describes the friendship between the two masters, which began in boyhood and lasted through life. Ten chapters follow, which set side by side companion pictures by the two artists and show how they interpreted great facts and features of life and character. It is a happy idea, and it is worked out in a most instructive and impressive way. Permission has been obtained for the reproduction of some of the finest masterpieces of the two artists, and these have been splendidly reproduced. There is no dull page in the book, and it will be warmly welcomed by all lovers of noble art and pure living.

A Reel of Rainbow. By F. W. Boreham. (Epworth Press. 6*s.* net.) A dusky little maiden of nine, when told that there was a new rainbow for every storm, exclaimed in delight, 'Why, then, there must be *reels and reels of rainbow* in the gully over the hill.' That gave Mr. Boreham the title for his new volume, and it is a prophecy of a bright succession of volumes, for it is as fresh, as picturesque, as radiant, and as hope-inspiring as any that have gone before it. There are eighteen studies, beginning with a tribute to 'Our Maiden Aunts,' which warms our hearts to these benefactors of our homes, and ending with 'The Sound of a Grand Amen.' We see the writer among his books and in his home; we follow him in his travels; we muse with him over life and its problems, and we close each study with eyes and minds enlightened by new visions of men and things. The Boreham Library is growing and growing more and more wonderful with each volume added to it.

The Passing of the Poor. By M. E. Blyth. (S.P.C.K. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.) Many interesting incidents of work as nurse and guardian are given in this little book. It begins with life in a London hospital and the slums of a northern city. It gives pictures of country cottages and those who live in them, and has much to say about outdoor relief, poor law guardians, and the workhouse. Some quaint anecdotes help us to look into the minds of the humble folk for whom better days have dawned.

My Neighbour, the Working Man. By James Roscoe Day. (Abingdon Press. 2.50 net.). Chancellor Day has lived with working men, and his College at Syracuse has found no better students than their sons and daughters. His fear is that the destructive Socialist may lead the working man to lean on strikes and violence as the means to larger wages and greater liberty. His book is a strong and timely protest against intimidation. 'The day has passed—it never was here—when laws can be passed or defeated by threats upon our free and fearless franchise.' He writes in a way that will arrest attention and will appeal to all that is best in American working men. The salaried mischief-makers should be got rid of; the strike abandoned as uncivilized and barbarous, and true Americans should 'work together for good citizenship, good business, good wages, and good fellowship.' No message could be more timely or more forcible.

Persecution of the Greeks in Turkey, 1914–1918. (Constantinople: Greek Patriarchate.) This account of the outrages committed by the Turks takes each diocese in turn and describes the sufferings of the inhabitants in place after place. 'A perfect reign of terror was inaugurated at Kirk-Klisse during the retreat of the Bulgarians and the return of the Turks, the former threatening the inhabitants with a wholesale massacre, while the latter plundered and pillaged them.' It is a tragic record, which demands the attention of politicians and adds new force to the demand for an end of Turkish tyranny.

Humours of a Parish and other Quaintnesses. By the Rev. W. B. Money. (Lane. 6*s*. 6*d*. net.) Mr. Money's first curacies were at Bakewell and at Drigg and Irton. Then he spent seven years as curate and twenty years as rector of Weybridge. His appreciation of the humorous side of life has helped him to bear many a burden of sadness, and his book will brighten many a quiet hour for his readers. The family doctor whose bill was swelled by repeated entries 'For anxiety of mind, 5*s*.'; the tinker who wanted to call his twins by names as much alike as possible and finally fixed on Abel and Arabella, the Irish clergyman who called the wise virgins 'acid spinsters,' because they wouldn't share their oil, are a few of his odd characters. He has delighted to meet them and to talk them over with his friends, and the result is a book which is full of amusing things told in the brightest and briskest fashion.

The Silver Tea-Shop. By E. Everett-Green. (Stanley Paul & Co. 7*s*. 6*d*. net.) Mrs. Silver's tea-shop is a great success and Jack Colquhoun makes it still more popular by its wonderful grill-room. He is the son of an inventor, and has a genius for all kinds of clever devices. There are two love stories, a thrilling exposure of a knave, and a dramatic sequel. It is a story that one does not easily put down, and the two girls and their lovers win and hold a reader's sympathy from first to last.—*Hidden Paths: an Everyday Tragedy.* By W. Scott King. (Epworth Press. 7*s*. net.) Theodore Lefevre

leaves her country home for London, where she has painful revelations of the seamy side of life. Amid all she keeps her high ideals, and when the clouds lift she and the brother for whom she had sacrificed her own comfort are on the way to real happiness and success. The retribution which comes to the money-lender is dramatic. It is a powerful story.—*Grass and Rushes and how to identify them.* By J. H. Crabtree. (Epworth Press. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.) Grasses grow in all conceivable situations, on the ledge of a disused coal-mine, in deep water, and on the highest hills and mountains. Every floret reveals some charming secret of plant-life when looked at through the pocket lens. Mr. Crabtree describes about fifty-nine different grasses and rushes, and the photographs of them are very well taken and capitally reproduced. The 'Identify' Series is one of the most attractive that we know, and this new volume will maintain and increase its reputation.—*What the Word of God says about Spiritism in its various Disguises.* Compiled by C. M. G. (Bath & Ward. 2*d.*) An impressive list of passages from the Old and New Testaments. It is much needed, and we are glad that it has reached a second edition.—*What is Wrong with the Stage?* By William Poel. (Allen & Unwin. 2*s.* net.) Mr. Poel thinks the theatre needs equal opportunity for showing good dramas as well as worthless ones. It has been carried on as an industry, instead of as an art. He makes various suggestions as to improvements needed.—*Bribery.* By R. M. Leonard. (S.P.C.K. 4*d.* net.) A compact survey of the legislation on this subject. Business men will be grateful for its protest against all dishonourable dealing.—*Chinese Pie* (C.M.S. 1*s.* net) is a novel combination of stories and articles by people who have lived in China, with the most amusing pictures. It will create deeper interest in a great missionary world.—*Kato's Prayer* (C.M.S. 6*d.* net) is an African story with outline pictures to be painted in colours. It will greatly please young folk.—*The New Zealand Official Year Book*, 1919. Prepared by J. W. Butcher, Acting Government Statistician. (Wellington: Marks.) Nearly a thousand pages are filled with every kind of information about the climate, population, industries, public health, &c., of New Zealand. It is wonderfully complete and well up to date.—*The Envelope System explained simply, with Examples and Success.* (Epworth Press. 3*d.* net.) This pamphlet is the best account we have seen of the new method and the results gained by its introduction. It ought to encourage many to adopt what is now a tried system and solves many financial problems.—*Plymouth*, by Arthur L. Salmon (S.P.C.K. 4*s.* net), is a small book packed with matter. The Three Towns are regarded as a unity from the first, though their final union was not accomplished till 1914. The chapters on the Sea-dogs of Devon, the Armada, The Mayflower, The Birth and Growth of the Dockyards, Churches and Public Buildings, and Notabilities are of great interest. It is a workmanlike and enjoyable little history.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

The Edinburgh Review (July).—Prof. Alison Phillips, in 'The Senate and the Covenant,' says that Lord Grey's letter in *The Times* as to the United States and the League of Nations created a sensation in America. 'It came like a blast of fresh air, dissipating the poison gas of suspicion in the minds of many Americans, and helping to reveal to them that, whatever else might be said about it, the Covenant of the League is not, and never was, a Machiavellian device for making the United States subservient to British ends.' Prof. Phillips reviews the course of the struggle in the Senate, and holds that 'but for the unfortunate action of the Conference in confusing the issues of making peace with the Central Powers with those involved in making the world peace permanent, the great association of the Entente nations would have remained unbroken, and peace would have been nearer than it is.'

Hibbert Journal (July).—The opening article by the Dean of St. Paul's on 'Religion and the State' deserves careful study. It is more instructive than most volumes on the subject, containing, as it does, materials for a philosophical and historical judgement on much-controverted religious questions. As a practical guide, the article is not so helpful. Dean Inge argues that 'the old idea, that the Church is the nation, under its spiritual aspect, is surely the right one.' His ideal of 'a holy Corporation' is a lofty dream. But like some other dreams, it may prove more potent than boasted actualities. Prof. H. L. Stewart's article on 'Mrs. Humphry Ward and the Theological Novel' is fair and appreciative, but he warns those who admire the accomplished novelist that fundamental discords in religion cannot be disguised with advantage, and that the 'clash of Yes and No' is often necessary to the attainment of truth. Prof. J. S. Mackenzie, under the title 'Ethical Religion,' discusses the old subject of the relation between morality and religion, with less than his usual force; while Prof. S. A. Cook's paper on 'The Interdependence of Religion and Research' attempts a similar examination into the bearings of biblical criticism on modern religion. Both papers are thoughtful, neither is convincing. The Bishop of Ontario contributes to the 'Reunion' discussion an article in which he shows how much more progressive the Church of England is in Canada than at home. 'The Mystery of Christ' is the title of an article by Rev. S. Means, of New Haven, U.S.A., which strikes a suggestive and valuable note—the sufficiency of Christ, as gradually

unfolded in history, for the deepest needs of man. Other articles in a very interesting number are 'The Conditions of Effective Idealism,' by F. R. Hoare, 'The Religious Philosophy of Pascal,' by Miss Jordain, and 'Man in the Light of Modern Psychology,' by Miss Caillard.

Church Quarterly Review (July).—Prof. Headlam, in his article on 'Comprehension,' criticizes the position taken by the Bishop of Zanzibar in opposing the consecration of Dr. Henson as Bishop of Hereford and Bishop Gore's criticism of the resolutions passed by the Mansfield Conference. 'It is no good saying that what he (Dr. Gore) thinks is the Catholic position, because the Catholic position needs interpretation, and all that he means is that his interpretation of the Catholic position is the true one; that is for the Church to judge. The only authority to which we can ultimately appeal is the general sense of our Church.' Dr. Headlam also has a short article on Father Walker's book on *The Problem of Reunion*. Prof. Turner's critique of Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures is mainly confined to questions arising directly out of the New Testament and the position of the ante-Nicene Church. Dr. Nairne also deals with the Lectures. He says Dr. Headlam 'looks facts in the face and shapes a policy.' He pays tribute also to 'the warm, generous heart which beats through this book.'

Constructive Quarterly (March).—Dr. Hamilton discusses 'The Organ of Christian Unity,' which he thinks must be the historic episcopate or 'the union of all ministries made by a mutual recognition of every means of equal authority with all the others.' He holds that only the episcopate can claim to be the ministry of the whole Church, and asks why others should not change 'to the ancient, time-honoured, and world-wide organ of unity, the episcopate?' Dr. Foakes-Jackson's estimate of 'Henry Melvill Gwatkin' is a real help to the understanding of the man and his work. Bishop McConnell writes a suggestive paper on 'The Church and Society.' 'We need a massive and spiritual organism—full of grace and truth—that the common people will hear, gladly yielding to a vital authority which is above all transient and fragmentary authorities whatsoever.'

The Holborn Review (July).—Prof. R. Mackintosh, of Lancashire College, contributes a Centenary estimate of Herbert Spencer which shows the weakness, as well as the strength, of a gifted student of science. Only the ghost of his vaunted 'Synthetic Philosophy' now remains. Prof. Humphries bestows higher praise on the volume of essays, entitled 'The Spirit,' and edited by Canon Streeter, than perhaps might have been expected. 'Its supreme merit is that it reflects the modern and scientific temper and is throughout in touch with reality.' This may readily be granted, and such a book was wanted, but it remains one-sided in its treatment of a great subject, and its deficiencies are hardly touched upon by Prof.

Humphries' notice. Emile Boutroux' article on the *Pensées* of Pascal is all too short. Three articles have a poetical tinge, one being on Marlowe's *Faustus*, another by Dr. Moffatt is on 'Hamlet and Habit,' whilst in another *The Hound of Heaven* is interestingly expounded by T. W. Coleman. The writer of the last paper characterizes Francis Thompson's work as human, evangelical, and mystical. Another type of article is by Rev. W. L. Spooner on 'The Problem of Methodism in the Villages'—a timely subject, handled with practical knowledge and ability. The writer does not conceal the difficulties attending proposed schemes of union, whether of Methodists, Free Churches, or an attempt to secure more comprehensive combination still. He thinks that the obstacles may possibly be surmounted, though the task will not be easy. Dr. Peake's Editorial Notices and Reviews are valuable as usual, and the new Editor is setting his own mark on this ably conducted Review.

The Expository Times (June and July).—The Editor, as is his custom, discusses in his Notes recent publications of special interest and importance. He expresses the disappointment felt by many in Canon Streeter's composite volume of essays on 'The Spirit.' The failure of the book, Dr. Hastings says, is on the Christian side, 'for the doctrine of the Spirit is not a doctrine of science or philosophy, but a doctrine of religious experience, the first and fullest record of which is in Scripture.' Canon Wilson's sermons on 'Christ's Thought of God,' and Bishop Chandler's *Scala Mundi* also receive appreciative but discriminating criticism. Mr. F. H. Stead's 'A Labour View of Christianity,' will prove illuminating to many. Rev. J. M. Ross commends 'the disciplined life,' unfolded in the Pastoral Epistles, as the chief need of the present disturbed times. Hardly, we should say! Two articles bear on the study of the Greek New Testament, one by Dr. G. Milligan and another on 'Henry Scott,' by Rev. W. F. Howard. The name of the modest scholar of Oxton is but little known to the general reader, but Dr. J. H. Moulton and Prof. Robertson both testified to the value of Mr. Henry Scott's minute and accurate study, especially in the compilation of numerical tables and indexes. Prof. Buchanan Gray contributes to the July number a scholarly article on 'A New Babylonian Literary Fragment.' Dr. J. A. Hutton's note on 'The Holy Spirit and Christ,' is tantalizingly brief. Its last sentence is, 'The sign of the Holy Ghost is that we spell "Jesus" with ease and accuracy.' The now familiar features of this admirable periodical—'In the Study,' 'Contributions and Comments,' &c.—preserve their freshness and interest.

Cornhill Magazine.—In the July number Lady Harcourt gives a lively account of life at Vienna when her father, John Lothrop Motley, was American minister there. At one great Court ball 'the stately form of the magnificent Empress Elizabeth swept up the palace floor in diaphanous robes of white tulle, her wealth of bright

chestnut hair, falling almost to her waist at the back, powdered with diamond stars; other splendid crown jewels adorning her.' Some pleasing glimpses are given of 'White of Selborne's brother,' who was rector of Fyfield in Hampshire from 1762 to 1788. He served four churches on Sundays, and had his brother's taste for natural history. He was a cricketer and a lover of music, and took pupils to prepare for the University. Major Hobart's account of 'The Gates of Europe' has a graphic description of the Cilician gates. The writer met a railway engineer who was 'very emphatic on the unpreparedness of Gallipoli, and the exhaustion of the ammunition of the coast batteries on the occasion of our first naval attack in February, 1915. He stated that the Turks could hardly believe their luck when our fleet steamed off, just when they themselves were at breakdown point.'

Science Progress (July).—Major Cherry writes on 'The Evolution of Man and his Mind.' He seeks to show that recent advances in knowledge have introduced new difficulties both on the side of structure and of function, and have made untenable the current theory of the comparatively recent separation of the human and the ape stocks. That man was evolved in conditions of comparative safety, so that the struggle was less severe than in the case of other animals, may be deduced, he thinks, from many points of structure and function. The relief from constant watchfulness may have set the growing brain free to develop intelligence instead of intellect.

The Christian East (June).—The Rev. J. A. Douglas writes on 'The Importance of Saint Sophia.' He describes the founding of Constantinople and the building of the great church. He quotes the Ex-President of the Deutsche Orient Mission, who charges the Turkish nation with a systematic and sustained effort to wipe the Armenian and Syrian nations out of Asia Minor. 'His record of rape, of undescribable and bestial torture, of cold-blooded and wholesale butchery, and of the calculated doing to death by starvation, exposure, and similar methods, reads like the fantasy of a criminal lunatic.' Mr. Douglas regards the decision to leave the Sultan at Constantinople and St. Sophia as a Turkish mosque as a great disaster. The number is one of special interest.

Theology (July).—This is the first number of a monthly journal of historic Christianity, published by the S.P.C.K. The Rev. G. Lacey May sketches the character and work of Fletcher of Madeley. Prof. A. E. Taylor writes on Prof. Webb's *God and Personality*, Prof. McNeile on 'St. Paul in relation to our Lord.' 'Exegesis, fresh, vivid, and searching' is to be provided, and the problems of the Anglican Communion will receive special attention. The Principal of Chichester Theological College writes on 'The Credentials of our Communion.' His first paper shows that the Anglican Church is committed by her formularies to the faithful upholding of the Creeds

and Conciliar definitions which have been accepted by Catholic Christendom. The first number is full of varied interest.

Calcutta Review (April).—'The Women of India—some characteristics,' by Anna Ross Macivor, says that a girl is broken into a spirit of unobtrusiveness that she may settle without jar into her husband's family. It takes much effort to conciliate touchy relatives-in-law. 'I have seen a little bride cowering with fear while her future relatives raged within earshot over some point of etiquette.' As daughter-in-law she is a cog on the wheel fitting into a system almost mechanical in its precision. Neither her fatalistic religion nor her social customs encourage the free play of personality. Subordination leads to want of serious purpose, idleness and waste of time, lack of fearless rectitude, too much diplomacy and intrigue, and an absorbing interest in petty details about food, personal adornment, and the tittle tattle and bickerings of the household.

British Journal of Inebriety (July).—The Society for the Study of Inebriety, of which Dr. Kelynack is the honorary secretary, was founded in 1884, and has done much to investigate all forms of alcoholism. Since the war began, 484 names have been added to the roll of associates. Dr. Maurice Nicoll contributes a paper on 'Analytical Psychology in Alcoholism.' Many turn to alcohol because they have a very definite psychological trouble which it seems to relieve for the time being.

AMERICAN

Harvard Theological Review.—To the July number, Dr. E. F. Scott contributes a study of 'The Epistle to the Hebrews and Roman Christianity.' With the larger assumptions which underlie the special thesis of the Epistle, he finds that Roman Christianity has points of contact. He pleads for a closer investigation of the Epistle from this point of view. 'Under the influence of false or one-sided theories it has been handed over to specialists in Jewish ritual or Alexandrian philosophy. . . . A more adequate criticism may come in time to recognize it as a historical document of the first importance, throwing light on the genesis of that type of Christianity which, through the premier Church, was at last to win predominance.' Two articles have reference to the Tercentenary of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers at Plymouth. Dr. Fenn, of Harvard, writes on 'John Robinson's Farewell Address.' Owing to its timeless and universal character, doubt has been cast upon its authenticity; but its words are shown to be 'in entire accord with the sentiments of Robinson as preserved in writings of unquestioned genuineness.' Dr. Fenn holds that to John Robinson it is mainly due that friendly relations were established between Puritans at Salem and Separatists at Plymouth when 'in England Puritan and Separatist were at loggerheads.' Dr. F. J. Powicke, in his article on 'John Robinson and

the Beginning of the Pilgrim Movement,' differs widely in his judgements from Dr. Usher, whom he regards as holding 'a brief for the ecclesiastical authorities and against the Puritans, against the Separatists especially.' The assumption that the Plymouth Church continued to be 'rigidly Separatist' is shown to be 'contrary to the evidence.' The Christian wisdom of John Robinson 'was not forgotten by those who had known him. . . . The spirit of it became a tradition of the Church.' There is no proof that 'difference of religious opinion or practice was visited by harsh treatment unless it issued in conduct dangerous to the common welfare.'

Bibliotheca Sacra (July).—This number opens with an instructive paper on 'The Temptations in the Wilderness.' Mr. Moore thinks they are given by St. Luke in the order in which they would be likely to make themselves felt. Prof. Johnson, of Lincoln University, gives reasons for 'The Finality of Christianity.' It is the most historical of all religions; the most exclusive; the most persistently vital; it meets the needs of the most people; is most comprehensive in its teaching; deals most seriously with the problem of sin; answers the most problems; and has in it the most saving power. Mr. Wiener continues his papers on 'A new Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch.' 'Education versus Enlightenment' dwells on the most radical vice in the German educational system. The young were taught only as much of the history of their country as it was deemed expedient for them to know. Mr. Super says the world has never before been a witness to so strange a mental phenomenon as the methods by which the German intellectuals sought to incite feeling against the British. 'Books, pamphlets, articles in periodicals, sermons, and public addresses without number—all were trained on England, denouncing her perfidy, her mercantilism, her envy, and her lack of idealism.'

FOREIGN

Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques (July).—The first article, on 'Philosophy and Science,' seeks to determine their sphere and their proper object. It does not deal with mathematics so much as with the physical and natural sciences. Special attention is given to the philosophy of St. Thomas and Modern Science. The 'Bulletin de Science des Religions,' which fills eighty pages, is divided into three parts; the Religion of Uncivilised Races; the Semitic Religions (Assyro-Babylonian, Canaanite, Arabian); the Indo-European religions and those of the Farther East, divided into the Mediterranean countries, the Europeans of the North, Iran and Central Asia, India, China, and Japan. It is a wonderful survey of the whole field of religion.