

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW

OCTOBER, 1928

THE DECAY OF PRAYERFULNESS

AMONG conforming members of various denominations in this country, there are many—I am afraid we ought to say very many—to whom the statement, lately published, that the people of England are ceasing to pray will stir but a languid interest. Some will disbelieve, or, anyhow, hesitate to believe it. These are they who enjoy the great blessing of consorting ordinarily with pious people, and who are disposed to think their *entourage* is typical of the average. A few will secretly welcome the news as giving the approval of society to their own laxity of practice ; being, in sooth, victims of a superstition, viz. that warrant for a religious opinion or practice may reasonably be looked for in popular fashion. But the majority will, of course, be merely the luke-warm, whose numbers have shown no signs of decreasing ever since the conversion of Constantine. They have never seriously tried to persevere in the practice of prayer, nor have ever been taught what is the place it must occupy in the life of any faithful follower of Christ.

Yet there is no subject which appeals so directly to the conscience of the community. Everybody who believes, however dimly, in the Fatherhood of God knows that he ought to pray. There is really no ethical perplexity in the matter. Man is described as a praying animal, and, if the truth were known, by far the most striking distinction between man and the beasts of the field is the general practice of prayer peculiar to man. Any ordinary man who has been taught to say his prayers in childhood may,

of course, easily grow into a cold-hearted worldling. If he does, prayer is the last observance to be jettisoned. Church attendance goes first ; then Bible-reading, if it has been ever begun ; prayer, not till many disappointing years have gone by.

All that can be attempted here is to diagnose the situation and to suggest some special points which all teachers and preachers are to-day called upon to bear in mind.

There is little reason to dispute the allegation we have quoted. An immense amount of private prayer has at all times been poor, thin, and mechanical, else the condition of Christendom would be wholly different from what we see it to be. Now, during the last half-century certain powerful influences have been warring against our souls. Amongst the most obvious is the vast increase in the 'racket' of life and in overwork. We must notice also how discipline in the homes and authority in social life have been undermined. It is clear that the result of this is to bring inclination into the first place as a guiding principle of conduct. Whereas, before, its claims were sternly disputed in the traditional training of the young, it is difficult to overstate the extent to which concessions are made in all classes of society to-day to the demands of mere taste, or personal predilection.¹

But Englishmen dislike insincerity, especially in worship ; and perhaps it is as well that people who have no idea why they should go to church, stay away. Their lack of understanding is to be laid partly at the door of the community. Why have we so failed to teach ?

The next advance in laxity will be to abandon, not prayer, but perseverance and belief in prayer. The practice drags

¹E. Fitzgerald caustically remarks: 'Self-deception begins when a man finds a reason for his predilections.' That is the true significance of the word 'hypocrisy' as used by our Lord. It is a kind of moral blindness. The late Dr. Rashdall, a great exponent of ethical principles, concurred in this suggestion, but was inclined to doubt if there was any such thing as self-deception.

on for a time as a formality ; but, as we dislike formalities which are irksome and apparently useless, is it not more honest to say, 'The struggle naught availeth,' and give up the quiet spiritual effort for active social work, which the world not only approves, but demands ?

So the 'praying animal' denies his heritage, and gradually ceases to think upon God as a Father. The death-sleep of the soul begins ; and, as nothing nowadays is said about the Day of Judgement, there seems to be no prospect of its being broken.

Now the symptom which calls for consideration is the general disappointment in prayer. St. James puts his finger on the spot (iv. 2-3). 'Ye lust, and have not : ye kill, and covet ; and cannot obtain : ye fight and war : ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures.' We have a perfect description of the spiritual disillusionment of our generation.

'Ye ask amiss.' This has been often explained. Satan finds it more to his advantage to spoil prayer than to stop it. It is one of the difficulties with which he has to contend that if he succeeds in the first he can hardly prevent the second ; and then he is found out. The spoiling consists in encouraging people to clamour to God for the satisfaction of natural desires, which are often quite good in themselves ; but the petitions are made without reference to God's will, and become a kind of impious dictation to the All-Wise. If the discontinuance of this sham prayer were to become general and deliberate, there would result such an open repudiation of religion, such a spiritual famine, that the reaction would be wholesome. 'He sent leanness withal into their soul.' This is God's law, operative, as always, for man's salvation.

But prayer is turned into sin owing to a more prevailing infirmity, if possible, than egoism, namely, misgiving as to its efficacy. There is not a Christian alive who is

quite free from the lurking doubt uttered by a voice within him, ' You are quite right to pray, but, as an educated man, you cannot suppose that it will make any difference.' This is a deadly temptation, and was made the theme of a most sacred and loving warning. ' All things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them and ye shall have them ' (Mark xi. 24 R.V.).

The corollary from the last remark is important. Every prayer should conclude with a word of thanksgiving *because the petition is already answered*. This follows from our faith in Christ's promises. If He taught that we are always to expect an answer to prayer, who are we that we should judge otherwise? What data have we?

Of course, it will be objected that very many prayers are fruitless. How, then, can the petitioner be confident that his prayer will gain for him more than other men's have gained for them? If he is not confident, then we are to believe that prayer is more likely to be abortive than not, and it would be better not to offer it at all.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the prevalence of this muddled and confused state of mind at the present time. It proceeds on the ego-centric assumption that we mortals pray in order to change the Almighty's will!

To correct this most baneful error, many volumes have been written and many thousands of sermons preached. We should note that it is the direct outcome of the religion of self-gratification in which the large majority of our children are nowadays being trained. The prayers of such children are either nothing at all or the utterance of expectant Hedonism. ' I want to be happy, God, make me happy. If you do not, I cannot go on praying to you, nor being thankful.' We observe also that parents who do exercise discipline, and exact obedience, mostly appeal to the same egoistic motive. The child learns that he is happier if he is generally obedient to what he believes to be, not divine law, but merely his parents' wish. Is it conceivable that that boy is being

given a fair chance of growing up a prayerful man? If he continues to pray, it is merely because a mechanical routine of prayer acts as a sort of anodyne when in later life some uneasy misgivings stir within him. If these psychological data are fairly considered, the question why private prayer is still so general becomes extremely difficult to answer.

Yet in the midst of so many depressing and disquieting facts there remains an illuminating experience; in a sense negative, it is true, but profoundly suggestive to us all. I cannot believe that any man can be found who, after ten years of perseverance in private prayer, of *doing his best* to pray as Christ prayed, will not testify at the end that it has been amply worth while. No theory or doctrine gives this fact its proper place in life and its due significance, except that, when Christ taught His followers to pray, He was disclosing, with His invariably serene confidence of sovereignty, some of the mysteries¹ of the Kingdom. Only those who have persevered have a right to speak on this subject; and perseverance is itself a gift. Rothe, the German philosopher, wrote, 'One of the greatest hindrances of good in this world is man's disbelief in its power.' That is faithlessness. But can faith grow without prayer? The continuous vitality of our belief in prayer is doubtless due to the 'effectual fervent prayers' of the really righteous intercessors on this earth. Substantial help may here be given by an aphorism which must be true. It is as follows: 'When we ask God for anything, He either gives us what we ask for or power to bear the refusal.' The truth so stated can be assimilated readily by a young child. If, however, we ponder on the

¹ Hence we can see what St. Paul meant when he wrote (1 Tim. iii. 16) *μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*. The Rev. G. H. Whitaker tells me that *μυστήριον* is not derived from the verb *μύω*, to close the eyes, but from *μύω*, to have the eyes opened as by a vision. Thus the word hints very beautifully at the growth in the vision of divine revelation, wherein each little advance opens out new or infinite vistas of truth beyond.

last verse of Matt. v., we shall amplify the last words ; for God promises, power not only to bear the refusal, but to thank Him for the refusal even more unfeignedly than for the favour granted. No Christian may dream of being contented with any lower standard in his upward striving.

Thus in prayer we have to overcome the stubborn enemy known as Sloth. Every tiny victory allowed to us in this warfare is a miracle, and some of these miracles have occurred in the experience of every individual soul. Very wonderful ; but it is desperately easy to fail in rightly interpreting our own experience ; still easier the collective records of the Church of Christ.

But the resourcefulness of Satan—and I fancy that no one who has genuinely tried to pray can doubt his existence or his malignity—is stirred to action as soon as he sees us on our knees, and he works upon us with deadly effect through our egoism. Supposing that he has already tried the falsehood of the abortiveness of prayer, our efforts may easily be spoilt by our fixing our attention on self (Mammon), not on God. Now self here means our individual needs, which, of course, are great and pressing in proportion as we are conscious of our own double-mindedness. If in prayer we regard our needs in isolation from the Christ who is present to help, they assume a bulk which prompts us, as reasonable beings, to despair. The more we contemplate them, the more we forget God our Saviour. Faith allows us to turn every evidence of our own impotence into a reason for magnifying God. But, without faith, prayer becomes a morbid introspection ; and faith is a divine gift which must be asked for. This cannot be done unless there is, deep down in the heart, a craving which cannot be stilled.

Some readers of these notes may demur to their avoidance of intellectual difficulties. It may be suspected, however, that in cases when they are pleaded most emphatically they are not the cause of the deterioration or the curtailing of prayer, but the excuse for its cessation. The intellectual

difficulties must have been felt for thousands of years, and perhaps more keenly by those who have persevered in prayer than by those who have abandoned it. The former come to be blessed by an experience which has been vouchsafed to many millions of pious supplicants for the last 2,000 years. They have learnt that when Christ said He was the Way, the Truth, and the Life, the second of the great words meant as much as either of the other two, and that by personal communion with the Risen Lord they gain ever fresh hold on the rudiments of the divine revelation. Thus it has been said, by an intellectualist who had no feeling for religion, that somehow piety was a wonderfully good substitute for brains, and that people who really prayed were never fools. But in the Bible there is one very striking mention of the same fact. Let any one attentively ponder on Titus i. 1, especially the remarkable expression, *κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εἰσίβειαν*, and the writer's point of view becomes plain. We may paraphrase: 'Paul, whose service to God and apostolical commission from Jesus Christ are realities in so far as they accord with the faith of the elect community and express the full knowledge of truth which that community has attained to as the fruit of joint prayer.' Here the effort of prayer is social, and the implication is that united intercession brings about a spreading abroad of the fuller, more living, and growing apprehension of divine revelation.

Sir Thomas Browne writes about the 'sturdy doubts and boisterous objections' whereby his mind was beset. 'More of these no man hath known than myself, which I confess I conquered, not in a martial posture, but on my knees.'

How unfamiliar to us to-day is the blessed hope thus presented! How general is the disposition to begin private prayer, as we repair to God's altar, with the wicked, blasphemous thought in our hearts: 'This is rather an irksome duty, but I had better do it to be on the safe side,' instead of the 'living hope' that every honest prayer offered

even in solitude brings to the community a little increase in the knowledge of truth ; a clearer and more potent perception of the unceasing operation of God's Holy Spirit. Of course, our divisions, our love of controversy, our narrow Teutonic individualism, impoverishes our receptivity of the divine bounty ; but the honest efforts of single supplicants in every country, every town and village, in Christendom counteract in their measure the adversary's fatal undoing. To this we are bidden by the petitions put into the conclusion of the Matins and Evensong of the Anglican Prayer-Book : ' Granting us in this world knowledge of Thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting.'

Some beautiful words were shown me lately, but the authorship is unknown. ' God does not demand of us brilliant achievement, but infinite desire.'

EDWARD LYTTTELTON, D.D.

JOHN BUNYAN: 1628-1928

IN the baptismal register of Elstow Church, near Bedford, is the following entry, 1628 : ' John the sonne of Thomas Bonnionn, Junr, the 30th of Novemb.' This return is signed by John Kellie, minister, and Anthony Manley and William Allerson, churchwardens. This child, John Bonnionn, now known to the world as John Bunyan, is one amongst the nineteen children who were baptized in Elstow Church in that year. Three hundred years have passed since then, and the lovers of John Bunyan throughout the world thank God for the birth of this noble saint and great imaginative genius. His claims to essential greatness are many, and he stands amongst a small band. He wrote the greatest allegory in the English language—*The Pilgrim's Progress* ; he is the author of our second greatest religious allegory—*The Holy War* ; he gave to us one of the classic religious autobiographies—*Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* ; he is the father of the English novel ; he is one of the noblest soldiers of spiritual freedom the world has ever known ; he sang many songs, and two of them are deathless—' Who would true valour see ' and ' He that is down needs fear no fall.' He seeks not our testimonials nor our praise, for he stands crowned amongst the immortals. There are few names better known than his. He has become a part of the great tradition of our race. At the end of three hundred years there is no need for him to plead for our remembrance ; we cannot forget him. This child of peasant parents was never more alive than he is to-day, and the years 1628 and 1928 both belong to him.

Besides the Bible and *The Imitation of Christ*, the two books most translated into foreign languages are *Don Quixote* and *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Both Cervantes and Bunyan belonged in a very real sense to their age, but each also wrote for all ages and peoples. The drapery of their stories speaks of

the times in which they wrote, but the experiences and struggles of their characters tell of all countries and centuries. Both Cervantes and Bunyan had great success in the first part of their stories, and each, greatly daring, attempted a second part, and succeeded again. Even Defoe, with all his skill and vivid imagination, could not claim that triumph. Both Cervantes and Bunyan knew a prison from the inside, and yet were never embittered, but by their sweet charity and catholicity teach us that :

Stone walls do not a prison make,
Nor iron bars a cage;
Minds innocent and quiet take
That for an hermitage.

Both wrote of the road, of battles, of comrades of the journey, and tell us of conversations seasoned with wit and full of fine insight into life. The popularity of Bunyan has stood the test of the centuries, and speaks of some singular powers. We cannot explain him by studying his genealogy; for genius has no ancestry, and is, like Melchizedek, without father and mother. It is something we cannot define except by saying, 'The wind bloweth where it listeth; but thou canst not tell whence it cometh, or whither it goeth; so is every one who is born of *genius*.' We can see Bunyan's circumstances, for he tells us of his life with a great exactness. 'For my descent, then, it was, as is well known by many, of a low and inconsiderable generation, my father's house being of that rank that is meanest and most despised of all the families of the land.' He tells us that he neither went to college nor university. But, as we follow his story and remember his works, we see that Bunyan, with an amazing facility, learned from all life's happenings, and was an apt scholar in the great University of Life. He fought in the Civil War as a Parliamentarian, and we know how well he used that experience in the narrating of the great fights in *The Pilgrim's Progress* and throughout *The Holy War*. He married a peasant girl, and writes of their marriage: 'This

woman and I, though we came together as poor as poor might be (not having so much household stuff as a dish or spoon betwixt us both), yet this she had for her part—*The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* and *The Practice of Piety*, which her father had left her when he died. In these books I sometimes read.' How he used this gift we well know, for in *The Plain Man's Pathway to Heaven* he saw pilgrims and the Pilgrim Road, and, like a true genius, used poor material in order to transfigure it, and out of a book once popular, but with no deathlessness in it, fashioned his immortal book, *The Pilgrim's Progress*. He had few other books, but they were enough. He read *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*, and was at home in all parts of the Bible; knew a few ballads, had read *Bevis of Southampton*, and probably a little Shakespeare. He knew no Latin and no Greek. He quotes a few words of Latin, and places in the margin the words, 'The Latine I borrow.' Poring over the Bible, meditating on it night and day, he learned its language, and all unconsciously caught its cadences and its music, and its language became his language. The Old Testament gave to him his power of narration, and the New Testament his experience. By trade he was a brazier, and we know that he went his rounds, and talked with men and women as he traded with them. He was all eyes and ears; he wrought at his trade and he saw and heard. One of his great and determining religious influences came to him when he went on his brazier's rounds. 'But upon a day the providence of God called me to Bedford to work at my calling, and in one of the streets of that town I came where there were three or four poor women sitting in the sun, talking about the things of God. They talked how God had visited their souls with His love in Christ Jesus. . . . Therefore I would often make it my business to be going again and again into the company of these poor people for I could not stay away.' He caught the very accents of the common people's speech, knew their talk and their reasonings. When the silence and loneliness of prison swathed him round about, and a great

stillness was about him, men and women came and talked to him, and he painted them as he saw them, and told us what they said. He had met Mr. Talkative before he wrote of him (and Mrs. Talkative also, although he never gave her a place in his book); he had seen the pliancy of Mr. Pliable before he limned him; he had talked with Faithful and Hopeful, with Byends and with Mr. Worldly Wiseman. He used the very stuff of life, and that is why his work is so living.

But we cannot understand Bunyan unless we realize that he learned his deepest truths through his own spiritual experiences. It is easy to say that there is a certain morbidness about some passages in the *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*. But we must remember that we are reading the story of an extraordinary man with a delicate sensitiveness, with a depth and richness of feeling given to few, and a flaming and fertile imagination. In his spiritual struggles he learned much. He says of his preaching, 'I preached what I felt, what I smartingly did feel.' His writings owe much to his deep experiences and high emotions. To treat Bunyan merely as a literary artist is a sheer misunderstanding of him. He was a great literary artist, and few have been greater. But he was first and foremost a child of God and a servant of Jesus. Professor G. M. Trevelyan, in his noble lecture on Bunyan, rightly says: 'Here, after three hundred years, we meet to celebrate John Bunyan's birth; and the world pays him homage. Seldom has there been such an exaltation of the humble and the meek. He shines, one of the brightest stars in the firmament of English literature. Yet he never had an ambition in anything he wrote save to turn poor sinners to repentance.' That last sentence is one of the most memorable things ever said about Bunyan, and unless we realize its truth we can never know much about him. His tumultuous experiences gave to him a deep sense of the struggle of the pilgrim's life; it enabled him to write with reality about Doubting Castle, Giant

Despair and Diffidence, and to give vividness to the telling of the story of the fight betwixt Apollyon and Christian in the Valley of Humiliation. He had been there ; he had seen Apollyon 'strodle quite over the whole breadth of the way' ; he had himself been locked, by Giant Despair, in 'a very dark dungeon, nasty and stinking,' and he had been fiercely beaten by his 'grievous crab-tree cudgle.' He knew the depths and the heights of religious experiences. He had seen the Cross, and known the thrill and dance of spiritual freedom—Bunyan is Christian, who 'gave three leaps for joy and went on singing'!—: he had seen from the Delectable Mountains the gate of the City : and watched saints pass over the river in triumph, and his words are autobiographic : 'Which, when I had seen, I wished myself among them.' We cannot explain Bunyan, for he still guards his secret. The great are far beyond our ken. We shall never pierce the mystery of Shakespeare, Jane Austen, Cervantes, Dickens, nor Bunyan, but we can realize something of the gifts which their writings reveal. Bunyan speaks to us of eyes which are always on the object, of an amazing imagination, of a man who used all life's experiences for high ends, and of a deep religious experience which unlocked the secret chambers of his soul, and fused into a great creative unity all his powers, and raised a peasant of the seventeenth century into one of the kingly creators of all time. He stands amongst us robed and crowned, and yet is approachable, intimate, companionable, and tender. His experience was a musical one, and the strings of the harp of his soul beat to the strains of heavenly music.

No one can read *The Pilgrim's Progress* attentively and for long without realizing that it beats to music. This was not conscious art ; it was an unpremeditated strain. The music wells up from his songful soul. We open the book, and it breaks forth into music at once. The first few lines are a revelation of the supreme artistry of the man. The heart of the whole story is in the first stanza. There is not a wasted

word ; it is written with such art, and yet is seemingly so artless. He slides into the tale, and you are caught at once by the narrative power, and by the sheer music :

As I walk'd through the wilderness of this world, I lighted on a certain place where was a Den, and laid me down in that place to sleep; and as I slept, I dreamed a Dream. I dreamed, and behold, I saw a man clothed with Rags, standing in a certain place, with his face from his own house, a Book in his hand, and a great Burden upon his back.

The beat, the rhythm, and the music of the passage can be at once felt by any one who will read aloud the words. What fine economy of words ! How swiftly he fixes upon the canvas the picture which will never fade. Sometimes he gets his effect by the repeating of a phrase. It is no trick of the writing trade with him ; it is rather the beat of his songful soul. In the House Beautiful, Discretion speaks to Christian :

Then she asked him whence he was, and whither he was going; and he told her. She asked him also how he got into the way ; and he told her. Then she asked him what he had seen and met on the way ; and he told her.

There he repeats the refrain—'and he told her'—and it gives music to the passage. But the best illustration of this is that lovely passage in which, in reply to the question of Prudence, 'Can you remember by what means you find your annoyances at times, as if they were vanquished?' Christian says :

'Yes, when I think what I saw at the Cross, that will do it ; and when I look upon my broidered Coat, that will do it ; also when I look into the Roll that I carry in my bosom, that will do it ; and when my thoughts wax warm about whither I am going, that will do it.'

We know this was not conscious art, but it is art none the less. *The Pilgrim's Progress* is a book with a first fine careless rapture. It pours forth from his musical soul. He calls his book 'my scribble.'

Neither did I but vacant seasons spend,
 In this my scribble ; nor did I intend
 But to divert myself in doing this
 From worsè thoughts which make me do amiss.

It is a book which tumbled out of his great heart : it was born in a day, and was a child of his tears, his struggles, his joys and triumphs.

It came from myne own heart, so to my head,
 And thence into my fingers trickled ;
 Then to my pen, from whence immediately
 On paper did I dribble it daintily.

The book is all his ; and yet none of it is his. Bunyan was, in this, like William Blake, who, when dying, said of his songs, 'Not Mine ! Not Mine !' But no one but Blake could have sung those songs—and no one but Bunyan could have written *The Pilgrim's Progress*. In short passages we catch this musical quality as well as in longer ones—'For, to tell you the truth, I love Him, because I was by Him eased of my burden' ; 'And behold there was a very stately Palace before him, the name whereof was Beautiful : and it stood by the High-way side' ; 'Then was Christian glad and light-some, and said with a merry heart, He hath given me rest by His sorrow, and life by His death' ; 'I know what I would obtain ; it is ease from my heavy burden.' And so we could go on quoting, but there would be no end to this, for the book is full of sweet music. But we must record the most musical passage from one of the most musical of books :

The Pilgrim they laid in a large upper chamber, whose windows opened towards the sun-rising : the name of the Chamber was Peace, where he slept till the break of day, and then he awoke and sang.

But a book cannot live on through the centuries as one of the great classics merely by its music. It can survive its dull passages, and such there are in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, but they are few and far between. But heavy and prosaic periods are to be found in all great books—in the Bible, in Homer, in

the works of Shakespeare, Jane Austen, and Dickens. The greatest books are great enough to cancel the wearying passages ; but no book can reach the highest heights without a real insight into life and character, and a knowledge of the strange workings of the soul. Often, when we are reading *The Pilgrim's Progress*, we say, ' How does Bunyan know me and my life ? ' Browning speaks rightly when he makes Ned Bratts say of John Bunyan :

His language was not ours.

'Tis my belief, God spoke : no tinker had such powers.

The insight of Bunyan is at times almost more than human. He knows that men sleep in the arbour of Hill Difficulty, that the lions roar in the darkness at the top of that Hill, that after the hard climb there is the House Beautiful, that Christian caught ' a slip or two ' going down into the Valley of Humiliation. R. L. Stevenson speaks of ' that masterpiece of Bunyan's insight into life, the Enchanted Ground ; where, in a few traits, he has set down the latter end of such a number of the would-be-good ; where his allegory goes so deep that, to people looking seriously on life, it cuts like satire.' The description of the Enchanted Ground is truly one of his masterpieces.

' I then saw in my dream, that they went on until they came into a certain country whose air naturally tended to make one drowsy, if he came a stranger into it. And here Hopeful began to be very dull and heavy of sleep : wherefore he said unto Christian, I do now grow so drowsy that I can scarce hold open mine eyes : let us lie down here and take a nap. By no means, said the other ; lest sleeping we never wake more.'

Bunyan manages this scene with a fine dexterity, and in a few words reveals how the dangers of this perilous Enchanted Land are to be overcome.

Christian : Now then, said Christian, to prevent drowsiness in this place, let us fall into good discourse.

Hopeful : With all my heart, said the other.

Christian : Where shall we begin ?

Hopeful : Where God began with us. But do you begin, if you please.

Christian : I will sing you first this song.

Then they safely wend their way, conquering through speech and song. The location of the Enchanted Land shows an expert knowledge of the perils of the pilgrim. The last and deadliest danger is drowsiness. It is Bunyan's way of saying that vigilance is the eternal price of freedom. Beyond this perilous country of drowsiness there is the joy of Beulah land. The whole picture of the Enchanted Land is something which cuts like satire. We know that it speaks of life, and it bites like an acid.

But there are many other passages where Bunyan shows an extraordinary penetration of gaze and a deep insight into life. In the first part of *The Pilgrim's Progress*, nigh to the Cross we see Simple, Sloth, and Presumption, fast asleep, and the pilgrims seek to arouse them, but they mumbled in their sleep, and refused to be warned. In the second part of the story they hang from the gibbets and dangle in chains. Bunyan had seen all this. He knew that high vision is often the prelude of great disaster, and that some foolish ones use the Cross as a resting-place rather than as a spur to devout action. In *Don Quixote* the same truth is taught in a saying, twice repeated in that book : 'The devil always lurks behind the Cross.' Bunyan and Cervantes knew not the language of the psychologists, but they saw with amazing vividness the workings of the human soul. Bunyan with a sure touch places his finger upon the subtle perils of religious experience. In his portrayal of Giant Despair and Diffidence he shows in story form that Diffidence is more cruel than Despair. It is the wife who rouses her husband to go down to the pilgrims, Hopeful and Christian, and to belabour them with heavy blows, to incite them to suicide, to terrify them by showing to them the skulls and bones of those pilgrims who have come to an untimely end in Doubting Castle. He knew that despair is an affair betwixt the soul and God, and

that we more easily overcome it than we conquer diffidence—for that is an affair betwixt man and the world. It is so hard, after a fall, to regain confidence, to meet the world's taunts without fear, to hold up one's head, and to address oneself again to the journey. We are too diffident, and life teaches us that diffidence is more inventive in fiendish cruelty than despair. Here Bunyan's insight is almost uncanny ; he makes the subtle perils of life so clear, and gives each temptation its true plan and meaning. Sometimes he is as terrifying as Dante. The close of the first part of *The Pilgrim's Progress* gives to us a grim and terrible ending to a great book. We read of the airy way in which Ignorance comes to the river, and how easily he crosses it, for he had arranged with one Vain Confidence to ferry him over. He walks jauntily up the hill, comes to the gate, and confidently awaits admittance. But those who look over the gate ask him for his certificate, ' that they might go in, and show it to the King. So he fumbled in his bosom for one and found none.' What a world of meaning there is in that one word ' fumbled ' ! We can catch sight of the twitching fingers of Ignorance, and see the look of vacant despair upon his face. Then there is the terrible end. ' The shining ones took him up, and carried him through the air to the door that I saw in the side of the Hill, and put him in there.' Then Bunyan closes his story with these words : ' Then I saw that there was a way to Hell even from the Gates of Heaven, as well as from the City of Destruction. So I awoke, and behold it was a dream.'

Bunyan's characters are not dull puppets worked by string ; they are not things moved by mechanical means, but men and women of flesh and blood. His scenes and incidents are from life, and speak of life. There is a certain inevitableness about the pilgrims' actions, for they spring from something deep and determined in their characters.

It has been given to few men to create places and characters whose names are so much a part of English speech as those

portrayed by John Bunyan. We all know Christian, Hopeful, Faithful, Mr. Obstinate, Christiana, Mr. Fearing ; we are all familiar with the Interpreter's House, the Slough of Despond, the House Beautiful, the Hill Difficulty, Vanity Fair, the Delectable Mountains, the Valley of Humiliation, the Valley of the Shadow of Death, the River, and the Celestial City. His skill in creating names and in characterization has never been surpassed. How amazingly clever is the genealogical tree of Mr. Byends ! He is asked who are his kindred, and replies, ' Almost the whole town of Fair Speech : and in particular my Lord, Turn About, my Lord, Time Server, my Lord, Fair Speech, from whose ancestors the town first took its name ; also Mr. Smoothman, Mr. Facing-both-Ways, Mr. Anything ; and the parson of our parish, Mr. Two Tongues, was my mother's own brother, by father's side : and to tell you the truth, I am become a gentleman of good quality : yet my great grand-father was but a waterman, looking one way and rowing another, and I got most of my estate by the same occupation.' How skilful is the giving of names for the gossiping women whom Mrs. Timorous asks to visit her—Mrs. Bats-Eyes, Mrs. Inconsiderate, Mrs. Light-Mind, and Mrs. Know-Nothing. In a few words Bunyan can write a whole biography—' A young woman her name was Dull.' The list of the jurymen and of the judge in the trial scene in Vanity Fair is a good instance of his power of creating descriptive names. We note that each jurymen speaks according to his character—Mr. Blindman—who, of course, thinks he has good sight—says, ' I see clearly that this man is a heretic.' ' Hang him, hang him,' said Mr. Heady. ' A sorry scrub,' said Mr. High-Mind. ' Hanging is too good for him,' said Mr. Cruelty. ' Let us dispatch him out of the way,' said Mr. Hate-Light. The whole scene is a dramatic unity. We see the court, the prisoners with their high faith, the fierce jurymen. We hear the verdict. By the stress and verisimilitude of Bunyan's writing we do not read of the trial ; we are in the court and at the trial,

What beautiful reticence there is in the words about the passing of Christiana—' But she gave Mr. Standfast a ring '!

Bunyan can be terrible in some of his writings ; he can be merry and humorous ; he can make us overhear conversations ; he can bring distant things nigh unto us, but he can never be embittered nor censorious. A lovely charity saturates the book with tender love. He is so kindly, so tolerant. He asks much of us, but never too much. He is serious without being solemn ; he is strenuous, yet he knoweth our frame, and, like his Maker, he remembereth that we are but dust. He asks not for perfection in action, but he does demand steadiness in direction. There must be no turning back, for we ' have no armour for the back.' He demands not the same temperament nor the same notions in each, nor the same speed. There is only one perfect pilgrim, and he is a type of our Lord—Great-Heart. All the others make mistakes, turn aside into By-Path Meadow, are flung into Doubting Castle, are beguiled by the Flatterer, desire to sleep in the Enchanted Land—but never renounce the pilgrimage. ' If they had been mindful they would have had opportunity to return.' But they had no mind for that treachery to their Lord. The frail pilgrims are amongst the most lovable, and seem to have been the dearest of Bunyan's children. He is so solicitous about them ; watches over them with such a tender and loving care. Bunyan gave his whole mind and heart to the sketching of Mr. Fearing, and his cameo of him is unequalled in the whole gallery of literary portraiture. With what tenderness and with what unflinching truth he sketches Mr. Feeble-Mind, Mr. Despondency, Miss Much-Afraid, Mr. Ready-to-Halt, Mr. Little Faith ! They are all frail, perplexed, and burdened by life's trials, but they all gain an abundant entrance into the Celestial City. It is to these timid pilgrims that special care and love are given. ' So the feeble and weak went in, and Mr. Great-Heart and the rest did follow.' Bunyan asks from them, not a

catalogue of perfect virtues, but a fixed direction. The programme of Feeble-Mind is enough for him. 'But this I have resolved on, to wit, to *run* when I can, to *go* when I cannot *run*, and to *creep* when I cannot *go*. As to the main, I thank him that loves me, I am fixed. My way is before me, my mind is beyond the River that has no Bridge, tho' I am, as you see, but of a *feeble* mind.'

Divine pity inspires all Bunyan's great work, and it is this appeal which wins our hearts. He is one of the most catholic of souls ; and he seeks to do good unto all men. His style is a reflection of the honesty of his heart, and re-echoes the music of his soul. He puts his own faith into the mouth of Mr. Holy-Man, who says, 'There are two things that they have need to possess that go on pilgrimage, courage and an unspotted life. If they have not courage, they can never hold on their way, and if their lives be loose, they will make the very name of Pilgrims stink.' That Bunyan had courage we all know ; for twelve years he lay in Bedford jail, in the very prime of his life, from the age of thirty-two to forty-four, and certainly his life has revealed the purity and nobility of his character, and has commended to thousands the pilgrim's task. We can say of him, we 'love the pilgrim soul in you.'

It is hard to write of John Bunyan with restraint, for he has meant, and still means, so much to us. His life was spent in Bedford, and his body rests—by the accident of a swift illness—in Bunhill Fields, London, near to the roar of the great City's traffic. He who dreamed of a Celestial City was laid to rest in an Imperial City. There is a certain fitness in this. His triumphs are many, and one of the greatest is this—that he whose tercentenary we now celebrate can never die. For if a man lives with an unchallenged and growing reputation of greatness for three hundred years, we know he bears an undying name. It was a moment of great triumph for the brazier of Elstow when, but a short time ago, the Prime Minister hushed the House of Commons to a great

silence as he closed his tribute to a great statesman with these words: 'So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.' But to our mind his greatest triumph clusters about Winchester College, the home of that classical learning which was denied to Bunyan. The New Cloisters of Winchester College tell of the most beautiful war-memorial in England. To the planning of that memorial much love was given and tender care. They were able to go to the literatures of many nations, and choose from them the most noble and fitting words to engrave in the stone of the cloisters. They went, rightly, to the incomparably beautiful farewell speeches in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, and chose the words of Mr. Valiant-for-Truth. It is a double wonder—for not only did the home of learning go to the peasant-preacher, but we all know that nowhere else could such fitting, tender, and lovely words have been found. So Wykehamists of to-day and for centuries will see carved in the stone of their cloisters these haunting, musical, and noble words: 'Then said he, "My Sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my Courage and Skill to him that can get it. My Marks and Scars I carry with me to be a witness for me that I have fought his Battles who will now be my Redeemer." . . . So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.'

We thank God for the gift to the world of John Bunyan. Born three hundred years ago, he calls us to-day to address ourselves to the journey, and flashes before our wistful eyes the vision of that Celestial City of which he dreamed and sang, and where he for ever dwells. His speech is all his own—tender, homely, musical, and touched with Divine Love.

His language is not ours.

'Tis my belief, God spoke: no tinker had such powers.

W. BARDSLEY BRASH.

BAPTISM IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

WHEN I was a boy, baptism was a very live subject. Pamphlets and tracts were circulated. Sometimes public debates were held, as in the great Graves-Ditzler debate in the South. It is a striking sign of a new feeling in religion that that old interest has departed. In the North, some Baptist Churches even take in, by letter, communicants from other Churches without immersion, and I do not know but that some even allow candidates their choice of modes. This is due, of course, to the general growth of liberalism in religion. This has gone so far in England that baptism itself is looked upon as of no great importance, and in some of the so-called evangelical Churches is omitted altogether. This is logical. Equally logical will it be to leave out also the Lord's Supper, next public worship, next any concern for salvation, and finally disband the Churches entirely. At any rate, we can afford to look with unbiased minds at what historically baptism was in the infant age of the Church.

The Church came out of Judaism. Our first question, then, is, What was proselyte baptism among the Jews? The New Testament reveals many pagans standing in cordial relations to God's ancient people, though it does not speak so much of the actual converts who went completely over and became full Jews. But there had always been such, and the Talmud gives directions as to their reception. They are asked: Why do you do this? Don't you know that Israel suffers now, is rejected and oppressed? The candidate answers: I know this, and I am scarcely worthy. He is then instructed as to the duties of a Jew and the sin of neglecting them, and that the punishment of death awaits some transgressions. If he persists in desiring to become a Jew, he is circumcised, and as soon as he is healed receives the ritually

purifying bath. After these two acts he goes as a full Israelite. The baptism is immersion. It is preceded by instruction, and it is accompanied by a confession of faith and other religious words, promises, &c. Pagan women were also baptized, being led by other women into the water up to the neck. After baptism, which went as new birth, they had to bring an offering. Where possible the baptism had to take place in running water.

What about John's baptism? The Old Testament prophets had prophesied of the washing from sin and uncleanness in the coming time of salvation. John the Baptist felt that he was a forerunner of that new day. Therefore he baptized, not the heathen, but Jews who wanted to prepare themselves for the Messiah's Kingdom by repentance and a new moral birth. He therefore gave full instructions as to personal righteousness, as was the case with proselyte baptism. 'For John came to you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not,' &c. (Matt. xxi. 32). The words 'way of righteousness,' or 'way of truth,' were the designation of the moral instruction given to the heathen at or before baptism. It was the genius of John to see that the only true preparation for the Messiah was a moral and spiritual one so thorough that it could be symbolized by baptism as a new birth. So it was the 'baptism of repentance'—that is, change of mind, change of nature. This the baptized solemnly confessed, and forgiveness of sins followed (Luke iii. 8). While, at the first, immense crowds went down into the Jordan valley, there was later a reaction, and John became an unpopular prophet. Probably the cause was the fact that John stuck to his guns that the baptism must represent a real inner repentance and change, and so be a real washing or purification (see John iii. 25), while most of the Jews thought either of a liturgical cleansing or of John's baptism as unnecessary.

Jesus Himself goes to John's baptism. Why? No wonder John was puzzled. Why should He who is to be the

inaugurator of the new Kingdom of the Messiah Himself be baptized as a sinful yet repentant member of it? He refuses to baptize Him. But Jesus had the insight to see that He could only be the redeemer of His people when He identifies Himself fully with them, takes their sins upon Himself, and, as He went up to the feasts, so here fulfils all the righteousness required of the sinful race. So with the rest He is submerged in the Jordan, though probably not before He explains to John who He is and His mission. Immediately there came what He was looking for—the certificate from His Father that He had not mistaken the time, the method, and that He was sure of his eternal relationship to Him.

Thoroughly familiar as Jews and as John's disciples with proselyte baptism and with John's, the disciples must therefore have expected as a matter of course that Jesus would continue the custom. If baptism was necessary as preparation for the Messiah, how much more for receiving Him when He is come. Therefore, though none of the Gospels, except Matthew (xxviii. 19), give any hint of a formal putting in of baptism, from the fact that Christ's disciples—even while He was with them—baptized, from the fact that Peter and his associates took it up spontaneously on the Day of Pentecost, we may believe that it rested in a genuine tradition of Christ's word, which Matthew alone records. Even the liberal Alfred Seeberg thinks Matthew xxviii. 19 is historical, that the world-wide mission and baptism go back to Jesus, though he assigns the threefold name to the current baptismal order at the time of the informant or reporter (*Die Taufe im Neuen Testament*, 1918, p. 14). But since it is very probable that in the first century baptism was given in the name of Jesus only, if there was any transformation of the original words of Jesus before they were written down in our Matthew xxviii. 19, it would have been in leaving out 'in the name of the Father and of the Holy Spirit,' rather than in adding them.

Since, however, it is the common opinion of scholars of the

liberal school that Matthew xxviii. 19 is unhistorical, it may be worth while to look at their arguments a moment. No one has presented them better than Dr. Paul Feine, one of the theological professors in the University of Halle, in his *Theologie des Neuen Testament*, 2 Aufl., 1911.

(1) Feine says that everywhere else in the New Testament when baptism is spoken of it is always with reference to Christ—'into Christ,' 'into the name of the Lord Jesus,' 'in the name of Jesus Christ,' 'upon the name of Jesus Christ.' And this was kept up through the first century, and was used at times in the second and even third century. This is not possible if Christ spoke Matthew xxviii. 19 (pp. 211-12). This sounds more plausible than it is. For it assumes things that are not so.

(a) It assumes that Christ gave these words as a legal form to be followed verbatim. But He never gave any such words. He gave no directions as to church organization or offices, as to calling and ordaining of ministers, as to a thousand things which Christians of later ages have concerned themselves with. His principle was, Know the truth and the truth shall make you free. Forms, formulæ, rites, ceremonies, words to be repeated, &c.—these He knew would come in their own good time; came all too soon perhaps and all too rigidly. When, therefore, the disciples heard the words we read in Matthew xxviii. they did not think of a rule, but of a principle or religious object or devotional goal.

(b) Even the text itself suggests this. It is not into the names of Father, Son, and Spirit, but into the name of Father, &c. In the Orient, name meant the person himself. But that Person was threefold—Father, Son, and Spirit. Even in the Synoptic Gospels you have that. Son and Spirit are not two separate individuals, standing over against the Father like two of his ministers over against a king, but they are parts of Him, so to speak, elements of His being, momenta of His eternity, going out from Him on their several functions, errands, and work. This the disciples

knew. Therefore baptism in the name of any one of these subsistences in God meant really and spiritually baptism in the name of all three. Religiously it was a matter of indifference into which or whom they baptized—Father, Son, or Spirit. But historically it made a big difference. For the being or subsistence immediately concerned was Christ alone. He came, He taught, He died, He arose again, He sent the disciples, He went into heaven, He sent down the Holy Spirit, He founded the Church. Therefore He and He alone filled the historical horizon. When you baptized a Jew, who already knew the Father and Spirit, he had to be baptized in the name of Jesus: that was his new pledge, his new death, his new life. When you baptized a heathen, he already had ideas of deity and the eternal Spirit, but the crucified Son of God, to whom he was now to belong—ah, that was another question! So he also was immersed in the name of Jesus. Later, when the Church saw that pagans needed instruction in the true God, they naturally added Father and Spirit. But the wonder is not why, in view of Matthew xxviii., they baptized in the name of the Son, but why they ever baptized in any other.

(c) The objection of Feine assumes an importance to quasi-commands of Jesus, words that seem like half-commands or, perhaps, real commands or directions, which did not exist either in his own mind or in the mind of his followers. For instance, he gave directions about prayer, even the words in which the prayer could be used. Did the Church in the apostolic age follow these directions or repeat this prayer? No, there is not the slightest trace of any such thing. They are apparently as oblivious to it as they are to baptism in the threefold Name. Some one says Paul's 'Abba, Father' (Rom. viii. 15) is an echo of the Lord's Prayer. It's a queer echo. There is not the slightest evidence that it is. Again, our Lord instituted, or seemed to institute, the Lord's Supper. He said certain words—'This is My body,' &c. It was a solemn hour. The words

must have abode in the memory of apostles and have been repeated to Christians many times. But there is not a trace that those words and that scene had historical influence on the sacred Suppers in the New Testament until Paul warned the Corinthians against turning Lord's Suppers into self suppers. They had the Suppers, they were Lord's Suppers in a real sense, but, so far as records go, the Christians did not repeat the words nor try to reproduce the scene. That is, Lord's Suppers as we perform them, and as Christ apparently wanted them performed, did not exist in the apostolic age, just as baptism as we perform it, as to mode and words used—the threefold Name—did not exist in apostolic times. Again: Christ washed the disciples' feet, and He said that Christians should do likewise. Did they? They acted as to that as they did to the threefold Name. It was two hundred years before they started Feet Washing. In fact, the customs of nineteen hundred years have dislocated the framework in which the New Testament has placed all such words and directions, have confused our perspective of that era, and have caused us to attach—consciously or unconsciously—a false value to the literal or binding character of many of Christ's commands or half-commands or suggestions or guiding hints as judged by the knowledge or conscience of Christians in the first age of the Church.

Besides all this, it was not for some years that Matthew's Gospel was written. After it was written, copies were scarce. It was not till Matthew xxviii. 19 became universally known that it could be universally followed.

(2) Feine says (p. 213) that Matthew xxviii. 19 is not only a baptismal formula, but that it is to be spoken out in the baptism act. Here we are again thrusting back our notions, built up on centuries of custom, upon the naïve consciousness and spontaneous practices of primitive times. From all the evidence, Christ cared nothing for formulae, and left none. He came, He said, not to give rubrics, but to give life (John x. 10). There is no recognized form of words

used in any service or sacrament in the New Testament, so far as we know. Even baptism in the name of Christ is expressed in various ways. And when Christ said, 'Baptize in the name of the Father,' &c., the only authority we have for saying that those very words should be used or spoken aloud in baptizing is custom. The thought in his mind might be carried out by private or public instruction. The essence of baptism was a voluntary and open confession of Christ, and dedication to Him in the sense of henceforth belonging to Him.

(3) Feine objects to Matthew xxviii. 19 because, in case of its genuineness, objections of a part of the Church to Paul's Gentile mission is not understandable. But there were no objections to Paul's heathen mission. Its right was taken for granted by all Christians. What was objected to was—and that only by the extreme section of Jewish Christians, the so-called Judaizers—that Paul did not insist on circumcision, and perhaps other laws, for the Gentiles. They all held that Paul could preach to the Gentiles to his heart's content. It was the extremists who cried, 'Bring them in by way of Moses first.' Paul never had to defend his Gentile mission, only its emancipating feature.'

(4) It is said also (p. 218) that if Christ spoke Matthew xxviii. 19 there could never have been separation of territories of the apostles—Peter to the circumcision, Paul to the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 7-9), for Peter would also claim rights to the world mission. But, so far as we know, he did claim those rights. Christ did not say, 'Go ye only to the Gentile world,' but, 'Go ye into all the world.' And the Jews were scattered practically into all parts of the then known world. So that when Peter went as apostle to the Dispersion, he was just as truly carrying out Christ's Last Commission as Paul.

(5) Finally, it is claimed that Paul did not know that

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 16 is not against this. The reference is to Jews, not Christians of any kind (see context).

Christ ever uttered Matthew xxviii. 19, for if he had known it he would not have thanked God he baptized so few, nor said that Christ had not sent him to baptize, but to preach the gospel (1 Cor. i. 14-17). Well, of course Paul was not there when Christ gave the Commission, and whether any of those who were there told him of it we do not know. But we do know that he not only highly valued baptism, but believed its religious significance was of exceeding preciousness, and saw to it as a matter of course that all his converts were baptized, so that he could easily have written what he does in 1 Corinthians i. and yet have known of the Commission. Nor does that Commission make baptism the chief thing, nor directly institute it. Notice the wording: one command or direction, and two participial clauses. One command: 'make disciples of all the nations,' preceded by the participle 'going'; two participial clauses, as though they were things taken for granted, mentioned in passing: 'baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,' and 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.' Both of these last would, in fact, be taken for granted, and both would be done without any specific word from Jesus. That was in the whole historical situation, and in everything that Jesus was and meant for them.

These are the objections of Feine to the historicity of Matthew xxviii. 19, and these are the reasons why those objections are invalid. Not one of them stands examination. On the other hand, it is fair to say that Feine confesses that the earliest baptisms were really Trinitarian. While Christians confessed Christ as Messiah and Lord, and therefore were baptized upon or in Christ, upon His name, &c., yet, since Christ was the commissioned of God, and a person subjected himself to Christ in order to come to God, so, from the beginning, Christ and God stood to each other in inner unity, both in Christian experience and in baptism. And, even at Pentecost, Peter portrays baptism as mediating

the Spirit. Salvation from God and Christ was mediated through the Spirit. 'So it is to be asserted,' says Feine, 'that, from the beginning on, Christian baptism was Trinitarian' (p. 218). 'God, Jesus the Lord or the Christ, and the Holy Spirit are the ground-pillars of Christian faith from the beginning.' Of course, there was no one formula always used, but whenever the primitive Christians 'wanted to realize the whole riches of their salvation in Christ, they always thought on God (the Father), on Christ the Lord, and on the Holy Spirit.'

Not only so; Feine acknowledges (p. 214) that this fact is not accidental, but goes back to Jesus's will and revelation, so that Matthew xxviii. 19 gives again a word which reflects Jesus's will. From the very beginning baptism was everywhere used, and used as an act of incorporation into the Church, which means that the Church believed itself acting in the sense of Jesus—and the connexion of baptism and Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians x. 2, 8 finds (says Feine) its most natural explanation if Paul considered both the institution of Jesus.* It is probable, therefore, he continues, that Jesus ordered baptism for His Church,

*Compare Harnack: 'From the beginning there is something deeply mystical in the words and designation, "the Father, the Son," as applied to God, and through and in this connexion with the Father a thoroughly established transcendental existence was ascribed to Jesus, not only by those who were given to philosophical speculation, but also in the eyes of those who were simply believers in Christ' (*Constitution and Law of the Church*, English translation, 1910, p. 272).

*In my judgement it is doubtful whether 1 Corinthians x. 2, 8 refers to baptism and Lord's Suppers, though this does not affect Feine's inference. Haupt (also Halle professor) thinks Christ put Spirit's baptism, and not our sacrament, in place of John's, and that the disciples at Pentecost, on assembling a Messianic community, put in baptism, since they found that that mediated the gift of the Spirit, thinking back on the baptism which they used earlier on the commission of Jesus (John iii. 22, iv. 1 f.). See Haupt, *Zum Verständnis des Apostolats im N. T.*, 41 ff. The difficulty with this is that Haupt's theory presupposes a complete misunderstanding of Jesus's intention on the part of the apostles. This is so unlikely that it is not to be assumed without proof.

and in that case Matthew xxviii. 19 must remain the foundation passage for Christian baptism.

In conformity to the reticence of the New Testament in regard to forms, rites, church orders, liturgies, &c., there are no directions for baptism whatever. In general, we know from New Testament and from post-apostolic light that it was founded on Jewish precedents. (1) It was on repentance and for remission of sins. (2) It was therefore, like Jewish baptism, confined to adults, and was by immersion. (3) It followed immediately on repentance. (4) In post-apostolic times those who declared themselves candidates were urged to test the grounds on which they desired baptism—just as with the Jewish proselytes. (5) In the second century at least—probably in the first—the baptism took place in running water, as with Jews. (6) It synchronized forgiveness, or—with the Oriental tendency to consolidate symbol and thing symbolized—it conferred it. (7) As with the Jews, before the immersion the baptizer gave moral instruction or lectures, which was practically identical with that given at Jewish baptism. (8) After this the person to be baptized confessed his repentance—also a Jewish custom. (9) As with the latter, in the case of women, other women helped, not, of course, in the crowning baptismal act, but in removing their garments, leading them into the water, &c.

Speaking of running water, it is thought that Hebrews x. 22—'Let us draw near with . . . our bodies bathed in pure water'—refers to this. As to the moral instruction preceding the baptism, Paul gives a catalogue of evil-doers (the bad men and things the candidates were warned against), and then he says, 'But such were some of you, but ye bathed yourselves off clean, but ye were sanctified,' &c. (1 Cor. vi. 11), referring to the fact that in the Corinthian Church especially, and in apostolic times generally, the baptizer—compared with later times—was an unimportant person, that the candidates themselves took the chief part in the

baptismal bathing, and that baptism represented a thorough cleansing and cleft with the old life.

This religious cleansing and forgiveness in baptism which our sources represent (‘Be baptized every one of you . . . unto the remission of your sins . . . arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins’) has been made into the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, viz. that in infant baptism the stains of original sin are washed away, and thus the child is saved, and if it dies will go to heaven; and, with adults, baptism, in association with repentance and faith, really cleanses, forgives, and justifies the soul. This celebrated doctrine is that of the Greek, Roman, Eastern, and High Anglican Churches, and is also that of the High Lutheran Church. But a little further attention to our sources will show that the teaching is not quite so magical and mechanical.

(1) The Orientals were realistic in their use of figures and identified symbol and thing symbolized. ‘I am the door of the sheep.’ ‘I am the shepherd.’ ‘I stand at the door.’ ‘Wash away thy sins.’ Shall we think that Christ was a literal door, or that water cancelled the sins? It is absurd.

(2) When Scripture gives deliberate instruction as to how men are saved it mentions spiritual means: faith—or faith, hope, and love—watchfulness, purity, humility, godliness, or salvation, the free gift of God or of Christ, &c. John iii. 16 is the epitome of the whole New Testament revelation.

(3) Repent ye, and be baptized. What is repentance? A change of mind. But that is impossible except God has begun His gracious work in the soul. And that is impossible without a degree of faith. In other words, repentance itself is the sign of an already saved state, not, of course, in its fullness, but in its beginnings. Before the man is baptized at all, he is in essence, in earnest, an already saved man. Baptism can only, in the nature of the case, proclaim, seal, and dramatically set forth to eyes of onlookers the splendid leap which the man has already taken in his soul from his old sins, associations, &c.

According to Jewish example it is certain that very soon in apostolic times there was a word spoken to the baptized, a word relating to the Saviour and his salvation deeds. We know from the Acts that the baptized were baptized in the name of Christ. What does that mean? Much more to an Oriental than to us. Those baptized in Christ's name were dedicated to Him; they took His name, they became His property, they were identified with Him. These converts already belonged to God and to the Spirit in a sense. They had that as Jews, or even as pagans, so the first impulse would be to baptize them in the name of Christ, which was always the form among the first Christians. As the Church moved away from Judaism, and in space, time, and spirit got farther from her early connexions, as heathen came into the Church more and more, she saw the necessity of uniting the Father and the Spirit with the Son in baptism. The heathen knew nothing competently of either subsistence in the ineffable Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Therefore instruction was given in these three elements. That instruction necessarily took a triadic form. As Matthew's Gospel became more and more widely read, this threefold instruction hitched on naturally to Matthew xxviii. 19, and the triadic baptismal name was spontaneously, and soon universally, used, and the primitive use of the name of Jesus ceased for ever.

I said a moment ago that a word was spoken to the candidates. This is perhaps referred to in Ephesians v. 26: 'Christ gave Himself up for the Church that He might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the bathing of the water in (or by) spoken word.' Here some special words are referred to which had to do with the religious effect of baptism, and there is not the least doubt that they had to do with Christ, especially His death, resurrection, and ascension. Paul connects baptism directly with Christ's death. 'All who were baptized unto Christ Jesus were baptized into his death' (Rom. vi. 8). His death was the main feature in

that pre-baptismal word or words. 'It was for that and unto that that ye were baptized.' This instruction was so well known and taken for granted that Paul almost apologizes for calling the attention of the Roman Christians to it: 'Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into His death?' &c. As though he said: 'Pardon me, but you cannot certainly have forgotten the universal custom, in all the Churches, of the pre-baptismal word as to Christ's death and resurrection, into which, so to speak, you were baptized? Why, the very form of your baptism shows it. Don't you remember how you were buried in the water into death—into Christ's death—for your sins and your own death to your sins?' (vv. 3 and 4).

This also seems suggested in Peter's fine section where he speaks of Christ the Righteous suffering death for us sinners, His resurrection, His going into heaven and being on the right hand of God—all in connexion with baptism, which saves us, not literally as external washing, but symbolically as setting forth or giving opportunity for the inquiry or appeal of a good conscience toward God, a good work in the soul having already been done in repentance and receiving Christ in faith, which was the indispensable preparation for the *ἐπερώτημα* of a good conscience unto God (1 Peter iii. 18-22). Paul does not mention baptism when he speaks of the things which Timothy heard from him among many witnesses (2 Tim. ii. 2), but some think he refers to his public baptism and the words about Christ's death, &c., which went before and on which he was baptized. Of course this *ρῆμα*, this spoken christological word which was the Christian confession accompanying baptism, had in itself no saving significance; but when it was appropriated by a vital faith, and responded to by a shout of assent as a life-and-death confession of faith to be taken on the dramatic immersion or burial ('Didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses'—1 Tim. vi. 12), then it was a real

act of faith which was impossible to be made honestly except the candidate was, not only already saved, but ready almost to die for his faith.

I wonder, Could we recover the essence of this baptismal confession? Well, the essence was Jesus. How was it probably expressed in briefest form? Perhaps in this way: *Jesus is Lord*. In immediate connexion with Peter's telling the convicted Jews at Pentecost to be baptized every one into the name of Jesus Christ, he said that their God had made Jesus both Lord and Messiah, or Anointed or Christ (Acts ii. 36, 38). 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth *Jesus as Lord*, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved' (Rom. x. 9). 'No man can say, *Jesus is Lord*, but in the Holy Spirit' (1 Cor. xii. 8). 'Every tongue should confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord*, to the glory of God the Father' (Phil. ii. 11; cf. 'Ye call me *Lord*, and I am'—John xiii. 13; see also Rom. xiv. 9). Of course, this was not an isolated confession, but it stood in relation to the salvation deeds of Jesus in which His Lordship was glorified. And it is interesting that, while it was Isaiah xlv. 23 which founded the proselyte confession among the Jews, 'Every knee shall bow to me; every tongue shall swear,' so Paul, after mentioning the salvation deeds of Jesus, says that 'therefore God has highly exalted Him, and that to His name [notice the word name—among Orientals the man himself, the very substance and glory of his personality] every knee should bend and every tongue confess' (Phil. ii. 10 f.).

Speaking of baptism in the name of Jesus, it is interesting that we have survivals of a baptismal custom included in the New Testament, viz. the calling out of the name of Jesus or Christ over the baptized. In James ii. 7 we read, 'Do not blaspheme that honourable name which was called out upon you' (R. V., Amer., marg.), prophesied in the Old Testament ('upon all the Gentiles upon whom My name is called'—Amos ix. 11, 12; Acts xv. 17). We do not know that in apostolic times the baptizer said in so many words,

'I baptize thee in the name of Jesus the Christ and Lord,' or, rather, that he simply shouted the name of Jesus Christ the Lord over the candidate and then completed the immersion. The latter seems to have been the custom. 'Arise, and be baptized, and bathe away thy sins, calling out upon His (Christ's) name' (Acts xxii. 16), where the baptized also loudly invokes the sacred name of the Christ. Paul connects calling out on the name of the Lord (Christ) with a preceding faith (another evidence that faith always preceded baptism), that faith with a preceding hearing, and that hearing with a preacher (Rom. x. 18, 14). It is possible that the name of Jesus was spoken or called out when Christians entered an assembly for worship, either when they entered, as a kind of password, or at some time in the service. At any rate, the first name of the Christians was 'Callers upon the name of the Lord' (1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22; Acts ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16).

Did the apostolic Church baptize people to free them from evil spirits? There is not a single example of this. We know indeed that Christ promised power over evil spirits to His disciples, and that they exercised it both before and after His resurrection. We know also that in post-apostolic times demons went out at the name of Jesus. Thus Justin Martyr writes (about 150), 'Every demon who is exorcised obeys the name of the Son of God, the Firstborn of all creation, born of a Virgin, became a suffering man, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate by your people, died, rose from the dead, and ascended to heaven' (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 85). Alfred Seeberg thinks that by apostles that name was used in baptism to free the heathen from bad spirits (*Die Taufe, usw.*, 19). He alleges the expression in Colossians i. 18, 'delivered us out of the power of darkness.' But this is too uncertain. The expression is too general, and there is no reference to baptism in the context. Everybody believed heathen were under power of demons, and that baptism was one method of deliverance. But that is all we can say.

A famous passage is 1 Corinthians xv. 29, 'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?' It was universally believed that Christ was Lord of living and dead. Peter voices a belief that after His death (put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit) He went and preached to the spirits in prison (1 Pet. iii. 18, 19), and later there grew up rank beliefs concerning His activities in the underworld, but this is the only passage where vicarious baptism to help the dead is mentioned. It appears that at Corinth a section of the Church, influenced by heathen notions (one of the mystery religions had a similar custom), had the custom of a member submitting to baptism to help save a friend or relative who had faith but who died too soon to be baptized. If so, it is the only instance in the New Testament where magic intrudes into the realm of this sacrament. Paul does not stop to endorse the custom, but brings it up rapidly as another argument for the resurrection of the body. Everybody would admit that the custom was absurd if the dead were not to rise.

It is well known that the gift of the Holy Spirit was often connected with baptism. It is natural that among the first Christians the psychological effect of an act so dramatic in itself, and so tremendous in significance for one's future life, would be preceded, or more often followed, by a special outpouring of the Spirit—that is, a special spiritual quickening, joy, and enlargement of soul, and occasionally with spiritual gifts. But the narrative in Acts also shows that the Spirit fell sometimes before baptism, and sometimes to a person spiritually unresponsive neither before nor after. We have seen also that the repentance and faith required, in the nature of the case, in persons to be baptized were themselves the gift of the Spirit. A larger gift might well accompany or follow so splendid an act of dedication and self-sacrifice as baptism was to the first Christians. In more senses than one it was the gate of death. And even to-day, if subjects

brought to their baptism more faith, love, and heroic abandonment to Christ, a baptism of the Spirit would follow equal in every essential to that of New Testament times.

What was the mode of baptism in the apostolic Church? A little library of books has been written on this question, and books are still appearing in the South. As I said, the New Testament is remarkably free from rules as to how to do religious or ecclesiastical acts. Its characteristic passage is, 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty' (2 Cor. iii. 17); or this, 'We are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh' (Phil. iii. 3). Of course it is understood that everything is done decently and in order (1 Cor. xiv. 40). Therefore to me the matter has historic interest only. Those who have read Dean Stanley's well-known essay on 'Baptism' will not need to be told that ritualistic or religious bathing or baptizing in streams was one of the commonest acts in the East, so that immersion was taken for granted. But the New Testament lays down no directions or commands or prohibitions, and I suspect that Christ does not care what mode is used, what formula, who is the administrator, so long as the baptism is gone through in the spirit of the early Christians—reverently, lovingly, and with faith in Him as Lord and Saviour.

JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.

SHAKESPEARE AND LIFE

WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE lived in an age when the foundations of the world were being shaken. Half Europe had just flung defiance in the face of the so-called Vicar of Jesus Christ upon the Papal Throne. Thirty-two years before his birth, in 1582, the English had broken loose from Rome. The King had declared himself head of the English Church. It was a period of violent reaction and of sudden changes in religion, in outlook, in customs, and traditions. The old order was passing away. It was a period, therefore, comparable to that through which we are passing to-day. In such a period we are able to see the solid rock of truth which remaineth, and to distinguish it from the shifting sands of mere surmise and speculation. The things which remain stand out in bold relief against the background of the things which are passing away. During the Great War we saw that fundamentally 'a man's a man for a' that.' Social position, wealth, mentality, religion—these things, which are ephemeral and insubstantial, faded, whilst humanity, goodness, good fellowship, and service shone forth gloriously. Alas, how quickly the vision splendid has faded and become dimmed. At such times we see that theology, philosophy, ritual, and creeds may be ever changing, as, indeed, they are. But God and truth, beauty and faith, are imperishable. Centuries like the sixteenth and the twentieth are not dogmatic, but practical. Shakespeare was a great philosopher, yet he wrote no books on philosophy. He was a great theologian, yet he produced no books on theology. He rarely mentions the name of God, yet God was a great reality to him. No doubt he was a good Protestant, yet all his clerical characters were of the ancient Roman Church ; perhaps because the priests of that Church

are more picturesque, and, if one may say so, more classical.

There is very little in the plays of Shakespeare specifically Christian, and only one or two actual references to Jesus Christ. To him life was more than religion and right thinking, and right doing more than orthodoxy.

Yet Shakespeare was a good man. 'His sins, which are many, are forgiven, for he loved much.' That is the truth about Shakespeare. He was a great lover of his kind. He pre-eminently possessed the qualities of 'sweetness and light' which Matthew Arnold commands and pleads for. With his associates in general, as Dr. Herford says, 'he had a reputation for uprightness of dealing.' After his fortieth year, some great personal sorrow, the result of tragic disillusion, caused him to 'become graver and to take life less easily, to feel time's abuses more keenly and to resent them more bitterly' (Herford). The darkness of this eclipse was somewhat lightened in his closing years. His true monument was his 'Book.' In 1628 his fellow actors, Heming and Condell, put forth a collected edition of his plays and poems.

He held a mirror up to nature, says Dr. Garnett. 'There is no situation of human fortune or emotion of the human bosom for which he has not the right word.' Like Homer and Dante, he is infallible in his knowledge of the human heart. The world has appreciated this 'overawing vastness' (Garnett). What, then, were the qualities, the eternal realities, that he brought to light?

I. SHAKESPEARE WAS PRE-EMINENTLY PRACTICAL.—It is true that he was 'of imagination all compact.' No man revelled in the faery fields of imagination more completely. He had a child's joy in the fairyland of romance. He worked in 'the light that never was on sea or land.' His ghosts and witches were very real to him. They represented those weird, uncanny forces and powers over which man

has no control. They represent the mystery in this our human life. They illustrate the truth :

There are more things in heaven and earth
Than are dreamed of in our philosophy.

Shakespeare protests against the cocksureness of the scientific mind. Religious people are especially prone to this. Shakespeare was conscious of the vast ocean of life out beyond the actual and visible. He felt the wavelets of that ocean impinging upon his soul and upon the soul of man, and leaving their indelible marks. He knew not whence they came. Professor Knight says : ' Doctrine, theory, metaphysic, morals—how should these help a man at the last encounter ? Men forge themselves these weapons and glory in them, only to find them an encumbrance at the hour of need. Where pain and sorrow come, reason is powerless ; good counsel turns to passion, and philosophy is put to shame.'

I will be flesh and blood ;
For there was never yet philosopher
That could endure the toothache patiently.

When men come right up against reality, theology, philosophy, and morality are futile.

When Hamlet realizes that the King is seeking his death, he sees ' a cherub that sees them '—a guardian angel who will protect him in the day of peril.

He has no fear of death. He says to Horatio, who pleads with him *not* to accept the challenge to the fatal duel :

We defy augury ; there's a special providence in the fall of a sparrow. If it be now, 'tis not to come ; if it be not to come, it will be now ; if it be not now, yet it will come ; the readiness is all.

Shakespeare, while conscious of the mystery, inevitability, and fatality that confront us, yet declares his belief in the victory of truth over error, of good over evil. ' The readiness

is all.' To be *ready*—to BE something, not to believe something, is the great secret of peace. To have qualified yourself for any fate, to be able to meet destiny with a clear conscience and an open countenance, to 'greet the unseen with a cheer'—that is the secret of greatness and of peace.

Shakespeare had no patience with theorizers and dreamers. His greatest play, *Hamlet*, is a protest against such. Hamlet delays action till it is too late, and he who declared that 'the readiness is all,' was himself unready. Hamlet himself perished through 'too much thinking on the event.'

Horatio comes as near Shakespeare's ideal as any man. Hamlet says to him :

Dost thou hear ?

Since my dear soul was mistress of her choice
And could of men distinguish, her election
Hath sealed thee for herself ; for thou hast been
As one, in suffering all, that suffers nothing,
A man that fortune's buffets and rewards
Hast ta'en with equal thanks ; and blessed are those
Whose blood and judgement are so well co-mingled,
That they are not a pipe for fortune's finger
To sound what stop she please.

Give me that man

That is not passion's slave, and I will wear him
In my heart's core, aye, in my heart of heart,
As I do thee.

Endurance, tenderness, sympathy, will-power, self-control, readiness for any possible prosperity or adversity—these are the qualities that make up a man, and are they not pre-eminently practical virtues ?

But, having practised all these virtues, men are still 'up against it'—they find themselves confronted by colossal misfortune, suffering, and death.

Ah, what a dusty answer gets the soul
When hot for certainties in this our life !

As one of Dickens's characters puts it, 'It's aw a muddle.' And no one who has lived through the Great War will ever deny it. Still, Shakespeare believes

There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them how we will.

II. SHAKESPEARE DECLARES THE MAJESTY OF THE MORAL LAW.—You cannot defy the fundamental laws of justice and truth without suffering. In the historical plays, and pre-eminently in the tragedies, Nemesis, the Furies, Vengeance, pursue the wicked. Shakespeare's plays are a commentary on the words of the Psalmist: 'Evil shall hunt the wicked man.' Wolsey cries out:

O Cromwell, Cromwell,
Had I but served my God with half the zeal
I served my King, He would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies.

Macbeth stabs King Duncan, his king, his guest, his friend; he seizes the crown of Scotland, and for a time realizes his brilliant ambitions. He wins a crown, a throne, a kingdom, but he loses his soul. They crumble away to dust even as he grasps them, and in his declining years he finds himself deserted and alone, and, when that terrible shriek of the dying Queen whom he had loved with passionate devotion strikes upon his ears, he cries out:

She should have died hereafter. . . .
To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools
The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage,
And then is heard no more; it is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing.

No water can wash out sin. Looking at his hands red with the blood of the murdered Duncan, he exclaims :

What hands are here ? Ha ! they pluck out mine eyes !
 Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
 Clean from my hands ? No ? this my hand will rather
 The multitudinous seas incarnadine,
 Making the green, one red.

III. SHAKESPEARE DECLARES THE SUPREMACY OF LOVE.—

In the modern world love is related to material considerations. Marriage is, in the vast majority of cases, interrelated with questions of social position, religion, financial considerations, and a thousand and one artificialities that are quite unessential and unnecessary to a man's real happiness. The question of money is a fertile cause of misery in marriage. No woman should ever dream of marrying a man unless she would be prepared to tramp on the open road with him to the world's end.

Hamlet and Ophelia were listeners to the players who had been brought to Court to divert him from his melancholy. They recite a prologue. Ophelia says, ' 'Tis brief, my lord.' Hamlet answers, 'As woman's love.' And, alas ! it is too terribly true that when poverty comes in at the door love flies out of the window. Shakespeare knew this. King Lear mistook loud profession and voluble utterance for love. He had loved his power, his wealth, his possessions. When he was stripped of them all by his own folly, he goes mad. He had driven love away when he banished the silent Cordelia. When Cordelia woos him back to consciousness and sanity, and they are afterward taken prisoners by her fiendish sisters, she proposes that they should beg for mercy of these same sisters. Lear exclaims :

No, no, no, no ! Come, let's away to prison :
 We two alone will sing like birds in the cage :
 When thou dost ask my blessing, I'll kneel down,
 And ask of thee forgiveness ; so we'll live

And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh
At gilded butterflies. . . .

And we'll wear out,
In a walled prison, packs and seats of great ones,
That ebb and flow by the moon.

Lear has discovered that love is the only thing that makes life worth living, and his love for his banished daughter Cordelia, and her love for him, has ushered in for him, the poor, lonely, helpless, tottering old captive king, a more glorious life than he had ever known when he was King of Britain.

And in the sonnets Shakespeare declares the infinity of love.

Let me not to the marriage of true minds
Admit impediments. Love's not love
Which alters when it alteration finds,
Or bends with the remover to remove :
Oh, no ; it is an ever-fixed mark,
That looks on tempests and is never shaken ;
It is the star to every wandering bark,
Whose worth's unknown, although his height be taken.
Love's not Time's fool, though rosy lips and cheeks
Within his bending sickle's compass come ;
Love alters not with the brief hours and weeks,
But bears it out even to the edge of doom.
If this be error, and upon me proved ;—
I never writ, nor no man ever loved.

There in that glorious sonnet Shakespeare declares the absolute and unrelated character of love. God's love is like that. God loves the unlovable and the rebellious. God says, ' I have loved thee with an everlasting love ; therefore with lovingkindness have I drawn thee.' Man's hideous crimes, his boundless and pitiless ambition, his brutalities and sensualities, his unnatural crimes, his hatreds and envyings, his greed, and lust of power—none of these things can destroy God's infinite love and eternal compassion.

IV. SHAKESPEARE DECLARES THE DIVINITY OF MAN.—

Dr. Dowden says : ' Assuredly the inference from Shakespeare's writings is not that he held himself, with virginal strength and pride, remote from the blameful pleasures of the world. What no reader will find in Shakespeare is a cold-blooded, hard, or selfish line ; all is warm, sensitive, vital, radiant with delight or a-thrill with pain, whatever his sins may have been.' As Professor Dowden says, it is improbable that Shakespeare could have uttered the proud words about his life being ' unspotted ' which Milton uttered. Shakespeare knew he was a sinner, which it is doubtful whether Milton ever knew. Shakespeare would get nearer to the Cross of Christ than Milton. He was not immaculate. His plays sometimes offend common decency. There was a coarseness and a sensuality that repels, and which reflects the coarseness and sensuality of the age against which, within a quarter of a century, Puritanism was a thundering protest. No one would, however, suspect or charge Shakespeare with being a prude. ' His poetry does not possess the proud virginity of Milton's poetry, and his youth was not devoted, like the youth of Milton, to an ideal of moral elevation and purity ' (Dowden). Shakespeare was very human, and he was not ashamed of it. He would have been the very last to say, in the words of Hamlet :

Man pleases me not ; no, nor woman neither.

Man, humanity, was infinitely interesting to him, and he loved them, and Jesus Christ would have said of Shakespeare what he said of Mary Magdalene. They were not hard, selfish, deliberate, cold-blooded sins. The poet Chapman pictures the life of great energy, enthusiasms, and passion which stands for ever on the edge of utmost danger and yet for ever remains in absolute security.

Give me the spirit that on this life's rough sea
Loves to have his sail filled with a lusty wind
Even till his sail-yards tremble, his masts crack,
And his rapt ship run on her side so low

That she drinks water and her keel ploughs air ;
 There is no danger to a man that knows
 What life and death is—there's not any law
 Exceeds his knowledge ; neither is it lawful
 That he should stoop to any other law.

'Such a spirit pressing forward under strained canvas was Shakespeare. If the ship dipped and drank water, she rose again, and at length we behold her within view of her haven, sailing under large calm wind, not without tokens of stress of weather, but, if battered, yet unbroken by the waves.'

Yes, that is Shakespeare's view of man. He looks out upon humanity with a great compassion. He sees the struggle of the masses. As Burns says, 'He knew not what's resented.' He would not judge harshly of his fellows. He knew the desperate character of the struggle. He knew with a divine insight that outside all the Churches were multitudes who, though they sinned, though they were battered or broken in the struggle, would still be saved 'yet so as by fire.'

V. SHAKESPEARE SUGGESTS THE REALITY OF THE ETERNAL WORLD AND THE EVANESCENCE OF THE MATERIAL WORLD.—The fashion of the world passeth away. In *The Tempest* he makes Prospero say :

These our actors,
 As I foretold you, were all spirits and
 Are melted into air, into thin air :
 And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
 The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
 The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
 Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
 And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
 Leave not a rack behind.

We are such stuff
 As dreams are made on, and our little life
 Is rounded with a sleep.

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION

IT is at once the tragedy and the grandeur of man that he is haunted, and often indeed tortured, by the ultimate questions of existence. Herein lies his supreme *differentia* from the other forms of animate existence known to us on this planet ; herein, also, is discovered the source both of his keenest joys and of his acutest anguish. Whether or no this quest has any meaning is the fundamental question which distinguishes the religious from the finally-agnostic attitude to life.

To the uncompromising agnostic it has no meaning. The urge of thought within man is to him no clue to a goal which is there for his discovery. A fundamental pessimism is integral to his attitude, inasmuch as a goal, which for him can never be there, he cannot help but seek. Planted in the heart of life there is, if you will, a lie, or, if you will, a deception—a lie which is no less such though no one has told it but himself, a deception which remains such though the perpetrator is none other than his own nature.

To the religious thinker this unquiet urge has its meaning. To him this very *élan* has within itself the clue to a goal which is there—a goal whereat he can find, if not complete comprehension, at least complete *meaning*. He is basally, though never superficially, optimistic, in that on various grounds—of thought as well as of faith—he cannot acquiesce in the illusory character of a goal which he cannot but seek. Planted in the heart of life there is to him a truth, or, if you will, an assurance—a truth which he believes has been put there by the Lord of Truth, an assurance which has been given to ignorant but aspiring humanity by the God from whom he comes and to whom he goes.

There are, of course, many varieties of agnosticism, as, indeed, there are many varieties of religion. The term itself

is comparatively recent,¹ but the attitude of critical scrutiny it may be held to describe is as old as the appearance on this planet of a being with the capacity for reflective thought. Confronted by the immensities, thinking man cannot avoid such ultimate questions as the cause and meaning of things, and the cause and meaning of himself. Upon which questions there follows, after further reflection, this other: Can his various faculties be relied upon to lead him to the truth?

The attitude of Spencer, Huxley, and the other leading representatives of nineteenth-century agnosticism is familiar. It is sufficient here, therefore, to say that those who declare that we must be content with a final ignorance as to the nature and meaning of things are seldom, if ever, consistent. The one type of thinker of whom history gives us no cognizance is the complete agnostic. A perpetual suspension of judgement is as impossible to a rational being as the perpetual suspension of a static body in mid air. On many questions, of course, the wise man will not speak dogmatically. But that is not the agnostic attitude. The term agnosticism is one which, if one is faithful to it, pre-judges at once every fact still to be observed, and all thinking upon those facts. If agnosticism is a final attitude for the human mind, then why does that mind persist in exploring the unknowable? If by their very constitution man's rational powers are incompetent to reach truth, then why, we cannot but ask, does he continue to think? On the hypothesis latent in this philosophic attitude, the evolutionary process has achieved its present goal in a being who seeks when there is nothing for him to seek, who is urged from within to a goal which for him can never be there. An uncompromising agnosticism consigns all its adherents to a perpetual, if self-imposed, intellectual impotency, to an inability to say anything at all about the ultimate problems of life. Those who maintain a conclusion which *says something*

¹For Huxley's account of the origin of the word see *Nineteenth Century*, February 1889.

leave themselves free to surrender it should the future disclose facts which forbid it, whereas a complete agnosticism takes shelter in a position which, by its very nature, renders futile all further search.

It is not to be forgotten, however, that 'agnosticism' was in large measure a revolt from the over-weening dogmatisms of the age. Most religious minds to-day derive from a perusal of the main orthodox apologetic literature of the nineteenth century a large measure of understanding sympathy for those who were unable to acquiesce in the finalities and rigidities of theological statement. With respect to that whole unhappy controversy, we can only rejoice that Christianity was able to survive the hard blows inflicted as much by its supposed protagonists as by its presumed antagonists—a survival which reveals, among other things, that religion is not theology.

Happily, modesty is not now normally divorced from apologetic literature. The curative mission of these blows has been, in part, accomplished; they have served, among other things, to lay bare the 'inferiority complex,' as the modern psychologist might call it, of an apologetic which manifested so many panicky fears and alarms.

In my own judgement, however, this more modest tone of modern theology is as much due to a return to essential spiritual religion as to the hard knocks received in past controversies. Theology, when it is not divorced from religious insight, is ever concerned to stress its own reverent, and hopeful, agnosticism.¹ The vision which religion gives compels the recognition of the provisional character of all attempts to explicate that insight in intellectual formulation. Considerations of space forbid me from illustrating this contention. Suffice it to say that a form of agnosticism is inseparable from religious insight whenever that is true and deep.

¹ For illustrations from Jewish literature see, e.g., Gen. xxxii. 29; Exod. iii. 14; Job xi. 7; Ecclus. xliii. 27f. For illustrations from Christian literature see, e.g., the hymns of the Church.

But it will, further, be manifest that, unless the claim of religion to give man real knowledge, or *experience* (to use, perhaps, a better word), of reality be set aside as illusion, as the figment of a dream, a final agnosticism can never cohere with religion. For religion is, or at least claims to be, *gnostic*, if such a word may here be permitted; if it were not so, or if it did not by its very nature claim to be so, it would very speedily, I imagine, disappear from the world. Were I ever to become convinced that religion was simply a phenomenon within humanity, giving no evidence whatever of objective reality, I do not see how I could permit myself to continue to give place in my life for such religious acts and customs as worship and prayer; my mental integrity would in such a case, I trust, compel me to relinquish such practices. Even the subject which is the theme of this paper I can only embark upon on the presupposition, or fundamental belief, that there is something to discuss; obviously, there would be nothing to discuss if I had come to regard religion as giving to us no real *gnosis*; my only task would be the—under the circumstances—somewhat futile one of giving another illustration of the finally-agnostic thesis.

From which it will be seen that the term religion, like the term agnostic, is used in a remarkable variety of senses. There are as many ways of regarding religion as there are types of religious, and unreligious, mind. There have been long and learned discussions of 'religion' on the part of those who regarded its presence within humanity as another illustration of the facility with which, in the interest of desire, humanity deceives itself. Reinach, for example, began his *General History of Religions* with this peculiarly illuminating definition—illuminating, I mean, as to his own position: Religion, he said, is 'a sum of scruples which impede the free exercise of our faculties.'¹ Such a definition of religion would fairly well correspond to such a definition of

¹ *Orpheus*, Eng. trans., p. 3.

science as 'a sum of the phenomenal observations which render unnecessary the exercise both of the metaphysical and the spiritual faculty of man.' Frequently, also, by opportunist statesmen and by sociologists, religion is conceived, and often defended (may religion be delivered from its friends!), as a kind of guarantee of the social order. I have frequently listened to apologists for the eighteenth-century revival of religion in England arguing with great energy, to the gratification of their religious hearers, that it saved this country from economic and political upheaval. Such apologies, whatever substratum of valuable truth they may have in them, are much too similar to the agnostic misconception, or to the political exploitation, of religion, to command the approval of those who have inner experience of what religion really is.¹

It is not to be denied that these and kindred conceptions of religion can receive a partial or seeming substantiation from many of the inescapable facts of history. No one acquainted, however superficially, with the history of thought would think of denying that frequently, if not indeed customarily, religion has been associated with theological and anthropological views which impeded the employment of man's scientific faculty and retarded the acceptance of its conclusions. Nor would any one familiar with political and institutional history wish to deny that very frequently religion has been regarded, often by complete sceptics, as a buttress to the accepted order of society and as a potent antidote to the *virus* of new and revolutionary ideas. Nevertheless, it is only those who have adopted a

¹ Cf. the words, according to Ludwig, spoken by Napoleon to the Council of State: 'What I see in religion is, not the mystery of the incarnation, but social order. It associates with heaven an idea of equality, which prevents the poor from massacring the rich. Religion has the same sort of value as vaccination. It gratifies our tastes for the miraculous, and protects us from quacks; for the priests are worth more than the Cagliostros, the Kants, and all the German dreamers,' &c. (*Napoleon*, Eng. trans., p. 598).

finally-agnostic view of life and the universe who can summarily dismiss the whole great fact of religion in one or other of these ways. Those who reject such an agnosticism, while looking with quite open and attentive eyes at these unhappy alliances contracted by religion, know, or believe, that the real meaning and purport of religion is something quite other.

The real question, therefore, between agnosticism and religion is not whether religion, as an historically observable phenomenon, has contracted either truth-opposing or worldly-wise alliances, but whether it is essential to its nature so to do; in other words, whether religion is, or is not, experience *sui generis*, affording experience of ultimate reality.

A final agnosticism answers this latter question in the negative. In these days of psychological scrutiny, the main and essential ground of this negation is, as it seems to me, to be found in the doctrine of illusionism, or, as it may alternatively be described, in the anthropomorphic theory.

Illusionism may be described as the nightmare of theology.¹ It is, I imagine, the chief enemy of any and every religious philosophy of life, and this because it denies to religion any *evidencing* quality—any quality, that is, derived from a source other than the hopes, desires, fears of humanity itself. The most thoroughgoing representative of this basally agnostic theory is Ludwig Feuerbach, and it is probable that the question he raised two or three generations ago will demand a closer attention, and a fuller answer from theology, than it has yet received.

To Feuerbach religion was 'the dream of the human mind.' 'The true sense of theology' to him was, therefore, 'anthropology'; and the task he set himself was 'to show that the antithesis of divine and human is altogether illusory.' 'Consciousness of God is self-consciousness;

¹ Cf., e.g., F. Ménégoz's *Le Problème de la Prière*, whose chief motif is to combat 'le cauchemar de la théologie : la doctrine de l'illusionisme.'

knowledge of God is self-knowledge. By his God thou knowest the man, and by the man his God.' 'God is the manifested inward nature, the imprisoned self of a man.' 'Religion is the solemn unveiling of a man's hidden treasures, the revelation of his intimate thoughts, the open confession of his love-secrets.' In religion 'man adores his own nature.' 'Man has given objectivity to himself, but has not recognized the object as his own nature.' Ignorance of the identity of 'consciousness of God' with 'the self-consciousness of man' is 'fundamental to the true nature of religion.' 'In religion man contemplates his own nature.' 'God is nothing else than the nature of man purified from that which to the human individual appears, whether in feeling or thought, a limitation, an evil.' Feuerbach 'reduced the supermundane, supernatural, and superhuman nature of God to the elements of human nature as its fundamental elements.' Therefore 'the beginning, middle, and end of religion is man.'

These words of Feuerbach himself, which I take from his *Essence of Christianity* (Eng. trans., 1854), set forth the essential agnostic-illusionist position as clearly and as succinctly as it could be stated in a general description. From them it will be seen that religion is regarded as a kind of beneficent self-deception which blinds man to the intrinsic unmeaningness of life. From them, also, it is, I think, clear that the illusionist only presses home to an ultimate, and what he regards as inevitable, end the theory which has commonly been termed the anthropomorphic theory of religion. This theory is very old in literature—as old, at least, as Xenophanes of Colophon. From the day when he declared that 'if horses fashioned gods for themselves, they would give them the shape of horses,' it has been customary to note the inescapable tendency of mankind to ascribe to the divine the characteristics, whether physical, mental, or moral, of a man. 'We cannot,' said Philo, 'constantly store up in our soul that verse, so worthy of the Cause, "God is not as man"'

(Num. xxiii. 19), so as to escape all anthropomorphic expressions.' 'A man,' said Goethe, in one of his familiar maxims, 'never understands how anthropomorphic he is'; which is just another way of saying that man cannot be other than himself. It is only a step beyond this position—but how big a step it is!—to declare that none of man's experiences and thoughts can take him beyond himself, and that he must therefore resign himself to the prison-house of his own mind, and be content with the recognition of the illusory character of his religious experiences. As Feuerbach put it: 'Wherever, therefore, this idea, that the religious predicates are only anthropomorphisms, has taken possession of a man, there has doubt, has unbelief, obtained the mastery of faith. And it is only the inconsequence of faint-heartedness and intellectual imbecility which does not proceed from this idea to the formal negation of the predicates, and from thence to the negation of the subject to which they relate. If thou doubtst the objective truth of the predicates, thou must also doubt the objective truth of the subject whose predicates they are. If thy predicates are anthropomorphisms, the subject of them is an anthropomorphism too. If love, goodness, personality, &c., are human attributes, so also is the subject which thou presupposest, the existence of God, the belief that there is a God, an anthropomorphism—a presupposition purely human.'

To the charge of 'the inconsequence of faint-heartedness and intellectual imbecility' the theistic thinker may quite calmly give the direct negative. The recognition that religion as an historical phenomenon has been, in its history, accompanied with crude anthropomorphic ideas, by no means involves the conclusion that religious experience and religious philosophy has its ground and cause only in the illusions of personal desire. Granted that unreflecting man conceives God in his own image, the question remains why he should ever dream of conceiving him at all. If man, by his very constitution, is shut within his own prison-house, why does

his thought soar into the immensities? Why should he not stay where he is, ask never a question, be content with a blindness to all but himself? Why does he ever *think* he sees beyond his prison-house? Why, indeed, this very illusion of objective reality outside himself? These ultimate questions which so haunt and perplex him—why does he ever begin to ask them at all? Surely only because they are *there* to be asked by any one who has the requisite mental, moral, and spiritual development. On the illusionist theory, why should man impose upon himself a painful and perplexing search? For was not his God the creation of his desire? Then why the age-long travail of human thought? Merely to find intellectual justification for what he desires? Not thus are the ultimate questions of existence to be summarily brushed aside as meaningless. For however completely we may strip ourselves of every wish that has clothed itself in apologetic argumentation, the same question remains: Is there, or is there not, any meaning in anything?

Not only, however, may the theistic thinker directly negative the confident dogmatism of the illusionist; he may, if so disposed, resort to the *argumentum ad hominem*, with the familiar *tu quoque*. Religion is not the only thing to be lost in the illusionist gulf. Is there any reason why what we call science is not lost there as well? Can we be permitted to rely on our sense perceptions any more than on our religious perceptions? Again, if the Object of religion is illusion, then how can the conclusions of the illusionist's reasoning be saved from the same illusionist gulf? A question which serves but to show that the illusionist is never wholly illusionist, just as the agnostic is never wholly agnostic. In regard to his own conclusions, he calls us to submit to their unillusionist truth and validity. The illusionist agnostic is in similar case to the final determinist, whose very act of thinking presupposes the repudiation of his theory. He is the man of whom Goethe spoke: 'A man must cling to the

belief that the incomprehensible is comprehensible ; otherwise he would not try to fathom it.' Enough, however, of these logomachies ! Sufficient here to say that we cannot settle the eternal question of the Being and Nature of, God the Ground and Object of religion, by the summary conclusion—illusion all.

Few agnostics, however, go quite as deep as Feuerbach for the attempted justification of their position. The considerations which sway and decide the attitude of most are the more obvious ones of history and of personal, common-sense observation. They point to the perpetual conflict of ideas about the divine, and ask whether, in view of these eternal disagreements, it were not the part of wisdom to acknowledge : I do not know, I cannot know. Again, they may point to the inescapable fact that the same man varies in his perceptions and in his judgements, accords to conflicting considerations a weight or an emphasis which differs according to the state of his health, his age, his circumstances. Likewise, they may point to the inescapable subjectivities imposed upon us by our cultural inheritance, and by the congenital diversity of our minds. The recurring variety of answers to the same questions, has it not its source in our hereditary and in our environmental heritage ? Or, again, does not our modern historical method and spirit, it may be asked, *involve* the agnostic attitude ? Is it not of the essence of that method to trace the growth, and therefore inevitability, of such dogmatic answers as have been given to the ultimate questions ? If we try, as we must, to trace—and succeed, as we do, in historically tracing—the growth of dogmatic systems, have we not evacuated our systems of any final truth ? If it is essential to the *knower* to be able to say, *This I know, and it must be so*, is it not as essential to the *spectator* of the whole to be able to say, How can you speak as if your knowledge gave you the validity of truth, when it is dependent on factors which I can historically trace ? If we have learned to speak of ' the incubation of orthodoxy,' is

not our confidence in the result of that incubation shaken? If, further, we are led to note the inextricable interrelation of a religion with its racial and cultural 'home,' can we avoid a sceptical agnosticism? Or, again, if we note such commonplace facts as that a deep pocket, made deep, frequently, by intense concentration on the material things and on the material values, can subsidize, and so indefinitely perpetuate, the false or inadequate ideas of its owner, is not the fount of our confidence in the 'orthodoxies' in danger of being wholly dried up? Or, again, in these days of general familiarity with the astronomical immensities, the agnostic will point us to the difficulty of conceiving that man, who dwells for but a flash of time on a mere 'coagulated drop of the sun,' can say anything final about a universe about which he must ever be abysmally ignorant.

It is these, what I may call, common-sense subjectivities, rather than any fundamental illusionism, which incline so many to agnosticism. The route of such considerations seems to many, both orthodox believer and final agnostic, to lead to complete scepticism. And the goal, so reached, was thus described by Anatole France, the prince of modern agnostics: 'It is an iniquitous abuse of intelligence, nothing less, to employ it in searching after truth.' 'Philosophic systems are interesting only as psychical documents—well adapted to enlighten the *savant* on the different conditions which the human mind has passed through. Valuable for the study of man, they can afford us no information about anything that is not man.'

Now, the deliverance from this final agnosticism is not to be gained, as far as we understand the matter, by seeking defensively to evade the common-sense considerations to which reference has been made. The subjectivities involved in the divergences of mental climate and of mental nature, in the method and spirit of modern historical inquiry, in the immense and humanly inexhaustible variety of natural

¹ See *Le Jardin d'Épicure*.

phenomena—these are all *there*. To ignore them, while ever the temptation of expedient worldly wisdom, is not to refute them ; in the end, it is rather to submit to their claim of final validity. No ! this deliverance is to be gained by showing that these subjectivities and necessities may, and indeed *must*, be transcended if any meaning is to be ascribed to the whole cosmic process. This is, in reality, only another phase of the whole urgent present task involved in the problem of the mutual relations of science and religion. For the progress of scientific investigation and exploration is to reveal at every fresh step deeper and more intricately involved necessities, and the task of religious thought is to transcend these necessities in a moral purposiveness wherein meaning, truth, goodness, can have the final word.

Science in its several branches—whether natural science, historical science, or psychological science—can give no final interpretation of the facts which it investigates and with which it deals. That task is left for thought reflecting on *all* the facts, and on all those problems which a one-sided concentration on *some* of those facts so frequently obscures. Sometimes—such is the frailty of the human mind—some of the facts are forgotten or overlooked. Among these facts is the great fact of religion—so easy for some to overlook because so personal, so intimate, so peremptory, when its claim is felt ; and for these same reasons so easy for others to *abstract* from those other outward or natural facts which are as much *given* as they.

The task, then, imposed upon religious thought is to see that due place is given in reflective interpretations of existence to the facts of religion. To be able to blend a primary concern for this task with refusal to overlook any of the other pertinent facts is not, let it be confessed, easy. Yet it is essential. And, when this attitude of twofold fidelity is securely maintained, it will be seen that religious thought is not, for example, concerned to deny the anthropomorphic tendency of the human mind, but only concerned to deny that

the ascription of personality to God is a mere anthropomorphism. The importance of this latter denial, however, can hardly be overestimated. For implicit in it is the ascription to Ultimate Reality of the highest values known to us. Should, for example, it be held to be degrading to divinity to regard It in personal terms, it must be maintained that it is much more degrading to withhold from the divine the highest we know. Likewise, religious thought is not concerned to deny that fundamental presupposition of historical inquiry—the historical traceability of beliefs, customs, &c.—but must be sufficiently tenacious of essential metaphysics to be able to distinguish *truth* and *value* from *origin* and *history*. For, just as man's worth and dignity are not affected by the acceptance of a theory of evolution which traces his emergence from the humblest beginnings, so neither is the truth of a theistic interpretation of the universe destroyed by tracing in historical fashion the emergence, and psychological motivations, of such a belief.

This concern of reflective religious thinking to set forth a theistic world-view as the one least inadequate to all the facts must ever, however, come back to religious experience for the fount of its inspiration. The endeavour 'to make all things clear' by thought alone fails, and probably will ever fail. Those who, I think, see 'clearliest' in these matters come back to—and, indeed, begin from—the reality of religion as given in personal experience. Nor does this attitude mean the centring all on 'the objective validity of religious experience,' with forgetfulness of the whole other series of facts on which the religious inference is based. No; but it *does* mean the assertion that religion is primarily and essentially, an *experience* and not an *inference*. No amount of intellectual facility for drawing inferences can take the place of religion itself. That is why so many who argue most vehemently, and, so often in the past, pugnaciously, for religion leave in the mind of the reader or the listener the inescapable feeling that they know little about religion in

personal experience. A profound knowledge of divinity does not always go with a personal knowledge of the divine.

Agnosticism will always tend to triumph over religious thought when that thought is not centred upon a personal experience of God, and therefore does not find its inspiration in the 'knowability' of God. It is historically significant that Spencer and Huxley regarded their agnosticism as the logical issue of the doctrine of Hamilton and Mansel, the latter of whom was regarded by progressive and forward-looking nineteenth-century theologians like F. D. Maurice, McLeod Campbell, and others as defending faith in a way to make faith impossible. The lesson is not without its warning in view of certain modern one-sided emphases on divine transcendence. The merely transcendent God becomes the unknowable God. The doctrine of the divine immanence is the life-blood of vital religion. The God in whom we believe, while His ways are beyond finite comprehension, is not the Transcendent Unknown. He is the God who is in living relation with our spirits—the One Great Object who is not far, but within; not there, but here; the God 'in whom we live and move and have our being.'

CHARLES J. WRIGHT.

DUMAS'S WANDERING JEW : 'ISAAC LAQUEDEM.'

I HAVE passed the night in writing for you, my friend, the three hours of Christ's agony in the olive-garden.

You also have had your three hours of anguish.

The first in 1848, when Charles Albert refused the glorious sword which you brought him from Monte Video.

The second, when the town you defended fell, when the wife you adored died.

The third, when you perceived that you could not respond to the cry of Venice and Rome, which called you from the depths of their agony.

You also, you have had your sweat of blood.

Wipe your brow, friend ; after Calvary, Thabor ; after the torture, the transfiguration.

A. D.

SO wrote Alexandre Dumas, the author of *Monte Cristo*, to General Giuseppe Garibaldi, at some time subsequent to August 1860. It will be remembered that from June 1860 until April 1864 Dumas was with the Italian patriot in his Sicilian campaign, and at Naples.

Following the above 'dedication,' there are twelve pages of MS., all in the beautiful handwriting of Dumas, detailing, in poetical and imaginative wording, the suffering of Christ in the garden. To this, again, succeeded a further brief application to Garibaldi's condition at that time. These twelve pages are not, however, as might be thought from his preface, matter then first composed. Instead, they prove to be very skilfully welded portions of two chapters from one of their author's well-known romances, *Isaac Laquedem*, and deal respectively with the temptation in the desert and the agony in the garden, in both of which Satan is pictured as trying to turn Christ from His purpose.

This romance, never completed, but of which we possess an amount about equal in length to Scott's *Ivanhoe*, was a marked favourite with its author. Indeed, in his note to

the management of the newspaper which first published it serially he describes it as 'the work of my life.' Dumas was exceedingly just, as a rule, in his estimates of his own productions, and in this case it can be shown that he had good reasons for confidence. *Isaac Laquedem* first began to appear at the close of the year 1852 in the *Constitutionnel*. Its author stated at the time that he had devoted thought and study to it for twenty-two years, and that, in fact, in 1880 he had sold it to the publisher Charpentier, and was to complete it in eight volumes. It must be explained that it was a frequent custom then to sell a work before putting it upon paper. However, Dumas felt himself not yet ready for the task, and bought back his contract. During the following stretch of years he had turned it over in his mind, elaborated his plot, and now purposed to make eighteen volumes instead of eight—that it to say, as volumes went then, a work as lengthy as *The Three Musketeers* and *Twenty Years After* combined. Of those planned eighteen tomes we possess four only.

Isaac Laquedem is the name by which the French call the Wandering Jew. Such a subject might well appeal to the tireless pen of Alexandre Dumas, and it is our loss that this epic of romance was never completed. Why, then, was it left a mere fragment—though, one must at once state, a very pleasing one—the first only of the 'six romances rolled into one' of which the work was to consist? It has always been stated that it was stopped by the censorship of the Second Empire, but there are reasons for doubting the accuracy of this assertion.

The *Constitutionnel* commenced its appearance on December 10 of the year stated, and all went well for about a month, during which time some seventeen lengthy instalments appeared. On January 8, 1853, readers enjoyed 'The Temptation in the Desert,' actually the third chapter of the main story, which had been preceded by six of prologue and three of introduction. But now some of the clerical

papers began to raise an outcry. It seems that the management of the *Constitutionnel* had recently become Jewish, and it is well known that there was antipathy between members of this nation and the ultra-clerical party. No doubt this fact helped to stir up opposition. An excuse was found in Dumas's panorama of the salient points of the life of Christ as dealt with in his romance. He used, not only the Scripture narrative, but a few incidents also from the Apocryphal Gospels. Whether this was wise may be doubted, but let it be said at once that his treatment was always reverent, though picturesque and at times somewhat imaginative. The *Constitutionnel* became nervous, and approached the author with a request—one gathers a rather emphatic request—that he would cut out the matter dealing with the gospel narrative. This Dumas agreed to do, the paper says ‘with full and entire assent,’ but the romancer himself published a statement in another paper, the *Presse*, on February 28, in which he says :

‘I ask my regular readers not to take seriously the chapter which has just been published under the title of ‘Eloha’ by the *Constitutionnel*, it being only the débris of three chapters abominably mutilated by it (i.e. the management). I do not know what account the *Constitutionnel* gives of other chapters, but I warn it that I shall claim for each fresh mutilation. For the rest, my readers will find the complete work again in the *Cabinet littéraire*. It is upon this edition, the only one acknowledged by me, that I ask to be judged.’

Thus the story as we have it in the collected works is as Dumas originally wrote it, very fortunately, and, by comparing it with the files of the *Constitutionnel* we can form our own opinions. As we shall see later, the romance progressed serially until twice the length which it had attained at the point when the management intervened. That is to say, a whole volume and a quarter appeared which had nothing whatever to do with the narrative or persons of Scripture. And since, moreover, the complete narration appeared

immediately after serial issue, with all the pruned chapters reinstated, we may definitely infer that its cessation was not the result of police or governmental interference, as has been frequently stated. What probably actually occurred is that Dumas, very certainly annoyed at both the unjust criticisms and the weak yielding thereto of the paper, when he reached the point to which his romance had arrived on paper, felt his interest sapped, and dropped the whole thing. Actually the portion eliminated by the management of the *Constitutionnel* comprises about fifteen and a half chapters, and these include some pieces of very fine writing indeed.

Now let us scan the story itself, of necessity very briefly, and see what Dumas did precisely commence to give us. We shall here follow the complete publication in book form, ignoring the garbled version of the *Constitutionnel*.

He opens with one of those wonderfully descriptive pieces of imaginative story which instantly grip our attention and give us the fullest confidence in the feast we are about to enjoy. We are shown the Appian Way as it appeared on the Thursday before Easter of the year 1469. For some distance before it reaches the walls of Rome, this famous thoroughfare is dominated by fortresses in the hands of nobles not a whit better than banditti. To attain the city in safety, the populace turns aside from this highway into bypaths—all save one, who, to the astonishment of the sentinels on the outmost citadel and of his fellow pilgrims, continues his solitary path, apparently all unaware of its dangers. He is thought to be mad. At the first post he ignores repeated challenges, and is only spared the risk of an arquebuse-shot by the sudden intervention of the young nobleman whose fortress he is passing. In return for a lavish hospitality offered—though the pilgrim will accept only a piece of bread and a cup of water, and these standing—he reveals a hidden treasure, for which search has been made unsuccessfully during many years.

Passing on his way, after refusing all recompense, he

falls into the hands of a band of mercenaries, who are practising the use of their various national weapons. Unable to pay for his passage through their midst, he offers a lesson in their art to the Englishmen among them, who are shooting with their long-bows. A shout of jeering laughter greets him, but, after defeating them with their own weapon, he exerts his strength to uncover an old tomb, and from it draws a mighty bow and six long arrows, with which he shows them marksmanship they had thought impossible. Just without the city walls he is again challenged, and once more pays no heed. Arquebuses and cross-bows are discharged at him, but he remains unscathed and, when beyond their range, quietly shakes his cloak, from which are scattered all the bolts and bullets which have reached him. Within the walls of Rome we are given a vivid picture of the papal ceremonies attendant upon the blessing of the populace and the washing of feet. The mysterious pilgrim is the thirteenth, and last, to undergo this ceremony.

When at length the Pope, Paul II, comes to him, his pallor and anxiety become excessive, and he flings himself at the knees of the Vicar of the Lord, crying :

' O holy, thrice holy ! I am not worthy that you should touch me ! '

In response to questions, he begs the Pope to hear his confession, which His Holiness promises to do when the services are concluded. In due course Paul II reappears. He asks what the pilgrim desires, and whence he comes. The wild appearance and excited answers of his visitor cause him to doubt the complete sanity of the penitent. Asked who he is, he sweeps back the long black locks from his forehead with the one word, ' Look ! '

' Oh ! ' cries Paul II, extending his finger, in his own despite, towards the fatal sign, ' are you, then, Cain ? '

' Would to God that I were, or that I had been Cain. Cain was not immortal ; he was killed by his nephew Lamech. Happy are those who can die ! '

'You yourself, then, cannot die?' asked the Pope, drawing back involuntarily.

'No, to my misfortune; no, to my despair; no, to my damnation! It is my punishment to be unable to die. . . . Oh! this God who pursues me, this God who has condemned me, this God who has avenged Himself! God, however, knows if I have not done all which I could to accomplish this!'

And the pilgrim goes on to describe his search for death, finally revealing himself as the Wandering Jew. 'The Pope could not resist this profound prayer,' proceeds the romance; 'he seated himself, supported his elbow on the table, allowed his head to fall on his hand, and listened. The Jew dragged himself towards him on his knees, and commenced.' However, instead of giving us the confession of the pilgrim—and no doubt wisely, since a narrative sixteen or seventeen volumes in length, in the first person, might present difficulties—Dumas harks back, and gives us a very picturesque sketch of the history of Jerusalem from the days of David until the signing of the treaty with the Romans and the death of Judas Maccabaeus. This ends the introductory portion and concludes the first volume.

We now reach the commencement of the actual narrative proper. First comes a graphic description of the city of Jerusalem in the days of Christ. This is followed by a selection of the events of His childhood and ministry. The chapters devoted to the temptation in the desert and to the agony in Gethsemane are conspicuous among these. This second volume concludes with the betrayal by Judas and the flight of the apostles.

Almost the whole of the third volume is taken up with the trial, sentence, and crucifixion of Christ. Outstanding in this portion, and well worth being known, are the description of the city on the night of the betrayal, the scene between Pilate and his wife Claudia, the trial

before the Roman procurator, and the sufferings and death of Jesus. These latter are vividly but reverently and sympathetically told, and it may well be that a more keen appreciation of them may dawn with this restatement.

Interwoven with the trial before Pilate is the legend of the bowing standards, taken from the ‘ Gospel of Nicodemus ; or the Acts of Pilate.’ Dumas here slightly varies his originals, in order to bring in, for the first time, Isaac Laquedem, a former legionary and standard-bearer of the army of Varus, now a cobbler in Jerusalem. When the Roman eagles, despite the efforts of the ensigns, bow in the dust at the feet of Christ, Isaac undertakes that in his hands this shall not be. A powerful man, he braces the standard against his breast and waits. Yet, as Christ approaches, the same sight is again seen ; do as he will, the eagle bends, bends ever nearer the earth. Furious, the bearer exclaims :

‘ O magician ! false prophet ! blasphemer ! be accursed ! ’
and flings himself out of the court.

Thus this man is already filled with rage, and, when Jesus requests permission to rest a moment upon his bench, on the way to Calvary, he spurns Him with contumely, and the curse of the legend is pronounced.

There is a really beautiful chapter in which the home of Isaac Laquedem is described, overshadowed as it is with the anticipation of the fulfilment of the sentence decreed against him. Strong man as he is, Isaac’s nerves are on edge, and reveal it, so that, when his small son sings at his play one of those little, almost poetical rhythms, the cobbler’s vexation is sharp. Here is the first verse :

When I have been a soldier, a soldier like my father,
I will return in a scaly cuirass fine,
A bright, sharp sword and a golden helm ashine—
When I have been a soldier, a soldier like my father.

Scarcely was he silenced than the old grandmother, senile and usually scarcely intelligible, begins in her turn :

There is a little three-leaved herb,
With on each leaf of blood a stain,
And, in their midst, of thorns a crown,
Where else a flower had surely lain.

As this song progresses, terror seizes upon each. At its conclusion, to distract them, Isaac asks his daughter Lia to take down her cithern and sing something which will banish the memories of what have just been heard. Obediently she sings :

Whence comest thou, fair messenger ?
From Carthage, Babylon, or Tyre,
Or eke from Alexandria ?
From forest, mountain, lake, or shire ?

I come not from the lake or shire,
From forest or from mountain height ;
Not Carthage, Babylon, nor Tyre
Have sent, but farther far my flight.

Lia's song is of a beautiful messenger from heaven, and with her last notes there sounds the blow upon the door which summons Isaac to his endless journey. In vain would the unhappy man resist ; his time has reached its limit, and go he must. He sees the Crucifixion, and the graves yielding up their dead. Bitter of soul at this curse laid upon him, he determines to war against the God who has decreed it with all the force of his personality.

After an interval of about twenty years, we meet Isaac searching for Apollonius of Tyana, to whom he has been recommended as the only man likely to be able to aid him to that which he desires to attain. As proof that he has found the man he seeks, he is to propound three questions to him, and his ability to answer will establish his identity. Several very clever chapters are devoted to these questions, and to supernatural happenings, founded upon the legends

concerning the man of Tyana, and related in Dumas's finest vein.

Though Isaac's three questions give Apollonius no difficulty, the philosopher cannot give an answer to the main thing of which the Jew is in quest. However, he agrees to aid him to the best of his ability, and the accursed and the man of Tyana set out together for Thessaly, the latter relating to his companion on the way graphic descriptions of battles and legends of the past. In Thessaly one after another the great witches and sorceresses of Greece are summoned from the grave to answer Isaac's interrogation, but not one can do so. Finally he is told that only Prometheus, still bound on the Caucasus, can give the information he desires. How the Jew proceeds to the spot, what service he renders the chained giant, and how, in return, he obtains his wish, must be read in Dumas's own pages.

Isaac now proceeds into the bowels of the earth through the cavern of Trophonius. That which hitherto the Jew, aided by Apollonius, has been seeking is now revealed. It is the abode of the Three Fates of old legend, now, with the advent of a new dispensation, about to vanish for ever. By the power of the golden bough conferred upon him by the Oceanides, kin to Prometheus, he is able to compel the Fates to give him what he seeks : the severed threads of the life of Cleopatra.

In his contemplated warfare against Him who has cursed him with immortality, Isaac has decided that he needs the assistance of a woman—the most beautiful and bewitching that the world has ever known. This he believes to be Cleopatra, and, by uniting the severed threads of her existence, he brings her again to life :

Isaac remained a moment bending over the sarcophagus, contemplating the corpse ; then, shrugging his shoulders, he murmured :
 ' Oh ! then it was for these few bones which I have beneath my eyes that Antony lost the empire of the world ! '

And he seemed to doubt that, if he restored it to life and beauty,

this feeble body would be able to aid him in the gigantic enterprise of combating a God.

But, at the end of a moment of hesitation :

'No matter,' said he ; 'let us try.'

And he tied together the two threads which the Fates had given him.

The corpse stirred.

Involuntarily Isaac flung back the upper part of his body.

Then, beneath that faint light from the moon, a light which seemed made for such sacrileges, he saw the prodigy accomplished.

Little by little this bronze skin grew soft, changed its hue, and became again fair and transparent ; the sagged flesh took again a fresh elasticity ; each muscle recovered its primitive form : the arms grew round, the hand was remodelled, the feet became white and mottled with rose ; the hair grew wavy, as though life penetrated it anew, the blood coursed through the temples, the cheeks, and the breast, reddening the bluish veins, and the lips, motionless and mute for a hundred years, separated and gave utterance to a sigh.

Isaac held out his hand.

'Live, arise, and speak,' said he.

The dead raised herself with a slow and automatic movement, remained seated upon her tomb, opened her eyes, instinctively carried her hand to her mirror, lifted it to her face, and, with a sweet smile, murmured :

'Ah ! Jupiter be praised ! I am still beautiful !'

Isaac proceeds to narrate to her briefly the events which have transpired in the world since her departure therefrom, and to give her a slight hint of what he requires from her.

'Where are we going ?' asked Cleopatra.

'To Rome,' replies Isaac.

'What are we going to do there ?'

'Give advice to the new emperor. . . .'

'And who is this new emperor ?'

'A young prince full of hopes : the son of Ahenobarbus and Agrippina, Lucius Domitius Claudius Nero. . . . You will be his mistress and I his favourite. I shall call myself Tigellinus, and you will call yourself Poppæa ! . . . Come !'

Then, following these words, at the foot of its last page we read : " End of the Fourth Volume and the First Part."

Tantalizing as it is to have such a promising romance cut short at so telling a point, it is at least some consolation that we know the course succeeding volumes were to follow.

Isaac, aided by Cleopatra, was to war against the Christian Church, to instigate the persecutions of Nero and Domitian, to stir up the Arian heresy, until at length, conscious of his hopeless struggle, realizing that he is beaten and powerless, he appeals, as in the introduction, to the intervention of Paul II. This pontiff, whose sympathy is powerfully aroused by the sufferings of the wanderer, agrees to intercede for him, not that he may have his sentence annulled—this being impossible—but that, for the future, instead of working against Christ's Church, he may labour in its service. The prayer is granted. But here is revealed the epic nature of the plot. Isaac now proceeds upon the course he desires, and we find him, successively, the originator of the Spanish Inquisition, of the crusades against the Albigenses and the Waldenses, the instigator of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and of the Spanish persecutions in the Netherlands, while, later, it is he who brings about the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

It may easily be imagined what possibilities of romantic treatment lie in the power possessed by Isaac over his female companion, through his possession of, and control over, the thread of her life ; how any signs of revolt on her part may bring the threat of its severance once more ; or even, at need, her temporary transference to the realms of the dead, until, her lesson being thus learned, she is again revived, docile to the demands of her master ; her efforts to obtain the thread or to discover its hiding-place ; the possibilities which lie in its transference to the hands of another, whether aware or ignorant of its import ; in fact, the potentialities in the hands of a writer like Dumas leave only regret that the work was never accomplished.

Just as *The Count of Monte Cristo* is perhaps our finest story depicting the futility of human vengeance, even when

carried to the utmost limits desired, so *Isaac Laquedem* promised to be as inculcative of the folly and uselessness of intolerance and compulsion as a motive force.

Finally, as we commenced with the connexion between Garibaldi and Dumas, let us also end with these two friends. One of Dumas's chapters in this romance ends with these few words : ' God grant to him who writes these lines the favour of making there (he is speaking of Christ's sepulchre) his humble prayer before he dies.'

Eight years after penning this it seemed that his wish was to be accomplished. The owner of his own yacht, the *Emma*, he had accumulated a considerable sum of money, and had set out to tour the Eastern Mediterranean—Asia Minor, Greece, Palestine, Syria, and Egypt—but, on reaching Genoa, he learned that his friend Garibaldi had landed in Sicily. Immediately he sailed for Palermo, joined the ' thousand,' learned of the scarcity of fighting material among them, set out again for Marseilles, spent the money for his projected excursion in muskets and ammunition, safely carried them to Garibaldi, and for four years remained to support with pen and with arm the efforts of the patriots to liberate Italy. So ended in a generous action all hope of attaining his wish.

FRANK W. REED.

EARLY CHURCH GOVERNMENT IN BRITAIN

IN an article in the *London Quarterly* for April 1925, Dr. Alfred Faulkner affirms that 'There is no more "assured result" of New Testament study than that bishops in the New Testament are synonymous with elders or presbyters.' A study of the evidence respecting the government of the Church in early times in Britain undoubtedly looks in the same direction. The Scoto-Irish Church, which had affinities with the British Church, had 'Bishops' who were rather Evangelists and Missionaries than ruling functionaries. When these men were not itinerating upon some missionary tour they seem to have resided in a monastery, and were 'equally with the other monks subject to the jurisdiction of the abbot,'¹ and the Abbot may not have ranked as a Bishop. Indeed we are credibly informed that the monks of Iona included 'Bishops who were subject to the Abbot,' although the latter 'was only a priest, and never took upon himself to perform any episcopal functions.'² This remarkable fact indicates in no equivocal way that at that time, whatever differences there may have been as to office, the hierarchical conception of the ministry—to put it at its lowest—was not aggressively prominent. Priests (that is, Presbyters) and Bishops were essentially of one order. Waiving the question as to whether the Abbot was, in the later conception of the term, a Priest, it was he, rather than the 'Bishop,' who was *Primus inter pares* with respect to his fellow monks when these were in residence, notwithstanding any distinguished service any of them (e.g. the Bishops) may have rendered in the course of their extra-monastic activities.

Another revealing bit of evidence is adverted to by

¹ See *London Quarterly Review*, January 1927.

² Hunt, *English Church*, p. 9.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Lingard.¹ Confirmation was not a rite observed in the original British Church. Whatever value Confirmation may have as the sequel of infant Baptism, as a function of the Bishop, *alone*, it implies acceptance of what Wesley denominated the 'fable' of Apostolical Succession. Lingard states that in Anglo-Saxon times the Bishop was only regarded as the 'superior of his priests in the discharge of the episcopal office . . . on other occasions he was the colleague of his priests.'² Lingard cannot be accused of overstating the case, and the conception may be illustrated, not only by the position filled by Irenæus—who, according to Lightfoot,³ did not regard Episcopacy as a distinct order, though the Bishop held a distinct *office* from the Presbyter—but also by Wesley's view of the position filled by his 'Superintendents,' who, as Rigg phrases it, 'were not in order, but only in office, distinguished from presbyters.'⁴ Rigg, however, uses 'Bishops' as an alternative name for 'Superintendents,' whereas we know that Wesley himself objected to the use of the term to designate his overseeing-elders in America. A recent writer⁵ scolds this objection as 'fretful' and 'childish,' yet it may register Wesley's suspicion that the term 'Bishop' smacks of the discredited Succession, an objection which does not hold with regard to 'Superintendent.' Doubtless the time is fully come for an authoritative and impartial re-investigation of all matters connected with the so-called 'Historic Episcopate,' for though, as Ramsay puts it, no account of the office can be true 'which makes it logical and self-consistent in character,' nevertheless, something approximating to the historic evolution of the office may be established. (a) Jerome's ascription of the connexion of the Episcopacy with the protection it afforded against schism may represent one

¹ *History and Antiquities*, p. 69.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 165.

³ *Dissertation on Christian Ministry*, p. 228.

⁴ Rigg, *Churchmanship of John Wesley*, p. 62 (note).

⁵ *New History of Methodism*, Vol. II., p. 161.

phase—but possibly not the oldest phase. Moreover, that the office *is* such a protection does not appear self-evident. (b) The idea occurred to the present writer's mind a dozen years ago, when reading Dimont's article on 'Charity' in *E. R. E.*, III. 382, that possibly Bishop, as distinct from Superintendent, arose in connexion with the distribution of charity. A recent re-reading of Lightfoot's *Dissertation* has revealed that he, possibly, had the same idea at the back of his mind. At any rate, he has a note (p. 194) indicating that 'some light is thrown on this subject' by the recognition by the Roman Government of Christian 'burial clubs,' and he suggests that in the circumstances it would be natural for the term (*Episkopos*) to be used 'as a fit designation of the presiding members'; or, as perhaps it might be phrased, for *the executive agent who in each several club was responsible to the Government*. Thus, from the very beginning, these officials had a governmental status; an important consideration.

Ramsay¹ informs us that 'even while Christianity was held a capital offence, communities obtained a legal position as benefit societies.' If the first 'Bishop' (of Jerusalem) may be assumed to be the same individual who wrote the Epistle of St. James, the insistence of that work upon the need of practical benevolence provides a link between the author and the office he held. Thus the Bishop, in so far as he differed from the Presbyter, seemingly assumed importance gradually (as a distinctive officer) as the result of his growing prominence, both in the Church and in the State, as the legal trustee and recognized custodian of charitable and other funds. Schaff,² quoting Hatch for the declaration that 'the chief function of the bishop originally was the care and disposition of charitable funds,' reminds us that 'in the long series of ecclesiastical canons and imperial edicts, the bishops are represented especially

¹ *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 436.

² *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 495.

in the light of trustees of Church property.' (c) In the period under review in the present article Bishops may have been travelling missionaries. The position is illuminated by considerations just named, together with those connected with Paul's commission (Gal. ii. 10) and his reputation in the early Church as an almoner (Acts xxiv. 17). It seems feasible that as the term 'Apostle' became reserved as a designation for 'the twelve,' the term *Episkopos* gained ground—not only by reason of the Bishops' position as presiding elders and government officials, but also as distinguished evangelists and missionaries. (d) What may not unfairly be called the later understanding of the term seemingly developed along with sacerdotal ideas of the ministry. Lightfoot¹ nobly says that 'The most exalted office of the Church, and the highest gift of the Spirit, conveyed no sacerdotal right which was not enjoyed by the humblest member of the Christian community.' It seems highly significant, therefore, that Cyprian, who 'crowned the edifice of episcopal power . . . was the first to put forward without relief or disguise . . . sacerdotal assumptions.'² In the view of Kuntz³ the hierarchical tendency is inherent in the system of Episcopacy, and 'was fostered and nourished by the idea of a *special priesthood* as a divine institution.' (e) The connexion of Episcopacy with State officialdom is germane to the issue, and needs to be attentively considered. Kemble, the historian of the *Saxons in England*, grounds his idea of the necessity of the Bishop upon his *usefulness to the State*. According to Kemble, it is the State and not the Church which has given him pre-eminence.

To return; from the evidence adduced by Lightfoot it is at least arguable that at the close of the second century the terms 'Bishop' and 'Presbyter' were still largely interchangeable—in other words, the office of overseer was

¹ *Dissertation on Christian Ministry*, p. 186. ² *Ibid.*, p. 258.

³ *History of the Christian Church*, p. 111.

executant rather than essential. In Britain in Saxon days, moreover, the Bishop was not alone concerned in ordinations. If a see was vacant, not merely the clergy but the laity took part in the appointment thereto, and 'all the priests present were enjoined to unite with the Bishop at the imposition of hands.' If this statement is allowed, does it not distinctly assume that the Bishop, if chief among the Presbyters, was not yet chief *over* the Presbyters? Any idea, therefore, of reserving ordinations to Bishops alone is not in accord with early practice. Furthermore, 'Of obedience to the Roman See, or of a belief in transubstantiation, there appears no mention in our earliest Pontifical.' The writer just quoted, basing himself upon Elfric, states expressly that there was 'between the priesthood and the episcopate no difference than that of office.' What difference there was arose out of the convenience of administration; there is no evidence at all of a difference of 'order': and thus, to a discerning mind, the whole case for the 'Historic Episcopate' is smashed to pieces.*

To the writer it seems that a desideratum of the present day is a history of the earliest times in Britain, as free from bias as candour and truth can produce; for the comparative isolation of this country from continental influences may have resulted in systems of government being perpetuated that in other lands were replaced by later and more developed forms. Such a work would have value not merely to people in England, but to scholars everywhere, and not least to theologians and ecclesiastical historians.

It is by no means a simple nor unimportant matter to decide the racial composition of the inhabitants of our land.

* Soames, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 261 (present writer's italics).

* Soames, *ibid.*, p. 255.

* Cf. Lord Chancellor King's judgement: vide *The Methodist Magazine*, April 1918.

* For an interesting scientific parallel cf. J. Arthur Thomson's account of the giant tortoises on Galápagos (*Concerning Evolution*, p. 65).

Some readers will no doubt be surprised at the robust declaration of Mackenzie¹ that 'no country in Europe has had fewer ethnic changes,' but he well remarks that the intrusions of *energetic minorities* which cause changes of language and habits of life, do not prevent the alien elements being absorbed, in time, by the predominating people; and, in the present writer's judgement, that is substantially what has occurred in these islands. When one has regard to the statements of Caesar and Diodorus that this country was fully peopled, and bearing in mind that both were well acquainted with densely populated countries (such as Italy), it is difficult to believe—and I do not regard uncorroborated statements of prejudiced parties as good evidence—that the earlier inhabitants of this island were so far exterminated, whether by Romans, Saxons, or, later, by Danes, that the ethnic character of the populace was fundamentally changed. Language in itself is no sure indication of race, and, indeed, Anglo-Saxon may have been the *lingua franca* spoken nowhere but in England. Pearson² affirms that 'a distinctively British population existed in the time of Alfred.' Bayley,³ with his usual forthrightness, declares that 'the neighbourhood of Epping and Upton was always very British.' Coote⁴ maintains that 'we have plain and unmistakable evidence of the survival of the Romans, not only in Wessex, but in every part of Britain.' Now, according to Pearson, in Wessex, 'Britons and Saxons were on almost equal terms as witnesses in a court of justice, and in their were-gild or value before the State.'⁵ Evidence is

¹ Douglas A. Mackenzie, *Ancient Man in Britain*, p. 138.

² The language problem in early Britain suggests a fascinating field for the student of linguistics.

³ Cf. George Smith, *Religion in Ancient Britain*, p. 29.

⁴ It is curious that the densely crowded state of Italy should be among the outstanding problems of our times. The rise of Mussolini is a portent to the modern world.

⁵ *History of England during Early and Middle Ages*, pp. 194-5.

⁶ Harold Bayley, *Archaic England*, p. 569.

⁷ *Romans in Britain*, p. 188.

⁸ Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 94-5.

not wanting 'to attest the presence of a numerous but inferior nationality' in the tenth century.

The question arises, *Who* were these inferior people, where and what are the evidences of their inferiority, and where were they located? It does not require unusual powers of perception to infer that the Britons whom Pearson places practically on an equality with the Saxons are the folk that Coote denominates 'Romans.' According to the latter writer, the Anglo-Saxons 'did not interfere with any of the conditions of Roman life, save only in deposing the Romans from . . . power.' The '*Comes*' of Roman times became the 'Ealdorman' of Teuton days. Already, therefore, there seem to have been three communities existing in Britain: (a) The British aborigines—some of whom may have deserved the epithet 'inferior'; but every community, however advanced in the scale of civilization, has its 'sub-mediocrities,' according to modern scientific notions; (b) a 'middle-class' population, largely British in racial composition, but possibly quickened with Roman blood and addicted to Roman ways of life—the people nicknamed by the Saxons the *Wealas*, and who, not merely in Wessex, but in some other places, lived on terms of substantial equality with intruders of Saxon blood, whom eventually they absorbed; (c) varied groups of Angles and Saxons, whose chiefs in some districts became Ealdormen, and whose blood mingled with that of the nobles of the land. These racial differences seem to have been rolled out by the Norman 'Conquest,' and so has there been made of all, one new nation, known throughout the world as 'English.' All are proud to be known by this name, but possibly the more accurate term is 'British'—a name which may be applied not unsuitably to the people throughout these coasts.

According to the opinion of Pearson,¹ it was only the

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 188.

² Cf. E. A. Freeman, *History of Norman Conquest*, I., p. 21.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 128.

Saxon nobles and yeomen who needed to be converted by Augustine's monks, 'for the British population retained its Churches.' This statement implies a good deal: for one thing, that the Britons had not been 'exterminated'; for another, that their 'Churches' had some system of government. However, this lends point to Mackenzie's judgement that 'what the Teutonic invasion accomplished in reality was not the destruction of a people, but of a civilization,' although the last part of the statement is too sweeping. It is supposed, therefore, that the Anglo-Saxon Church looked up to Rome as its original and as *its ultimate court of appeal*, but this can only be accepted in a very general way. The trend of the evidence is fairly clear all down the centuries to him who is willing to receive it, and in one direction, at any rate, it is consistent throughout; it is a tale of independence, both of spirit and of action—of freedom from servile dependence and from meek subjection. At the time of the Council at Whitby¹ it appears that 'only Kent and East Anglia were in full communion with Canterbury and Rome.' A year later an incident occurred which shows conclusively that there was plenty of independence left in the island. Wilfrith was elected Bishop of the Northumbrians, and went to Compiègne (on the Oise) to be consecrated. He remained abroad, however, longer than was appreciated here, with the result that St. Chad was appointed Bishop in his room. Chad himself was consecrated by three 'Bishops,' one being Wine 'the usurper,' the others being *British* 'Bishops.' Hunt makes this incident the occasion of a panegyric upon the change Christianity was effecting in the relations of Britons and Saxons. 'It had become possible for Britons who lived beyond the pale of conquest to be on friendly terms with their English neighbours.'² In the light of

¹ *Ancient Man in Britain*, p. 227.

² For reference to Council at Whitby, in A.D. 664, cf. Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 110: 'a mixed gathering of laymen and of ecclesiastics of all orders.'

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 128.

later events this is a curious comment. The two British Bishops, that is, supposedly came from 'the unconquered lands,' and, moreover, presumably followed 'the Celtic usages.' As might be anticipated, Hunt realized that this incident cannot be made to square with the thesis he tries to establish, but he merely remarks that 'it implies a certain reaction against the predominance of the Roman party,' a statement which completely begs the question at issue. Whether Wine himself was a Saxon must be left undetermined, but to the present writer it is difficult to think he spoke the tongue of those 'strangers'; whereas, that there was some ecclesiastical affinity or alliance between him and the two Bishops from 'beyond the pale' seems self-evident. What that affinity was it is not impossible to conjecture.

The real departure from what had been the previous usage took place when, on March 26, 668, *Theodore*—a monk of Tarsus in Cilicia, who had studied at Athens—was consecrated by the Roman Pontiff as Archbishop of Canterbury, for this appointment was made over the heads both of king and people, who previously would certainly have taken a leading part in deciding who should fill the position. Hunt comments that prior to the arrival of Theodore 'the English Church can scarcely be said to have existed except in name.' The statement itself lacks somewhat in precision; for if the reference is to the Italian-Saxon Church it may be accepted, but if the statement applies to the Christian Church in England it is too categorical. Bede is quoted for the assertion that Theodore was 'the first Archbishop to whom the whole English Church made submission.'¹ I do not regard this statement as being as important as it sounds, but, in any case, the 'submission,' such as it was, seems to have been more nominal than real. None the less, Theodore quickly sought to have his prestige and authority acknowledged. It was not long ere he laid a heavy episcopal hand upon the northern see. St. Chad

¹ This was on May 27, A.D. 668.

¹ Cf. Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

was informed that his consecration had been irregular. St. Chad seems to have been a surprisingly meek man, and being thus compliant—he resigned. The ‘Penitential’ of Theodore makes the position quite clear. ‘It lays down that all ordained by Bishops of the Scots or Britons who held to Celtic usage *had no orders in the Catholic Church, until their orders had been confirmed by the imposition of the hands of a Catholic Bishop.*’ Chad subsequently became Bishop ‘of the Mercians,’ but, consistently with what has just been quoted from the ‘Pontifical,’ Hunt maintains that Theodore did not regard Chad’s consecration as complete until his orders had been confirmed by fresh rites. ‘Had he done otherwise he would have seemed either to have affirmed his orders or to consecrate him as Bishop without his having passed through them, which would have been uncanonical.’ The loss of the See of York, in conjunction with the statement of the ‘Penitential,’ makes it certain that Chad’s ordination took place again—*de novo*.

In one direction, at any rate, Theodore’s ‘reforming’ zeal was checked. The resistance of the Bishop of the West Saxons ‘seems to have been upheld by the West Saxon Witan, who may have desired to maintain something of the tradition of ecclesiastical independence and isolation.’ It seems clear that this Witan adhered to the policy of the British Church. Other evidence exists of Churches which maintained their independence and adhered to their own usages. Hunt, it is true, places such Churches ‘beyond the Severn,’ but here, I suggest, he goes beyond the evidence or interprets it in a hackneyed and servile way.

The position is further explicated at a somewhat later time

‘Hunt op. cit., p. 188. The present writer regards this statement, which he has italicized, as representing substantially the Roman position to-day with regard to non-papal ordinations, and invites Anglo-Catholics to deny specifically a similar implication with regard to the ‘orders’ of ministers unordained by the hands of Anglican or ‘Catholic’ *Bishops*.

‘Op. cit., p. 184.

‘Ibid., p. 170.

‘Ibid., p. 169.

by the enactment of the Synod at Celychyth (in 816) of the canon that 'None of Scottish extract be permitted to usurp to himself the sacred ministry in any ones diocese . . . because we are not certain how or by whom they were ordained.' Soames's comment is pertinent. 'The prohibition is absolute, as if intended for crushing a rival party'; and this canon, together with the reference to the Scots in the famous 'Penitential,' suggests the possibility that the chief 'Bishop' at the first ordination of St. Chad was a Scottish 'usurper.' Further, Soames regards it as having been the fate of Alfred the Great 'to fill no unimportant place among Anglo-Saxon builders of that Italian system which . . . eventually degraded English policy.' Nevertheless, he is not oblivious to the fact that 'the correspondence between England and Rome was never very close; and that this prince and the English Church were not servilely governed by that see.' Hunt's verdict is not dissimilar, for, though the king's affection for the Roman See 'permanently and materially affected the relations between England and the papacy, *it did not lead him to assume any position of subserviency . . . the English Church pursued its way without external interference.*' To the present writer Alfred seems to have been actuated rather by diplomacy, in the interests of national unity, than by 'affection' for an ecclesiastical prince or system. There is a letter attributed to Alfred which certainly suggests that the king had no intention whatever of submitting to papal orders. Having referred to certain commands of his 'royal predecessors,' and of 'the Archbishop sent formerly from Rome, with all the prelates of Britain,' he says quite plainly that he will never change these while he lives, 'whatever writings you may bring me from the Apostolic seat, *as you choose to call it.*'

¹ Soames, *op. cit.*, p. 182 (note). ² *Ibid.*, p. 188. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴ Hunt, *op. cit.*, p. 284 (present writer's italics).

⁵ Sharon Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. I., p. 835 (italics mine).

It is impossible to miss the withering sarcasm of those final words even after an interval of a thousand years !

As late as the times of Edward the Confessor we are confronted with the revealing fact that Stigand, Archbishop of Canterbury, 'never presented himself at the papal Court to sue for a pall.' The reader may ponder over the observation of Soames that, in this, 'England manifested a feeling of ecclesiastical independence which may surprise those who have hastily assumed her entire dependence upon Rome from Augustine to the Reformation.' The writer of this article cherishes the hope that his readers will not be surprised at Stigand's independence, but, rather, that they will agree that an assumption of 'entire dependence' is not merely hasty, but is unjustified. None the less, this significant event was destined to exercise a profound influence upon English affairs both of State and of Church, for, in consequence of this demonstration of independence, Hildebrand persuaded the papal curia to bless the expedition that William brought to England, and so it fell out 'that the papal banner floated in victory over English soil.'

S. R. Gardiner is undoubtedly right in affirming that Protestantism is 'much more than a change of doctrine.' Something has been suggested (by these notes) of the spirit of independence it enshrines, and the conclusion does not seem far away that British Nonconformity is ecclesiastically the collateral descendant of the ancient British tradition to which attention has been directed. The writer cannot claim, of course, to have escaped altogether 'the influence of those unconscious phenomena that warp the judgement of all men however conscientious,' but he does claim to have taken as far as possible a detached standpoint, and if, notwithstanding, he has not been able, as Ramsay phrases it, 'to hit the passionless scientific truth,' it must be recollected,

¹ Soames, *Anglo-Saxon Church*, p. 282.

² G. Elliot Smith in *Proceedings of the British Academy*.

³ *Church in the Roman Empire*.

as Rhys affirms, ' that it is unavoidable that ' much of the reasoning should be of a highly hypothetical nature ' and that under these circumstances the writer has carefully avoided extravagance. It is his considered judgement, however, that the road of Episcopacy is the road to State control and may conceivably lead to the domination of the foreigner, not alone in the Church, but also in the affairs of State. He nourishes the hope, therefore, that he has re-'lighted a candle that will not be put out ' by any action, however seemingly innocent, that would involve the *negation* of some of the most ancient and important of our *national liberties, and ecclesiastical traditions.*

CLEMENT ASHLIN WEST.

' *Celtic Britain* (Preface).

SOME ASPECTS OF A. E.

GEORGE WILLIAM RUSSELL, known to literature as A. E., was born at Lurgan (Co. Armagh) in 1867. He came to Dublin as a youth, and became an art student, working also at Pim's—the Marshall & Snelgrove of Dublin. He studied the Upanishads and other Eastern wisdom, and fed with esoteric philosophy his natural mysticism. 'His purpose,' Ernest Boyd says in *Ireland's Literary Renaissance*, 'was to illustrate from personal experience the mystic faith that was in him, and to reveal Ireland in a clear, beautiful light.' So he came to write poetry. In the nineties he became a regular contributor to the *Irish Theosophist* and the *International*. Darrell Figgis gives the explanation of his *nom-de-plume*. Russell had signed an article 'Aeon' in his usual bad writing, which the printer gave up in despair, simply giving 'A E' with a query in the proof. Russell henceforth adopted the two letters as his pseudonym.

Through his friendship for W. B. Yeats, the poet, he was introduced to Sir Horace Plunkett, and became organizer to the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, bicycling about the country lecturing and speaking to farmers and peasants, and thus he entered on a career of great usefulness to the development of Irish industry. He was associated with Yeats, J. M. Synge, and Lady Gregory in running the Abbey Theatre, and was also a moving spirit in the Irish literary revival. Mystic as he is, his practical good sense and wide knowledge of men and women in town and country have saved him from many of the eccentricities of his circle. He has, of course, published many volumes of poems from 1894 onwards. But the best avenue to acquaintance with his writings will be found in the *Collected Poems*, published by Macmillan in 1926.

THERE are at least four strands intertwining in the web of the thought of A. E. To recognize them shows us wherein he differs from, and in some ways surpasses, other Irish poets. It would be an interesting quest to search for their origins in the life of turmoil in which his part has been played. But let us rather distinguish and describe them. There is, first, a convinced and radical Platonism, which goes as deep as that of Donne or Shelley, verging on a positive shrinking from the tyrannous charm of material

beauty, from desire to attain the Beauty of Beauty, God Himself. Next there is a distinctly Indian strain, at home with the conception of the infinite Brahma, from which all things come, and apart from which all is illusion. Then, in contrast to these, there is richly manifested the typical Celtic element, which Matthew Arnold called 'natural magic.' He is as rich as Yeats in the transparent, pellucid aliveness to brightness and clear sunlight, and as ready to pass into the twilight of Celtic melancholy. But there is virility in A. E. ; he has the tone of a man of action ; he is not one who looks with repining to the past, but constructively and with supreme hope in humanity, low though it be fallen, to the future.

If he could write his 'Prelude,' it would be a fascinating poem. It would tell how ancient culture wells into the actuality of modern life, forming a new stream of spiritual conviction in arid places ; it would show the old idealism mating with hard and rough, or sweet and tender, reality. It would do this because no poetry is, if I may use a much-battered adjective, more 'authentic' than his. Entirely lyrical, it justifies the theories of Croce ; we can see it formed and framed in the moment of conception ; we can feel the self of the poet expressed obviously in external form ; we can test its value, not as an artifact, but as a manifestation of personal life.

The Platonic element is, of course, common in poetry. Its presence or absence, indeed, may be said to mark two orders of poetic temperament. Poets in touch with beauty (which it is their business to be) either rest in it, absorbed and satisfied like Keats, or find in its very glory of colour, sound, smell, and shape such hints of a more perfect beauty as make all material beauty flat, tame, and unsatisfying ; these latter, to whose company A. E. belongs, are exiles with deep-seated nostalgia ; beauty, the thing to which they are most alive, only tells them of a lost home. We may call them Platonists, for they trace back to him who taught that

the things of sense are but copies of ideals in the heavenly place, which are all summed up in the idea of the Good, which is God. And among them A. E. is a prince ; the very acuteness of his delight in sense makes him distrust it ; besieged with the sollicitations of beauty, he retorts with austerity ; he is on his guard, for beauty is, like Janus, two-faced ;

Image of Beauty, when I gaze on thee,
Trembling I waken to a mystery ;
How through one door we go to life or death,
By spirit kindled or by sensual breath.

In the transience of beauty lies its sting.

The suns that rise, the suns that set,
Time's tidal waves of blue and gold,
That roll from far ethereal seas,
Hill-land and forest, starlit pool,
Are images we soon forget,
And swiftest when most beautiful,
For when most beautiful, we feel
That there is something they reveal,
Some lordlier being of their kind,
And beauty only meaneth this,
And to the symbol we are blind.

Love itself, in which all the claims of beauty are concentrated for man, shares this same disdain ; the love even that rises above sense is but a ladder to the love of the supreme, the ' Dark Divine,' in whose being is the eternal play and interplay of love itself. So the poet can turn unthrilled from the lips he has ' late so sweetly kissed,' for

A love more ancient draws me now
To keep some immemorial tryst.

And can cry :

The voice I loved so long
Seemed only the near echo, faint and sweet,
Of a far sweeter song.

Again and again does the poet recur to this conviction ; his final expression that the symbol of beauty here vouches for the reality beyond comes in one of the most lovely of his lyrics :

The unattainable beauty
The thought of which was pain,
That flickered in eyes and on lips
And vanished again,
That fugitive beauty
Thou shalt attain.

Is there an oasis
Where Time stands still ?
Where the fugitive beauty
Stays as we will ?
Is there an oasis
Where Time stands still ?

Some of A. E.'s poems consciously reproduce the thought of the Upanishads. Such poems are more than artistic copies ; they show the poet at home in the atmosphere of Indian mysticism. But he often, without deliberate intention, breathes out the same spirit. It is like his native air. The similarity suggests a racial affinity far back in time. The point of view about beauty we have just considered ; the sense of its symbolic aspect merges in the suspicion that it is all illusion, necessary illusion, for

I need the lamp of the world to light me,
Lead me, and set me free.

But still illusion—for the only reality is God, out of whom all things proceed, and to whom all things return. In a poem called ' Symbolism ' he says :

Nearer to Thee, not by delusion led,
For there no hearth-fires burn, or bright eyes gaze,
We rise, but by the symbol charioted,
Through loved things rising up to Love's own ways.

So far as the symbol is true, it is itself Brahma, the eternal in time. That is not illusion ; so Dana the Mother-Goddess can sing :

Too vast and vague they know me not, but yet
I am the heart-break over fallen things,
The sudden gentleness that stays the blow,
And I am in the Kiss that foemen give,
Pausing in battle, and in the tears that fall
Over the vanquished foe.

But God, for A. E., is not only the tender and merciful element in humanity ; he feels in the turmoil and vulgarity of the Dublin street that ' the rapture of their crowded notes is all the myriad voice of One.'

Such mysticism is expressed in no stately philosophic form, but with the childlike grace of direct vision. We need not attempt to analyse what is called the Celtic spirit in poetry ; we know it as a specific quality ; any page of Irish poetry will reveal it in its truth, its brightness, and its witchery ; in it the conception seems to flow undiluted from the impression ; the charm and magic of things is caught up, as it were, untranslated into the words ; Nature seems to express herself intimately through the personal medium of the poet. Sometimes it is a joy of the moment :

I begin through the grass again to be bound to the Lord ;
I can see through a face that has faded, the face full of rest
Of the earth, of the mother, my heart with heart in accord.
As I lie 'mid the cool green tresses that mantle her breast,
I begin with the grass again to be bound with the Lord.

Or :

When the breath of twilight blows to flame the misty skies,
All its vaporous sapphire, violet glow, and silver gleam,
When their magic floods me through the gateway of the eyes,
I am one with the twilight's gleam.

More often it is a tender Virgilian melancholy at the

transience of things, and a craving for some sure foothold in the flood of time. Sometimes it comes charged with primitive legend and racial sentiment, consecrated through who knows how many centuries, clinging romantically round native cliff or headland, shore or wood. Sometimes it is just a clear picture, clean-cut as the reflection of life in a Greek epigram. But it is always true, sincere, and, as we say, 'magical,' belonging to a world wherein thought hardly interferes to adjust the impressions and reactions pouring into the spirit from the objective world. The fusion of nature and the poet's soul is nowhere more startlingly expressed than in A. E.'s 'Hermit.' Here the tempest plays around his hut 'like a big kind brother.' The light of dawn 'throws its arms about his neck.' Darkness

Lays her chin upon the roof,
And her burning seraph eyes
Now no longer keep aloof.

And, climax of it all, actual communion with the soul of things is thus expressed :

And the ancient mystery
Holds its hand out day by day,
Takes a chair, and croons with me
By my cabin built of clay.

But, intimate as his bond with nature is, he does not, like William Morris, retreat to the poetry of nature and romance to escape from the mechanical, sordid, and ugly environment of life. He is virile, and his virility is expressed along with the dreams. He is no idle singer of an empty day, but one whose vision baptizes the busy day in all its fullness. His is a vision that cleanses and purifies the actual, and makes it, not only tolerable, but desirable—the vision of Blake and Francis Thompson. What Thames is to the latter Patrick, Street is to A. E.

So he sings :

What miracle was it made this grey Rathgar seem holy earth,
a leaping-place from star to star ?

The degradation of the city slum does not appal his poetic sense. ' Through the swarthy faces the stars shine.'

Yon girl [he says] whirls like an Eastern
Dervish, her dance is
No less a god-intoxicated dance than his,
Though all unknowing the arcane fire that lights her feet,
What motions of what starry tribes her limbs repeat.

The very trams are for him transfigured into

high-built galleons of the streets,
That float through twilight rivers, through galaxies of light.

The ' dark-misshapen folk ' are wending to the great deep, the Holy Sepulchre, to be made lovely there. And ' heaven holds no lovelier court than College Green.' There is a presence with the poet in Patrick Street who sees it is a fairy-land of hearts' desire—pearly phantoms with blown hair dancing where drunkards reel, cloud-frail daffodils shining ' where filth is splashing from the heel.' And at night the disinherited put on their purples, and ' know the masters of their fate.'

Dark and misshapen, wrinkled hag and drunken brawler, the poet cannot rise without them to the innermost union with the divine that is to fulfil all his yearnings ; they with the earthly beauty must fulfil their sure destiny.

Not alone, not alone would I go to the heart of the love :
Were I tranced in the innermost beauty, the flame of the tenderest
breath,
I would still hear the cry of the fallen, recalling me back from above,
To go down to the side of the people who weep in the shadow of
death.

Like Shelley, and Wordsworth or Coleridge in their youth,

A. E. is bound up heart and soul in enterprises which represent to him the true values of life. His thought, like theirs, comes into active conflict with injustice, falsity, and wrong ; and he does not retreat from life in thought or act ; he seeks to mould it.

He therefore is ready to reject the fetish of the past, and to throw himself in faith on the future ; he is a modern man who, though intensely sensible of the beauty of old things seen through the haze of time, would not tie the soul of Ireland or himself to them. He would be no restorer, but an architect ; his burning conviction of ideal realities imperfectly expressed as yet in life, best seen in the reality of beauty, will, he knows, reach their consummation. His office is to be prophet, architect, kindler, and affirmer of the triumph that is to come. In such a spirit he writes to those who look back, to the mediaeval mind :

We are less children of this clime
Than of some nation yet unborn
Or empire in the womb of time—
We hold the Ireland in the heart
More than the land our eyes have seen,
And love the goal for which we start
More than the hate of what hath been.

It is a spirit very much at one with modern thinking, but rather strangely mated with the characteristic Celtic temperament.

There are, of course, moods and moments of flickering faith, such as A. E. has expressed in 'The Iron Age,' where society seems bound, either for anarchy, or the 'grim mechanic state' that does not heed or value beauty ; the materialism and venality of 'the hucksters of the market-place,' who are dragged into the seat of political leaders, are the worst augury for the future. The whole aspect of the modern world is a challenge, and a troubling one to the idealist in Ireland and elsewhere, apart altogether from the

turmoil of politics. Men have said, with him, at many periods in the world's history :

The sacred Hazel's blooms are shed,
The nuts of Knowledge harvested.

But the life of ideal values has recovered and bloomed more richly even while they murmured. It is the function of the poet to express them beautifully, and so to keep them alive ; the main trend of A. E.'s work is to do so, to ' search for the high, austere, and lonely road the spirit moves on through eternities.' His general certainty of the triumph of the quest makes his verse virile and strong ; his doubts and hesitations are rare, though the brightness of the vision is at times suffused with racial melancholy. This he is the first to confess. Does he not say to himself, in the proem to his *Collected Poems* :

When I first discovered the King in His Beauty, I thought I would be the singer of the happiest songs. Forgive me, Spirit of my spirit, for this, that I have found it easier to read the mystery told in tears, and understand Thee better in sorrow than in joy! that, though I would not, I have made the way dark and thorny, and have wandered in too many by-ways, imagining myself into moods that held Thee not.

W. J. FERRAR.

Notes and Discussions

RELIGIOUS VALUES IN THE SACRAMENTS

THE Croall Lectures for 1926-7 (T. & T. Clark) were delivered by Dr. H. J. Witherspoon. They are now published under the title *Religious Values in the Sacraments*. Dr. Witherspoon is one of the Presbyterians of to-day who love the sacraments with 'all their heart and mind and soul and strength.' His book is no spinning of mere theories; it is the testimony of love. No one can read it without feeling that its author has found God in the sacraments—that he has found God, indeed, in them as nowhere else. It has been said that no one can rightly interpret anything unless he loves it. Dr. Witherspoon is a fine interpreter of the sacraments because he loves them. He loves them so much that he believes that, if only the Churches of Britain would give them the central place in worship, the long-desired revival of religion would come. Every one who believes in sacraments at all—whether he agrees with all Dr. Witherspoon's convictions or disagrees with some of them—will find in his book such deep help as one devout soul can give to others. This is a book of theology, but it is a book of devotion too.

It is not possible, in the space available for review, to enumerate all the particular examples of the author's helpfulness, but some may be mentioned. The first lecture is on 'The Sacramental Principle.' It expounds lucidly the truth that for the Christian of insight there is no such thing as 'the merely material.' As for Mrs. Browning, so for Dr. Witherspoon:

Earth's crammed with heaven,
And every common bush afire with God.

A generation ago this truth was by way of being overlooked in Evangelical Christianity. Now it is recovering its due place. It is at this point that the Evangelical and the Sacerdotalist draw nearest together. As I tried to explain in last year's Fernley Lecture, it does not seem to me possible that even here they should meet, yet here they come nearest. The sturdiest of modern Evangelicals may find much to agree with and much to meditate upon either in Canon Quick's recent discussion of the symbolism of nature, in his book on *The Christian Sacraments*, or in Dr. Witherspoon's briefer treatment of the same subject in his first lecture.

Again, Dr. Witherspoon has a fine discussion of the meaning and nature of grace. His examination of Paul's use of the term, and of its relation to the use of the word in the Greek version of the Old Testament, is especially valuable. But the wealthiest piece of

writing in the whole book is the exposition of the meaning of the two sacraments. For Dr. Wotherspoon they epitomize Christianity, and he shows good grounds for his opinion. Their meaning for him, indeed, is so manifold that here and there his sentences grow so involved as to be difficult to follow, but one remembers that the same is true of St. Paul's sentences when he sets himself to unfold the mystery of the gospel. It is not an inapt comparison, for to Dr. Wotherspoon the sacraments *are* the gospel. Or, at the least, they are its one perfect expression. And an Evangelical who broods upon them as this writer has brooded upon them will confess with joy that at any rate they are *one* perfect expression of the gospel. If there are any left among us who sniff at sacraments, they should pore over this exposition.

Yet Dr. Wotherspoon is a Sacerdotalist. So far as I have noted, he does not use the term, and I suspect that he dislikes it, but I do not know what other word sums his creed. Not that he goes all the way, say, with the extreme Anglo-Catholics, but he stands on their side of the line that divides Christendom on this subject. Both statements may be illustrated from a long 'Excursus as to Confirmation'—a disproportionately long excursus, to tell the truth—to which a recent Anglo-Catholic volume on confirmation has provoked him. He pleads with the writers of that book not to make the doctrine of 'the communication of the indwelling Spirit of God and of Christ' depend on 'a voluminous accumulation of adminicles of probability in the interpretation of possibly allusive citations of Scripture' (p. 204). 'Adminicles,' quotha? To one reader of the book in question, at least, it is the very word! But Dr. Wotherspoon pleads with these Anglican writers against their theory because, if it be true, many Greek and Roman Christians would be shut out from the blessing of the Indwelling Spirit, since neither the Greek nor the Roman Church has exactly the Anglican rite. He says nothing about the multitudes of Nonconformist Christians who would be shut out from it too! This is typical of the book. The author's eyes are towards the Sacerdotalist Churches all the time, and to them he holds out both hands. He has neither gesture for the Evangelicals. And he himself suggests that in confirmation the 'graces' (*charismata*) that equip Christians for service are normally given. Is there any evidence for this whatever in Christian history? Have 'graces' been commoner or greater in the Churches that practise confirmation, in any of its forms, than in those that do not? Many an Evangelical will sympathize with Dr. Wotherspoon's plea for the observance of some such rite as confirmation, especially in the case of young Christians who have grown up in Christian homes, but they will urge it on other grounds than these.

It would be interesting to discuss other parts of Dr. Wotherspoon's teaching. For instance, he insists more than once that all symbols are 'natural' and not 'arbitrary.' One would like his definition of these adjectives. He rightly urges, for instance, that baptism is a natural symbol of spiritual cleansing, but he urges, too, that in

baptism there is also a symbol of re-birth ; is either immersion in water or effusion with it a natural symbol of this ? Immersion, indeed, may be a symbol of resurrection, as Paul seems to say in First Corinthians, but resurrection is not what Dr. Wotherspoon means by re-birth, and, besides, he himself doubts, rather curiously, whether immersion would suggest resurrection to a first-century Christian. Again, bread and wine, as usual elements in a common meal, are indeed natural symbols of fellowship, but are they natural symbols of 'flesh' and 'blood' ?

To come to the crucial point, Dr. Wotherspoon has this remark about what he calls the 'Sacramentarian' position : 'I should doubt whether at the Holy Table itself it is possible to be a Sacramentarian' (p. 276). As the multitudes of Evangelical Christians are almost all 'Sacramentarians,' this remark looks uncharitable. Yet it is impossible for such a man as Dr. Wotherspoon to be uncharitable. How, then, does he come to say such a thing ? The reasons, I think, are two. First, he does not seem to understand the 'Sacramentarian' position. He defines it in this way on the same page : 'The doctrine that the consecrated elements merely represent to the imagination what they are said to be.' Similarly, on the very first page of the Preface he writes : 'If our belief is that we can take from sacraments only what we have first put into them, we can, as a consequence, put in little or nothing.' The second of these two sentences is true, but who holds such an opinion of the sacraments ? I doubt whether even the Quakers hold it ; certainly very few other Christians do. As to the definition in the first sentence, it is like Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark ! For the pivot of sacramental belief about the Eucharist is that Christ is really and objectively, though spiritually, present in it—or, rather, that He is really and objectively, *because* spiritually, present in it. I have tried to expound this concept in the Fernley Lecture for 1927, and cannot say more about it here. But to add it to Dr. Wotherspoon's definition is like adding a man to his clothes ! Perhaps I may just suggest here that Dr. Wotherspoon should tell us how he defines 'subjective.' The term is as much outworn in relation to the sacraments as in relation to the Atonement. But there is a second and deeper reason for that seemingly uncharitable saying. We have seen that Dr. Wotherspoon loves the sacraments, and that for him they are central in Christianity. Like some other devout Sacerdotalists, he is unable to conceive that our Lord can be really present in the Eucharist unless, in some undefined but literal way, the 'bread' is His 'body' and the 'wine' His 'blood.' For him two things are inseparable : the spiritual value of the Eucharist—its very existence, indeed, as a means of grace at all—and the literal interpretation of the words of institution. Let any one say, 'The words of institution are symbolical,' and he replies, 'You have taken away my Lord.' At the risk of seeming uncharitable in turn, I will recall the story of Serapion the monk, as told both by Sabatier and Bowne. Serapion had been used to take the anthropomorphisms

of the Bible literally. One day two friends, Paphnutius and Photinus, called on him and persuaded him of his error. They then turned to thank God for 'having restored the holy man to the true faith. But . . . Serapion threw himself on the ground weeping and wailing because they had taken away his God and left him no one to pray to.' I do not mean, of course, that Sacerdotalism is anthropomorphism, but for the rest the parable will hold. Multitudes and multitudes of 'Sacramentarians,' if Dr. Wotherspoon likes to name them by that name, have frequented the Holy Table and found their Lord waiting for them there.

It is, perhaps, inevitable that, in reviewing a book of this kind, a reviewer should spend more time on points of difference than on points of agreement, for one needs to explain the first and not the second. Yet, in closing, I should like to return to the starting-point. This is not a controversial book. No writer on such a subject, of course, can leave points of controversy altogether alone, and Dr. Wotherspoon is too wise to attempt so artificial a task, yet his purpose is not controversy but exposition. And it is to exposition that he gives his strength and space. Happily, even on this subject Evangelical and Sacerdotalist can go a long way together. If an Evangelical will follow Dr. Wotherspoon along that large part of the road, he will find that his guide knows it as one knows a path that he frequents for sheer love of it.¹

C. RYDER SMITH.

OLIVER GOLDSMITH

GOLDSMITH was born on November 10, 1728. His father was parish minister of Pallas, Co. Longford. His ancestors had 'rarely acted like other people. Their hearts were in the right place, but their heads seemed to do anything but what they ought.' He himself inherited both the weaknesses and the virtues of his ancestors. His father had married when very young and very poor. He had eight children, of whom Oliver was the fifth.

Oliver's earliest school was like that of *The Deserted Village*. At six he was placed under a master who had fought Queen Anne's battles in Spain, and had retained a wandering and unsettled spirit, which he seems to have imparted to at least one of his pupils. He went to two other schools besides, and then to Trinity College, Dublin. His course was not happy there. He must have been cramped in his resources, for it was as a sizar that he went. Dr. Wilder, the principal, was not easy to please, and Oliver did not try hard to please any one. He was often in debt, but could, if hard put to it, compose a ballad, which he sold for 5s.

¹ Among a very few misprints, &c., one may note that Fr. Peck was formerly not a Wesleyan, but a United Methodist (p. vii.); that the Son of Sirach was not the writer of the Book of Wisdom (p. 287); and that on p. 244 the first two footnotes are printed in the wrong order. In the first footnote on p. 6, is the second use of the word 'Incarnation' accurate, or is some other word meant?

We next hear of him trying to get orders in the Church of Ireland. His bad reputation at college and his appearing before the bishop in flaming red breeches were no doubt factors in his rejection. Tutoring was tried, and he even saved up £80. Then he threw up the engagement and set out for America, but came back penniless without having left Erin's shores. He now tried law, an uncle paying him £50 for the purpose, but when he reached London he gambled it all away. This same uncle was kind enough to fit him out again, and this time he went to Edinburgh to learn medicine.

Thence he went to study at Leyden. His love of playing for stakes soon lost him every shilling he had. He set off on a tour of Europe, supporting himself by flute-playing. France, Germany, Switzerland, and Italy were visited. He added to his means of travel by 'disputations' at convents and universities. On this tour he made a rough draft of his poem, *The Traveller*.

When, in *The Vicar of Wakefield*, published many years later, he makes the errant son of the vicar relate his adventures on the Continent, he is practically telling his own experiences. He was twenty-seven when he reached England again. He now tried to put his medical knowledge to use, first as apothecary's assistant and then, with the help of a friend in Edinburgh, setting up as a poor physician (poor in both senses) in Southwark. Doctoring evidently did not pay, for he becomes a proof-reader for a printer, and then usher in a Peckham academy.

For the next few years he passed a makeshift and hand-to-mouth existence. *An Inquiry into the State of Education in Europe* brought him no wealth, but it enhanced his literary reputation.

In 1762 his outlook was brighter. He wrote many magazine articles, which brought in a regular income. Yet he could not keep out of debt. Dr. Johnson found his friend's landlady had taken legal proceedings against him for debt, and asked Goldsmith if he had a manuscript ready. He had, and Johnson took it, and soon disposed of it to a publisher for £60, which he brought back to Goldsmith and so set him on his feet again. It was *The Vicar of Wakefield*.

After discharging his debt, he removed to Islington. Newbery, his patron and publisher, always deducted his lodging money, paying it direct, to guard against unpleasant episodes in the future. His *History of England* came out in 1764.

The Traveller at once brought him fame. Johnson said it was the best poem that had appeared since the death of Pope, twenty years before. Its philosophic insight into human nature and social conditions is displayed in even greater degree than its classical knowledge, and that is considerable. A knowledge of parts of the world at that time but slightly explored almost startles one, as, for instance :

Where wild Oswego spreads her swamps around,
And Niagara stuns with thundering sound.

The strange and aimless wanderings of his young manhood thus

bore fruit. His inclination to travel was fully satisfied for the rest of his lifetime. As he wrote in the poem :

Where'er I roam, whatever realms I see,
My heart, untravelled, fondly turns to thee.

He next brought out *Edwin and Angelina*, which he regarded as his best poem. It is incorporated in *The Vicar of Wakefield*.

For some unaccountable reason, *The Vicar* was held back for four years by the publisher who bought it. It was a success from the first. Considerable though that success was, its success in the nineteenth century was still greater, and is probably undiminished in the twentieth. It has been translated into most European languages. It abounds in inconsistencies and improbabilities. The following critique is just: 'Its inimitable types, its happy mingling of Christianity and character, its wholesome benevolence and its practical wisdom, are still unimpaired. We smile at the inconsistencies of the plot, but we are carried forward in spite of them, captivated by the grace, the kindliness, the gentle humour of the story.'

For *The Good-Natured Man* he received £500, of which he spent four-fifths on the lease of sumptuous rooms and had to work as hard as ever to pay expenses. *The Deserted Village* came out in 1770, and ran through five editions in a year. It is regarded by many as his best work. The grace and tenderness of description exceeds anything to be found elsewhere in his works.

The question arises, Where was this deserted village? Was the author drawing on his imagination? Was it in his native Ireland, or was it in England? Could there ever be in either such a complete deterioration as that described in the poem? The best solution seems to be that which Macaulay gives in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* in 1856. He supposes Goldsmith had seen such a village in its last state, ruined and bereft. What it had been like before he could only guess. To fill in this part, he selects the best village he knew in Kent. The difference between the old and happy state and the later and unhappy one could not be the result of comparing what he knew in Ireland in his youth and what he saw on return, for there is not the slightest evidence that he ever saw Ireland again after leaving it as a youth. So Macaulay's theory may stand: 'By joining the two (i.e. the Kentish village at its best and the Irish village at its worst) he has produced something that never was, and never will be, seen.'

His next work was *She Stoops to Conquer*. It brought him not a little gain. In a song in this play is to be found the only allusion which he makes to the Methodist Revival which had been going on during all his lifetime. The description there given of Methodists is so uncomplimentary, not to say untruthful, that it is best to draw a veil over it. When Wesley had finished his *System of Natural Philosophy* in 1775, he met Goldsmith's *History of the Earth and Animated Nature*, which made him almost repent that he had written his own work. He says, 'It cannot be denied that he is a fine writer,' though he thinks the price of the volumes somewhat prohibitive.

In spite of undoubted success, inability to gauge his income and expenses was still his bane. Work and worry brought on a nervous fever, of which he died on April 4, 1774. He was buried outside the Temple Church, and two years later a tablet to his memory was placed in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey.

E. F. P. SCHOLES.

CHRIST AND TERROR

FEAR is one of the primary human instincts. Under stimulus, it may be sublimated into awe, or prostituted into terror. Dr. Selbie, in his *Psychology of Religion*, quoting Dr. Marett, says: 'Of all English words, awe is, I think, the one that expresses the fundamental religious feeling most nearly, and wonder, admiration, interest, respect, even love perhaps, no less than fear, are its essential constituents.' Fear is a constituent of awe, but it is also a constituent of terror. Terror perverts and absorbs into itself all the constituents of awe, of which it is the anti-climax.

An excellent illustration of the reaction of instinctive fear to stimulus is afforded by Edgar Allan Poe's *Descent into the Maelström*, in which two brothers in a schooner are caught in a gigantic whirlpool, the Maelström.

The first brother was not only remarkable for the degree of awe which he felt, but for the strength of his will and the clearness of his intellect, which endowed him with such remarkable self-possession. Feeling (which in his case was awe), will, and intellect are forces which are mutually complementary. It is impossible, for example, to explain accurately why the second brother was so different from the first. Whether his feeling, will, or intellect were *primarily* at fault it would be difficult to say, because at this stage they were all at fault. He could neither feel nobly, act reasonably, nor think clearly. He was paralysed with terror, where his brother was inspired with awe.

Terror, then, not only perverts the constituents of awe, but it also perverts the whole religious consciousness of which awe forms the part known as religious feeling (cf. Dr. Marett, par. 1). In religious consciousness all the parts are interdependent, and whatever violates the feeling inevitably cripples the judgement and limits the intelligence. He was paralysed with terror, and could neither feel nobly, act reasonably, nor think clearly.

The terror promulgated by the Inquisition, by the Russian pogroms, by the hell creed of the more fanatical Puritans, was vitiating in the extreme. Bunyan tells us that he used to wonder how the children of his day grew up sane—probably a lot of them did not—being kept in constant terror of the Devil of the Puritans. That arch-terror of the committal of the unpardonable sin was encouraged by the creed of the Puritans. Bunyan and a few of us humbler ones have agonized through it, and know full well how it vitiates the whole religious

consciousness, paralysing the feelings, crippling the judgement, and obsessing the intellect. A violated instinct is bound to affect the man as a whole. It does not merely affect the feelings, and produce terror from fear, or blasphemy from anger. It makes the man as a whole something less than a man—heartless, unreliable, and untrustworthy. He is too absorbed to have heart or thought for anything else. The loathsome abominations of Dante's *Inferno* are not only a literary masterpiece, but are true to the life in religion. An abused intellect, a tyrannical will, an abandonment of lust or cruelty, all find one bed in hell.

To most of us the apparition is probably as unnecessary as the alleged appearances of the totem-killer, who cannot rest till he is buried afresh by a white man. Algernon Blackwood describes such an appearance in his collection of *Ancient Sorceries*. But it speaks of a morbid and harrowing remorse brooding upon the soul and darkening the religious consciousness of those whom it terrorizes.

Before we proceed to consider the attitude of Christ to terror, it seems desirable at this point to ask how far terror for terror's sake is legitimate in literature, for there are many people who feel very strongly that Edgar Allan Poe is not exactly 'healthy' reading. There are two main reasons for this view, the first being that some people themselves have a terror of terror, and the second being that some are biased in favour of the older Puritanical notion that pleasure for pleasure's sake, art for art's sake, is wrong. For the first sort of people nothing can be done except to readjust their religious consciousness towards the idea of terror. For the second, the weaknesses of the older Puritanical idea can be pointed out.

In the Puritan creed, God and His righteousness, the Devil and his clutch, had to strike terror into the souls of the damned. Terror transformed from a divine scourge and a diabolical pastime into a literary medium of expression was uncongenial to the fanatical type of Puritan.

However, during the eighteenth century—the 'age of prose and reason,' as it is somewhat sardonically called—there was a growing feeling that, in the same way that the flowers and birds were their own justification for giving pleasure to man, so was art. This reaction from extreme Puritanism cleared the air of a lot of nonsense concerning theology and art. Samuel Butler, in *Hudibras*, has summed up the worst features of Protestant bigotry in the lines concerning

Such as do build their faith upon
The holy text of pike and gun . . .
And prove their doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks.

Art for art's sake is its own justification, and Poe, the king of terror-mongers, had the soul of a genius and of an artist. The fact that Poe makes terror fascinating will not generate a morbid love of horror, any more than one is likely to hatch out a morbid love for a fascinating snake. There is as much difference between Poe's tales and the sickly

horrors of the shilling shocker as there is between the fascinating coils of the cobra about the loins of Laokoön and the writhings of an eel in the carcass of a drowned dog. One is art, the other is not.

It is as well to remember that the Puritan Devil was hoary with age even at the time of Christ, for the Puritans studied the Old Testament rather than the New, and their method of terrorizing was as old as the curse of Cain. Jesus knew that terror travestied the best in men. He knew that the wrath of the God of the early prophets had not saved the world.

Jesus only admits the salutary effect of fear in the sublimated form of awe, the supreme awe, the fear of God as above quoted, which is the highest feeling in religious consciousness. Man should fear no one save God (v. Matt. x. 28). During the tempest at sea, Jesus skilfully turned the abject terror of the frantic disciples into awe. He stilled the tempest, and they were filled with awe (v. Mark iv. 41).

When the disciples saw Him walking across the sea towards them, He hastened to reassure them as He saw the affrighted stare that welcomed Him. 'It is I; be not afraid.' If their terror had been salutary, it is hardly conceivable that He would so readily have declared Himself. On the contrary, their terror distressed Him grievously. It showed they had not understood the recent miracle of the loaves, and that they had failed to appreciate His divine power.

Jesus ignored any value that might be attached to the ghostly appearances of the dead (v. Luke xvi. 31). Ghostly apparitions calculated to inspire terror would not do what He desired. One reads how he cast the demons from men (v. Mark iii. 28). Only the enemy of a force can cast out that force. The Puritans were constantly trying to make the Devil cast out the Devil.

When Jesus cured the Gerasene demoniac, the demon of terror which had obsessed the poor wretch entered into the swine, and they, possessed of that demon, rushed—like the second brother in the Maelström—deliberately to their own destruction.

As the gospel narrative proceeds from that moment of agony in the garden, where His supreme awe for the will of God remains unparalleled in the history of the world, to the terror and flight of His disciples at the moment of His need, and on to the tragic climax of Crucifixion, never once does He flinch or felter from fear of pain.

On the first day of the week, when the women had come to anoint His body after burial, they found the tomb empty. The angel of the Lord—most assuredly of the Lord—said: 'Fear not!'—but they fled in terror. Then He came again, not in terror, but as unobtrusively as a gardener. That unsurpassable, unforgettable walk to Emmaus held no episode of terror.

Judas the traitor, terrified at his dreadful deed, went out and hanged himself, seeking the destruction that the swine sought. Peter the traitor, bow'd down with a harrowing remorse, went forth awe-struck at the boundless love of Christ.

(MRS.) G. E. PRAKE.

THE FAITH OF PERSONALITY

At the centre of the Christian faith there stands a Person, the Man Christ Jesus. He not only claims special knowledge of God, but He declares that His own life is the authentic and sufficient revelation of God to men. In this He is unique. Others have taught men what has been revealed to them about God, and left their followers either to thread a precarious maze of symbolism or to grope darkly in transcendental speculation. In Christ, simplicity touches the sublime, for He teaches us to discern God here at our side.

The God who can be expressed to us in the life of a person is a Person. There is much about Him which can be symbolized, but personality is ultimate, and defies expression by means of an emblem. If He chooses to be 'found in fashion as a man,' it is because His divinest characteristics are shared only by men. One of the hardest religious truths for men to grasp has always been that human nature in its essential constitution and in its common circumstances is able to enter intelligently into the purposes of God. The Incarnation of God in Christ makes it certain that God desires and expects men to live a Godward life in their familiar surroundings. The divine is not the exceptional and occasional; it is the vital and permanent in life, the one infinitely attainable reality of which we have knowledge.

God, then, is personal. The assertion must be made, but it is not without difficulty. The only personality we know is cast in human moulds, and, in order that we may know His nature, God has cast that too in a human mould. We must reason always from the known to the unknown, but in the personality with which we are familiar many incidental elements are confused, and the important question arises of what we are to attribute to God under the name of personality. There is a bewildering difference between the infinite being which we must postulate for God and the strictly limited terms upon which we live and act and move and know. Granting that the transcendent postulates of deity—omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, and so forth—are not essential to the nature of personality, our notions are so limited that it is almost impossible to conceive personality in any sense which we know without the same limitations which alone make it amenable to our knowledge. A Person who is Spirit but is denied form, who acts but has no location, who knows but is indifferent to time-values, baffles our intelligence. We are driven, either to conceding to God qualities of an infinite magnitude which becomes for us meaningless, or to asserting some form of limitation which shall not be inconsistent with the transcendence of God. It is possible, however, that an exit from the difficulty may be found in the fact that the distinctively personal activities even of human life are less fettered than at first appears. The movements of the mind are less circumscribed than those of the body, for thought can compass the globe, can journey into the past or the future, and can move beyond the region of sense-experience altogether, while the body is rigidly confined to a given place and time. Moreover, the range of the soul

is still less limited, for the spirit on its emotional side can penetrate where its purely intellectual energy is powerless. We may therefore allow, knowing so little as we do of the subject, that this gives a clue to the Being of God, and that His thought and His love range widely, at His will, while yet He Himself is in some way spiritually discernible as a central personal essence. St. Paul's idea of a *σῶμα πνευματικόν* is helpful at least in delivering the mind from the intolerable perplexity of an infinitely extended invisible spirit which yet we must call a Person. Our mind and heart alike demand some focus; we would know where we may find Him, for even though, in the experience of every inquiring soul, He becomes crystallized to the heart's vision, the metaphysical problem abides, and our mind demands that He be *somewhere*, and that when we leave this tenement of the body, our spirit, not diffused upon the wind, but still personally cohering, may find Him, and recognize, and worship.

At the same time, it is characteristic of the Christian faith that the metaphysical interest is dominated by the historical. Although these questions inevitably arise, they arise out of the historical fact of Jesus, in whom we know God, and our understanding of God must begin on this foundation of verifiable fact. Thus the divine personality which we discern as revealed in Christ is one in which the ruling factor is love. This emerges in the consistent practice of our Lord, and He declares it to be the consistent attitude of God. This is not accidental. It is the only satisfying explanation of human life, since the further we examine the conditions under which we live, the more certain it becomes that the whole can be composed only within an all-embracing relationship of love. In other words, the only mode of dealing possible between free persons is one of graciousness, and, further, the only possible field for gracious dealing lies between free persons.

This is Dr. Oman's¹ main contention. A moral person, he says, is self-determined according to his own self-direction, in the world of his own self-consciousness. If in this way he is not free he is not moral, because action ceases to be moral when, owing either to coercion or to absence of opportunity, there is no possible alternative. But life is full of alternatives, and we assert our personality in choosing our course of action.

On the other hand, seeing that we have this freedom, there is no moral way in which God can deal with us that is not gracious. This does not rule out considerations of righteousness, or even of punishment, but the whole of God's dealing must be governed by graciousness. The gift of freedom is in itself gracious, not capricious, and God is morally bound to be interested in the consequences to His creatures of the gift which He bestows. It is this continued interest, determined by a sense of moral obligation (which in the case of God must be the necessity for self-consistency), that in its turn determines the whole divine activity towards us supremely expressed in Calvary.

¹ *Grace and Personality*, third edition, pp. 44 ff.

Through the whole of personal life there runs the thread of responsibility. The Christian faith uplifts the historical Jesus, who speaks irresistibly to our conscience and raises unmistakably the issues of sin, righteousness, and judgement. His exposition of God makes perfectly clear His eternal antagonism to evil; or, perhaps more truly, it makes clear that a self-seeking disregard for those values to which an enlightened conscience witnesses is perpetually in opposition to the final reality of things, which resides in God. For the hostility is all on the human side, and it inevitably provides its own ruinous consequences—the disillusionment which must follow the reckless or obstinate ascription of reality to that which is unreal.

But the uplifted Christ also 'draws all men unto Him,' and in Him to God, for the God who thus dies for us is indeed full, not only of truth, but of grace. Responsibility on the human side is matched on the side of God, and His gracious initiative opens the door of reconciliation. The compulsion of a free spirit is worthless; yet, if anything in the realm of spiritual things has compelling power, it is the evidence of the redeeming friendliness of God, who reaches out welcoming hands to sinful men. Nothing is so subduing of human pride as the glorious self-abasement of God for our sake, and the soul that persistently rejects that love must of need go forth to the outer dark; but it is not the will of the Father whom we know in Christ Jesus. The fault arises out of a misconception of the nature and purpose of human freedom. 'Our wills are *ours*—to make them *Thine*' expresses the final truth. We are indeed free to choose either way; yet if we choose wrongly, and persist in the choice, we ultimately lose our freedom, because the only liberty that matters for us is liberty to develop our personality Godwards, since in Him alone it is satisfied. We have, and must retain, moral independence, which is essential to our truly personal life. But, as Dr. Oman¹ insists, we must equally attain religious dependence on God, for without it we lose that which our independence has gained.

There is no understanding of the message and mission of our Lord except as we re-think both God and man in the light of Jesus Christ; whatever may have been our preconceptions, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is God in truth, and we cannot afford to neglect reality. He is a gracious Person who meets us with understanding eyes; while, for ourselves, we must learn that there is no approach to Him except the free response of our spirit to His Spirit, and that yielding of the utmost for the highest which is perfect freedom.

L. H. BUNN.

¹ *Grace and Personality*, third edition, pp. 58 ff., 100.

Recent Literature

THEOLOGY AND APOLOGETICS

Israel's Debt to Egypt. By E. H. Sugden, M.A., Litt.D.
(Epworth Press. 5s.)

THE appearance of Dr. E. H. Sugden, Master of Queen's College, Melbourne, and President of the General Conference of Australasia 1928-29, as Fernley Lecturer this year has been welcomed very heartily in this country and in various parts of the British Empire. Dr. Sugden occupies an eminent position in the educational world of Australia, and is perhaps best known here by his masterly edition of *Wesley's Standard Sermons*, a work marked by its high literary and biblical scholarship, as well as by the devoutness of its evangelical spirit.

Dr. Sugden has chosen as the subject of his Lecture a topic full of interest to all careful Old Testament students, one which he has made his own by original and fruitful study. The investigation of *Israel's Debt to Egypt* implies a background of acquaintance with biblical criticism and of historical and archaeological knowledge such as not many living writers possess; and Dr. Sugden here shows himself so fully master of his theme that he can present the results of minute technical research in a living and interesting style welcome to less learned readers.

The range of subjects dealt with is wide. It includes the 'Historical Contacts between Egypt and Israel' from the Exodus to the time of Christ; a careful examination into the influence of Egypt on the Religion of Israel, also into the traces of such influence upon the Hebrew language and literature; whilst the fourth, and last, section deals with arts and crafts of every kind, from buildings like the Temple down to the musical instruments used in its worship. In the detailed treatment of every part, Dr. Sugden shows himself to be no Dryasdust. He never loses himself in abstract technicalities, but, as becomes a Fernley Lecturer, presents the results at which he has arrived in a form which will gain and keep the interest of every biblical student and educated reader.

We cannot here follow him in detail. The lecturer's attitude to Old Testament criticism is at the same time modern and conservative. He accepts the assured results of latter-day scholarship, whilst quite able to defend traditional beliefs against crude and speculative rationalism. In one detail he is interestingly conservative—the spelling of the name of the God of the Hebrews as Jehovah, not Jahve or Yahveh. 'I would as soon write Kikero for Cicero, or Skipio for Scipio, or Yaysoos for Jesus, as Jahve for Jehovah.' The

lecturer shows how fully he believes that God spoke to Moses, i.e. 'declared to him those principles and laws upon which Judaism was founded.' But he shows quite as plainly that he regards the passionate denunciation of 'the almost unanimous judgement of scholars as to the composite character of the Pentateuch' as an example of 'the danger of exalting the letter of the Mosaic law above the spirit of the teaching of Jesus.'

Opinions will, of course, differ as to the measure of Egyptian influence traced out by the lecturer in his examination of Old Testament documents. Some will think he has gone too far, finding Egypt where no Egypt is; some may think he has not gone far enough. Perhaps most readers will agree with the present writer that Dr. Sugden preserves throughout the even keel of a sound, discriminating judgement. Those who do not agree with him will, we feel sure, learn much from his learned and candid presentation of the data. We give one illustration from, perhaps, the most important and interesting section of the book—the influence of Egypt on Israel's conception of God. Dr. Sugden says concerning the theology of the prophets: 'All this sublime monotheism is implicit in the name Jehovah. Moses planted the seed which was to develop and blossom into the ultimate faith of Judaism, and, through it, of Mohammedanism and Christianity. And it is not too much to say that we owe this supreme revelation under God to Egypt; Egyptian henotheism prepared the way, and Egyptian idolatry suggested by contrast the self-existence and the spirituality of Jehovah.' We welcome most heartily this erudite, yet popularly interesting book. It will make the writer, whose early ministry was spent in this country, better known in Britain, whilst it will extend his great influence in the Overseas Commonwealth, where his merits as a biblical scholar and educational leader are fully known and appreciated.

The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit. By H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D. (Nisbet & Co. 10s. 6d.)

Devotional books on the manifold ministries of the Holy Spirit are numerous. But they rarely bring us, even approximately, nearer any illuminating interpretation of His nature and work as a factor in constructive theology. No doctrine is more difficult to state; none has so escaped the mark of dogmatic and conciliar definition; no doctrine is more comprehensive in its range of relations to the profound realities of the nature of God and man. To deal with it adequately requires, not only expert knowledge of all theological problems, but 'a familiarity with science and art, life and literature, history and philosophy, which no single mind can possibly attain.' Consequently, the Christian Church has been waiting for generations for theological thinkers who might do for the Person and Work of the Holy Spirit what others have done for the Person and Work of our Lord. Dr. Wheeler Robinson considers that, 'from the Reformation onwards, we may claim that the higher thought of man has been dealing with the nature and reality of Spirit—Spirit as

manifested to and in his own spirit, and Spirit as manifested in the natural world. This is the ground for belief that there is a new approach to the Christian doctrine of the Godhead.' In this movement of thought 'the psychological criticism of religious experience is the most central of all' for present-day efforts towards theological reconstruction. Consequently, he lays great stress upon the validity of the indubitable Christian experience of the Holy Spirit as at once the starting-point and the ultimate verification for a constructive doctrine. Using this analysis of religious consciousness as primary data, he sets his constructive method in harmony with modern scientific and philosophical thought, accepting Bradley's dictum that 'the man who demands a reality more solid than the religious consciousness seeks he does not know what.' Working on these lines, we consider that Dr. Wheeler Robinson has made a notable contribution to theological literature. Recognizing that no experience can be taken at its face value, he meets the criticism that it is illusory. He finds that the nature of spirit as known in human personality is revealed by its activity in unifying, socializing, transforming, and sacramentalizing life and nature. Practically all his subsequent discussion of the work and personality of the Holy Spirit is 'the expansion of these attributes in relation to the Spirit of God, who is like unto our spirits though so far beyond our comprehension.' These discussions are carried through with illuminating persuasiveness. The philosophical implicates of psychology involved in these discussions are frankly dealt with; for 'we are in the midst of a demonstration of the inadequacy of psychology without metaphysics'; 'a religion that is purely subjective ceases to be a religion'; 'this does not mean that we can assert objectivity in its traditional forms, scriptural or ecclesiastical.' This is no longer necessary, for subject and object are known together in the one reality of the spiritual consciousness.

In Part II. of his book, Dr. Wheeler Robinson deals with the Work of the Holy Spirit in the Church, the Scriptures, the Sacraments, and in the Individual Life. The insight of a distinguished Old Testament scholar reveals itself in a penetrating exposition of the validity of the prophetic consciousness; and there is the appearance also of a sacramental value higher than might have been looked for, but fully justified by, the exposition given. Considering the wide area of human life claimed as the sphere of the Spirit's activity, the chapter on His work in the individual soul seems to lack proportion, compared with that on His work in the Church. For 'prevenient grace' is always the index of a larger realm of the ministry of the Spirit of God than is traditionally recognized. In other sections, perhaps, this deficiency finds compensation in the emphasis placed on the immanence of the Spirit in all human life and history.

We are glad that Dr. Robinson overcame his hesitation, occasioned by his hope of publishing a future volume on the 'Biblical and Historical Development of the Doctrine,' in regard to adding Part III. to the present

volume. For it is inevitable that his interpretation of the Christian experience of the Holy Spirit should run up into the philosophical problems of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Godhead. It is essential, indeed, that the Christian thinker should pursue a necessary continuity of thought through his experience into the realm of eternal reality. And, as a matter of fact, we regard chapter x., on 'The Spirithood of God,' as the most valuable discussion in a volume of remarkable and sustained interest. We are particularly attracted by Dr. Robinson's effective criticism of the speculative interpretations of the Trinity as 'social.' And his conception of the ultimate divine reality as 'Spirithood,' whilst it leaves the last mysteries of the Godhead still unresolved, definitely tends to relieve the present confusion of thought resulting from the failure of the classical doctrine of the Trinity to function within the intellectual categories in which the Christian thinker must fashion his philosophical theism under modern conditions of thought. The close reasoning of these difficult discussions is lighted up with felicitous illustrations.

Whilst truly catholic in temper and range, the necessary constraint of the book is essentially evangelical. Preachers will gain from it a fresh hallowing of their office and a quickening sense of reality for their evangel. Under the pressure of such need, the author has himself accomplished his task. He writes: 'In 1918, in the course of a serious illness, he was led to ask himself why the truths of "evangelical" Christianity, which he had often preached to others, now failed to bring him personal strength. They remained true to him, but they seemed to lack vitality. They seemed to demand an active effort of faith for which the physical energy was lacking. . . . He contrasted with this presentation of Christian truth that of a more "sacramental" religion, as he rightly or wrongly conceived it, in which the priest would bring the sacred elements to the bedside, and with them the needed grace. The result of this experience was not to change a "Protestant" into a "Catholic," but to lead him to seek for the lacuna in his own conception of evangelical truth. He found it in his relative neglect of those conceptions of the Holy Spirit in which the New Testament is so rich.'

Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation, by Members of the Anglican Communion. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. (Longmans & Co. 21s. net.)

These eight essays have grown out of meetings for theological discussion at Oxford. The writers are agreed that Christianity demands and involves a distinctive doctrine of God, which cannot be adequately expressed in the terms of any non-Christian philosophy. They also believe that the Church was rightly impelled to express and formulate its doctrine of God in the terms of Trinitarianism. Dr. Rawlinson's subject is 'Hebraic Theism as Presupposed by the Christian Movement.' Judaism was a religion of expectation which looked ever forward to the coming redemption of God's people. Mr. Narborough's essay on 'The Christ' seeks to estimate the

christology of Jesus as it interprets and is interpreted by His ministry. His ceremonial entry into Jerusalem was a deliberate appeal to the nation to look to Him for leadership, and the attitude of the people who returned from the cross smiting their breasts was the beginning of the triumph of the Son of God. Mr. Nock adds a brief, but important, note on the Resurrection, which contrasts it with the pagan ideas of resurrection. He also writes on 'Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background.' Christianity offered a cultus in which the individual found his own personal needs and the desire for brotherhood in worship satisfied. The means of salvation centred in a recent historical figure invested with deity. It also combined belief in God's perfect justice with the conviction that He loved the sinner even in his sin and desired his salvation. Dr. Kirk's subject is 'The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity.' He shows how theology has advanced a very long stage, by asserting that man's conception of relations within the Godhead are largely influenced by his experience of his relations with God. The relations which God establishes between Himself and man are so true to the real nature of the Godhead that they can be predicated of the Godhead itself as eternal characteristics of the Divine Being. The Church was thus free to explore the subject of the Trinity 'by a sanctified reason marching hand in hand with a mature, devotional, and dedicated experience of God.' The later development of the doctrine is described by the Rev. F. W. Green in an historical review of special interest. Mr. Brabant contributes essays on 'Augustine and Plotinus' and 'God and Time.' St. Augustine learned from Plotinus the need for salvation; Christianity taught him the way of salvation for all through Christ. Professor Hodson's essay is on 'The Incarnation.' The Gospels describe Christ as one whose knowledge reached His mind through channels open to Him as man, but whose judgement was the judgement of One who viewed His life from the point of view of God. 'It is hard to see what other form a true incarnation could take, and this *a priori* anticipation of what would be expected is met more than half-way by the gospel story.' The book is one of great value—the work of thinkers who are able to set old truths in new light which is both impressive and suggestive.

And was made Man: An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. By Leonard Hodgson, M.A. (Longmans & Co. 9s. net.)

The Professor of Christian Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary of New York has given us a volume of great interest and importance. He has set himself to sketch the outlines of the figure of Christ as historical insight and Christian meditation may reveal Him. The Catholic doctrine of Christ as God made Man can best be explained on the hypothesis that during His life on earth His godhead was veiled in His manhood. 'He was human in mind as well as in body,' and in the growth of His human mind came to the knowledge of His Messiahship. A critical study of the Gospels

reveals Him as One convinced that He was the Messiah come on earth to inaugurate the Kingdom of God, and that for Him Messiahship and the Kingdom were moral conceptions through and through. The attempts to discredit the 'ransom for many' passage as a late ecclesiastical addition to the gospel is itself discredited. His idea of Messiahship brought into His mind the thought of Himself as called to die for the sins of mankind. As to miracles, the question to be asked of each is how its performance helped forward His work, what was its purpose in His mind? Professor Hodgson regards the Fourth Gospel as the most 'staggeringly' human of all the portraits of Him in the New Testament. The key-note to our Lord's thought is dependence on the Father. The prevailing impression is 'of a Man with His back against the wall, faced by a multitude of men who cannot understand what He says; who is striving to speak His message home to those whom He cannot reach, while for Himself He holds firmly to the path marked out for Him to walk in by the Father's Will. It is a picture overwhelmingly and "staggeringly" human of Him in whom I recognize and worship my God.' Professor Hodgson holds that the gospel in substance comes from St. John the son of Zebedee; but is inclined to think that one of his disciples was the actual author. For him the question really is not whether the characterization of Christ in the Fourth Gospel is in harmony with the Synoptists, but are they credible apart from it. Are the Synoptic records of that tremendous Figure 'in any way credible apart from just such a life of inner dependence upon and communion with the Father as is presented to us in the Fourth Gospel?'

The Faith that Rebels: A Re-examination of the Miracles of Jesus. By D. S. Cairns, D.D. (Student Christian Movement. 8s. 6d.)

Dr. Cairns here sets forth the Traditional and the Modernist view of miracles, and indicates their defects. He then shows the view of these signs taken by Christ and His contemporaries, and asks whether it is believable to-day, and, if so, what are its bearings on the doctrine of God, of the world, and of man, and on the tragic element in human experience. The Gospels record the greatest attack in all history on sin and death. The story 'looks towards the final victory over all sin and all mortal tragedy, which is symbolized in apocalyptic language as the Return of the Lord.' The Gospels, read under the Modernist theory of excluding miracle, are subtly changed. The Crucifixion is regarded as a fate; the Resurrection as a baseless story. The Gospel miracles are associated with the teaching of Jesus about faith in a way which has no parallel in the records of most of the Old Testament miracles. They are also far more closely interwoven with the whole fabric of New Testament thought. The signs are integral parts of the revelation, and, 'as they are works wrought through the Perfect Man, and are meant by Him to be imitated by imperfect men, they must affect our conceptions of the possibilities of man, and the possibilities and range of

prayer.' Dr. Cairns argues that nature is not a rigid system, imperious and inflexible to the spiritual world, and that the miracles of Jesus are 'the natural results within a Spiritual Universe of the appearance of a unique Personality. But they are unique in degree, not in kind.' They were conditioned upon 'the faith, hope, and love that were in Him.' His faith in God's Sovereign Reality and His Fatherly Love were joined to faith in His own perfect Liberty to help men, to act creatively whenever the real spiritual interest of His children required it. The malady of our time lies in its contracted thoughts of God's power, love, and freedom to help man. The miracles of Jesus, and His teaching about faith, mean that God is more near, more real and mighty, more ready to help every one of us than any one of us realizes. That is the argument of this stimulating study, and, though we think that it cannot explain all our Lord's miracles, it throws light upon many of them.

Theistic Monism. By Joseph Evans, M.A. (Macmillan & Co. 12s. 6d. net.)

In this book Mr. Evans approaches the question of the relation of God to the world from an unusual angle. Deliberately setting aside the method that begins with a conception of God based upon the postulates of faith, i.e. upon considerations of moral and spiritual values, he seeks to confine himself to observable 'facts,' accumulated by science and unified by philosophy, and to derive from them evidence of the existence and nature of God. With this aim in view, he turns to the problem of the relation of man's spirit to his body as likeliest to provide material for the determination of God's relation to the universe. He commences his examination of the problem of psycho-physical relations with criticism of the various solutions offered by parallelism, epiphenomenalism, psychical monism, and animism. He points out the difficulty, once we regard the physical order and the spiritual order as external to each other, of achieving any satisfactory theory of their interaction, because of the scientific postulates of the constancy of the sum of physical energy and the absoluteness of the mechanical system of the universe. There would seem to be no crack in it through which new and effective energy of psychic origin can penetrate. His own solution is, in brief, to bring the psychical within the physical order of the universe, and reinterpret the latter in terms of its highest product, viz. conscious organisms. Instead of accepting the distinction between matter and spirit, and seeking to find the relation between them, he tries to get rid of the distinction itself by showing how a thinking subject—a spirit—has come to be evolved within the universe. He treats consciousness, not as an entity in itself, but as a state of the brain, which he considers to be a vortex in the universal system of energy that we call physical; but, since this system is capable of producing such a phenomenon, our conception of it must be enlarged to include and explain the attribute of consciousness. Mr. Evans identifies this system of energy whereby we are

encompassed with God, and, holding that all our thoughts are due to its quasi-physical action operative through the brain, he reaches a position 'somewhat resembling that held by Berkeley, namely, that our thoughts are due to the direct action of God upon us.'

We may welcome this extremely interesting 'scientific Berkeleianism' for its assertion of the ultimate unity of the physical and the spiritual within one universe, and hold, with Mr. Evans, that the 'kinetic' theory of the constitution of matter suggests a line of approach to that unification from the side of physical science, but yet feel at the same time that he has seriously vitiated his conclusions, and, indeed, compromised the whole theistic position by his pre-occupation with the abstract view of the universe necessarily taken by physical science, and consequently with the mechanism that conditions the functioning of consciousness to the neglect of the data provided by its content. The investigation of origins can never take the place in philosophical thinking of the appreciation of values. His treatment of the subject is thus severely limited, with serious consequences in several important respects. To treat consciousness merely as a state of brain produced by a complex of physical influences acting externally upon the self involves a determinism which, whatever we call the system of energy, is still physical, and, whilst we may allow that consciousness is awakened through sensation by external stimuli, we may question whether its conceptual content is the product of the action of this external influence. Another result of interpreting spiritual action solely in terms of the mechanism through which it operates is the identification of God with the universe as a system of physical energy. This is a pantheistic conclusion rather than a theistic one, and Mr. Evans would be hard put to it to save our moral consciousness from the disastrous logical consequences of pantheism. Finally, since he regards consciousness as nothing more than a state of brain, rather than a state of mind of which the brain is the changing material instrument, the spirit is dependent for its existence upon the continuance of the physical organism, and Mr. Evans cannot find any ground for a belief in the immortality of the soul. There is a worm at the root of his theism, for belief in a personal God is interwoven with belief in the absolute and enduring value of personality.

The lesson of the book lies in its failure. The author has been ensnared by the peril of over-simplification. He unifies by leaving out too much, and only proves the impossibility of basing philosophy upon the findings of physical science to the exclusion of that other order of knowledge in which we know ourselves as participators, and, indeed, creators, within a system of values which give content and meaning to our view of the universe and our idea of God, and in which, in the freedom of thought, we can enter into personal and effectual relations with one to whom we can give the name of Father with far more justification and confidence than (as Mr. Evans does) to a system of energy that produces us as momentary vortices within itself.

Theologen der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen. Band IV.
(Leipzig: Felix Meiner. Cloth, Rm. 12.)

For the fourth volume of these instructive *Self-Delineations of Present-day Theologians* the names selected include four Germans—Ernst von Dobschütz, Adolf Jülicher, Gustaf Dalman, and Julius Kaftan; one Dane—Alfred Th. Jörgensen; and Alfred E. Garvie, who describes himself as of Scottish descent and nationality, though born, under Russian rule, in Poland. An English translation of Dr. Garvie's deeply interesting reminiscences would be welcomed by many. The environment of his youth enabled him to acquire familiarity with five languages; in the home, Polish, German, and English were spoken, and at school some acquaintance with French and Russian was gained. It is impossible to give even the titles of the numerous theological works whose origin is traced. But Dr. Garvie is more than a theologian; his activities are many-sided, and he has made valuable contributions towards the solution of social and international problems. He says: 'I have never regarded my theological writings as the main work of my life, but always as a by-product resulting from the fulfilment of my calling as a preacher of the gospel.' Dr. Garvie regards *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead* as his most important work, and cherishes the hope of publishing a similar volume on *Religious Faith in God*, and yet another on *The Christian Ideal of the Kingdom of God*.

Religious Experience: The Methodist Fundamental. By
Wilfred R. Wilkinson. (Holborn Publishing House.
5s. net.)

The fundamental thing in religion is an experience of God in Christ. That is the starting-point of this twenty-eighth Hartley Lecture, and it is illustrated and explained by scenes from Methodist life, and by apt quotations from Baron von Hügel and modern writers. Mr. Wilkinson also discusses the position taken by St. Paul, St. Augustine, St. Francis of Assisi, John Wesley, and George Cadbury, and reaches the definition of religious experience as 'an awareness of God giving assurance as the self seeks harmonious relations with Him.' Otto's contention, in *The Idea of the Holy*, that the essence of religion is non-rational is criticized, and it is shown that what men discover in their religious experience is supremely and divinely helpful, for it assures them of the love between them and God. The chapter on mysticism is of special interest. Methodism has preserved a mild mysticism which recognizes that fellowship and communion with God are real and necessary, but must issue in practical spiritual efficiency and redemptive activities. Prayer is religious experience, and one of the chief means by which that experience can be progressively enriched. The Lecture is one that will be read with pleasure and will promote and deepen religious experience.

A Translation of Chapters XI.-XVI. of the Pseudo-Augustinian Sermon against Jews, Pagans, and Arians, concerning the Creed, also of the Ordo Prophetarum of St. Martial of Limoges. By Edward Noble Stone. (University of Washington Press.)

This is one of the Language and Literature Publications of the University, and is intended as an Appendix to the writer's translation of *Le Mystère d'Adam*. The much debated subject of the evolution of the mediæval drama is not touched, but the dramatic development of the 'Procession of the Prophets' is shown. The *Sermon* was ascribed to St. Augustine in the Middle Ages, but was probably written in the sixth century. Portions of it were read in many churches as a lesson in the Christmas season. The liturgical play of St. Martial follows the *Sermon* closely, but it is metrical, and Zachariah disappears from the list of the prophets and Israel is added. The Jews held that the testimony of two men was true, and the *Sermon* makes Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and others bear witness to Christ and condemn their unbelief. Special use is made of the Sibylline Oracles. It is a very interesting specimen of early apologetics, and the notes bring out its significance and importance.

Studies in New Testament Christianity. By George A. Barton, D.D. (Milford. 8s. 6d.)

The Professor of Semitic Languages and History of Religions in the University of Philadelphia has written seven papers which will be much prized by Christian men and women. In that on 'The Fulfilment of Prophecy' he reaches the conclusion that it was the function of the prophet to formulate ideals, to see the goal toward which God would lead mankind. Fulfilments will generally appear as immeasurably greater in spiritual significance than the bit that the prophetic herald could grasp. The accounts of the Virgin Birth are trustworthy testimonies to the quality and magnitude of Jesus's character. The Trinity stands for faith in the eternity of unselfish love—for faith in the certainty of the triumph of the social ideal. Sin, in the New Testament, is regarded as the central fact of life, around which all the powers of heaven, earth, and hell range themselves. All the manifestations of God in history look to the annihilation of this malignant power in the human soul. The death of Christ links Christianity with the pain and tragedy of the world in a way that meets man's deepest need. The New Testament gives three glimpses of the Eucharist. Our Lord instituted it as memorial of His death; St. Paul rescued it from abuse and sought to preserve it as a memorial; the Fourth Gospel sought to prevent Christianity from becoming a mystery religion, and to preserve it as a genuine spiritual mysticism. The last paper, on 'The Christian Life,' brings out impressively that Christ called men to live the life of fellowship with God in experience, in purity, in love, in aims, in work, in suffering—and thus to share Christ's achievement. The papers are the

work of a true thinker who is sensitive to modern thought, but keeps a firm grasp on essential Christian truth.

The Suffering of the Impassible God. By Bertrand R. Brasnett, M.A., B.D. (S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.)

The traditional view that God is impassible is now challenged on many sides. The early Church held that He did not suffer, but Mr. Brasnett argues in his suggestive Preliminary Survey for emotion in the divine life. He is led to postulate a Deity who knows joy and sorrow, and happiness and pain, by the conclusions of the intellect and the demands of the religious consciousness. He deals with his subject under six heads: 'The Incarnation'; 'The Holy Spirit'; 'The Happiness of Men and of God'; 'God and Time'; 'Passible and Impassible'; 'God and His Creatures.' Other views are examined, and it is interesting to find that, of the six writers, three are Methodists—Dr. Randles, Dr. Maldwyn Hughes, and Bishop McConnell. Mr. Brasnett holds that God does not shut out pain from Himself, and is impassible towards moral evil, though passible in the sense that sin causes Him to suffer. 'A strong God who suffers to make the ideal real will yet bring men to worship Him and serve Him when gods heedless of mankind can but produce a mankind heedless of the gods.' The book deals with a profound subject in a way that arrests and holds a reader's attention, and its conclusion appeals strongly to his judgement.

The Son of Man. By Emil Ludwig. Translated from the German by Eden and Cedar Paul. With eight illustrations after Rembrandt. (Benn. 15s.)

The object of this book is to show our Lord as a real and intensely human figure. Its aim is to portray His inner life—the world of His own feelings. It is done with rare literary skill, and helps us to realize what the early life at Nazareth was, and to understand many phases of the ministry in Galilee and the last week in Jerusalem. We have never seen the cleansing of the Temple more vividly depicted, and the trial before the Sanhedrin and the attitude of Pilate are powerfully described. But, despite its beauties, the book jars upon us. At Cana we read of the 'fuddled' guests, whom the attitude of Jesus to His mother sobers in the twinkling of an eye. The miracles are explained as evidences of hypnotic power, and we read of our Lord being pushed by various misunderstandings 'along the road leading towards morbid exaltation.' His self-confidence is multiplied a thousandfold, till it becomes overweening. That is how the acts and words of Jesus are misinterpreted when His divinity is shut out. And Mary of Magdala is represented as 'the first to make Jesus immortal by her dream of His resurrection.' The whole picture is unreal and unconvincing.

Roads to the City of God, by Basil Mathews (Edinburgh House, 1s.), gives the 'world outlook from Jerusalem.' In a Foreword, Dr. Mott describes the Conference there as a most courageous assembly. The addresses, debates, and decisions were ever forward-looking, and no

one could describe them with more power and skill than Mr. Mathews. The Council kept tryst with Christ Himself in the Holy City in that Passiontide. Dr. Mott proved a superb chairman, and, as the members faced the world situation, they realized afresh the call to a more heroic practice of the gospel. Every considerable element in the problem of inter-racial relations was represented in the Council, and it was clearly seen how the conditions of life of the workers of the world were bound up with the universal problem of Christianity. This little book is meant to spread the Jerusalem spirit through the whole Church, so that the world may be won for Christ.—*Concerning the Faith*. By Joseph M. M. Gray. (Abingdon Press. \$2.) These chapters attempt to explain 'some of the trends of the times, and their implications for faith, intelligence, and duty.' It is a book that makes one feel that it is very easy to claim a robust faith and live feebly, and suggests that 'the present-day ineffectiveness of religion is due to the fact that we are loyal to the faith but avoid the adventure.' 'It is in the great verities from which, in all generations, men have drawn their best and noblest life that we shall find ours.' 'The argument for Christ does not lie in theology, but is evidenced by life. It is the world even as it is which bears the most eloquent witness to Jesus.' The book leads up to the inspiring conclusion that 'for Christians to recover the magnificence and glory is for Christianity to regain its contagion and its power.'—*Christianity in Science*. By Frederick D. Leete. (Abingdon Press. \$3.) Dr. Leete brings out, in this valuable volume, the unquestionable tribute and aid of scientific achievements and personalities to the reality and influence of the Christian religion. He emphasizes the consistency of truth and the indisputable fact that, 'Christian faith and character inhere conformably in personalities devoted to national researches and precision.' The chapters which describe the achievements of science, its heroes and martyrs, and its Christian men, are of great interest, and are brought down to Lyndburgh's flight across the Atlantic and other modern events in an arresting way. There are also important chapters on 'The Present Situation' and 'Science and Immortality.' The book is one for which scientists and theologians will alike be grateful.—Messrs. Morgan & Scott publish two books by Dr. F. B. Meyer, *The Call and Challenge of the Unseen* (8s. 6d.) and *Five 'Musts' of the Christian Life* (2s. 6d.). The Foreword to the first was written amid the glow of love which gathered round him on his eighty-first birthday, and gives fifteen sermons rich in spiritual truth, aptly illustrated and applied. It is the work of a scholar-saint. The other book interprets the 'musts' of regeneration, sacrifice, selflessness, service, and worship, and gives four other addresses experimental and helpful. Dr. Meyer's friendship with other evangelists lights up both the books in a very happy way. *Does God answer Prayer?* by 'Torchbearer' (8s.), is full of impressive incidents which will embolden others to pray in faith.—*The Secret of the Throne of Grace*, by Andrew Murray, D.D. (1s. 4d.), has an uplifting meditation for each day of the month. To read it will help to hallow every day.—*The Eternal Quest*, by Cyril

Harrison (C. W. Daniel Coy., 4s. 6d.), states the case for the pantheistic interpretation of the universe. 'Every act of creation is merely one passing phase in the everlasting quest of the Absolute after self-realization.' Neo-panteism is regarded as a clear light amid the dark uncertainties of the modern world. It is obviously on the side of some belief in immortality. 'Intercessory prayer is the most potent and fruitful form of telepathy.' That is the teaching of the book, but it is by no means convincing.—*Back to Realities: A Way Out of the Present Chaos in Religion*. By S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc. (Constable & Co. 2s.) Mr. Mellone's first chapter describes the condition of organized Christianity to-day, with quotations from Bishop Barnes and others. He holds that 'the authority of the Bible as an infallible rule of faith and life has been completely undermined by scientific and historical criticism, and the age of dogma has come to an end.' He regards the Fatherhood of God as the essence of the Galilean gospel, and acknowledges the leadership of Jesus. It is the Unitarian position, and, despite the ability of the advocate, we should return a decisive negative to the closing question: 'Are you a Unitarian without knowing it?'—*The Technique of Public Worship*, by J. H. Odgers and E. G. Schutz (Methodist Book Concern, 2s.), deals with worship in the Sunday service, showing the place that architecture and music should take, and the principles which should govern the order in public worship. The second part is on the ritual at the Baptismal Font, the Communion Table, the Marriage Altar, and the Funeral Service. That on the marriage ceremony is very elaborate, and will be eagerly studied by brides and bridegrooms. It is a unique volume, and one that many will welcome.—*Christian Theology*. By William Shaw. (Melbourne: Methodist Book Depot.) This manual was prepared at the request of the Methodist Church of Australasia, and is a careful and comprehensive survey of the whole field. It begins with the Bible, and passes on to the doctrines of God, of man, of sin, of redemption, and of the Last Things. The sections on the Holy Spirit and the Ethics of Redemption are excellent. The historical development of doctrine is well brought out, and everything is treated in a lucid and practical way that will be of real service to young students. It has a very full synopsis and a good index.—*Evolution Disproved*. By W. A. Williams, D.D. (Camden, New Jersey. \$1.) This is a second edition of 20,000, and the arguments against evolution are gathered together from all sources in a way that has evidently made a wide appeal. It is the outcome of much reading and strong conviction.—*A Certain Priest*, by Bernard M. Hancock (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.), is a series of Retreat Meditations by the Rector of Bishopstoke, based on St. Luke's Gospel. They are simple, practical, and heart-searching. It is a book that will make a deep impression on all who use it.—*The Gospel According to St. Mark*. Questions and Answers. By Stanley Wood, M.A. (Gill & Sons. 1s. 6d.) This Scripture manual follows the plan of the 'Dinglewood Shakespeare Manual.' Its aim is to provoke inquiry. It is a lucid and reliable manual, which will be of great service.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, TRAVEL

Trollope. A Commentary. By Michael Sadleir. (Constable & Co. 7s. 6d.)

Anthony Trollope. By Hugh Walpole. (Macmillan & Co. 5s.)

TROLLOPE is now taking his rightful place as 'the chronicler, the observer, the interpreter of the well-to-do, comfortable England of London and the English shires.' It is his good fortune to have won the admiration of two of the most gifted of our younger novelists, and their books are of deep and sustained interest. Mr. Sadleir's *Trollope* was recognized as an altogether admirable study of the man and his work, and this new and cheaper edition will give real pleasure to a wider circle. Mr. Walpole's volume marks Trollope's entrance into the classic circle of 'English Men of Letters' and gives abundant evidence that this long deferred honour is his due. He owes much to Mr. Sadleir's *Commentary*, and makes effective use of Trollope's *Autobiography*, 'one of the most honest, sincere, and noble-minded books in the English language.' Its publication a few months after his death damaged his sales, for its revelation of clockwork regularity seemed to leave no room for inspiration, but we have come to see that Mr. Walpole's estimate is the true one. Nothing in Mr. Sadleir's *Commentary* interests us more than the section devoted to 'Anthony's Mother.' Her husband's failures and misfortunes made her the family breadwinner, and her novels and her heroic and successful fight with poverty mark her out as a woman of sterling gifts and character. Anthony's school life was pitiful, and he passed through seven years of struggle at the Post Office in London before he went to Ireland and won his laurels as an official of unusual capacity and tact. There he married a woman who made him a singularly happy home, and there he turned author. His two Irish stories lacked imagination and had an excess of instructional zeal, whilst *La Vendée*, his only historical novel, is described by Mr. Sadleir as a work of unexampled dreariness. It was not till 1858, when he had spent two years as post-office inspector in Gloucestershire and Somerset, that he finished *The Warden* and began the Barseshire novels which made him famous. When he heard that *Cornhill* was to start in 1860 he proposed to send Thackeray a set of short stories for it. The publishers stepped in and offered him £1,000 for a three-volume novel, to begin as the serial in January. Without a moment's hesitation he grasped the opportunity. He hurried to London to find what was needed, and on his way back to Ireland on the night of November 4, 1859, wrote the first few pages of *Framley Parsonage*. 'From the opening words the novel found instant and enormous popularity.' One valuable feature of Mr. Sadleir's book is the *Calendar of Events* in the life of mother and son and the full bibliographies of both. Mr. Walpole says that Trollope's satire sprang

from his humorous scorn of his own oddities and failures. 'That is why he is the rest and refreshment to us that he is. His affections are natural and logical. He restores our own confidence, calls in our own distrust, laughs at our vanity without scorning us, and revives our pride in our own average humanity.' On Mr. Sadleir's canvas he stands out as 'a sturdy, manly, unaffected figure, a man high-minded and high-principled; a tireless worker; a brave fighter; a faithful friend; a generous judge.' Every side of his life, as huntsman, traveller, friend, and novelist, is described in these two charming tributes from fellow craftsmen.

Wesley's Legacy to the World. By J. Ernest Rattenbury.
(Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.)

These six studies in the Permanent Values of the Evangelical Revival were delivered as the Quillian Lectures at Emory University. The first describes Wesley as the Pilgrim of Eternity who lived in England and sojourned for a time in America. The human Wesley stands out as an apostle in the making at Epworth, Oxford, and Savannah. Sophia Hopkey figures largely in the last stage of Wesley's development, but he was set on fire in Aldersgate Street on that memorable Whit-week of 1738, of which Mr. Rattenbury says it is impossible to exaggerate the importance. He unfolds the doctrines of the discovery, and explains the organization by which they were not only spread but conserved. The strong common sense of Wesley stands out in all his work and led to the building up of a common-sense Church. How it influenced Anglicanism and Nonconformity and remained strongly Protestant, while devoted to the sacraments, is clearly brought out. Special attention is given to the hymns of Charles Wesley as literature, history, and religion. They have been 'the chief medium of inspiration of Methodists since the death of the Wesleys. Nothing else can express, with anything like their force, the spirit of their teaching, practice, and experience. The fires of revival are still lighted by these flaming verses. The deep and fervid religious experience enshrined in them is sought and recovered by those who sing them.' The volume is the fruit of much thought and study, and those who know the subject best will feel the keenest interest in it.

Methodism. By W. Bardsley Brash, M.A., B.D., B.Litt.
(Methuen & Co. 5s.)

Dr. Jacks is giving us a wide view of The Faiths in the series to which this volume belongs. Methodism is much in the eye of the world, and Mr. Brash unfolds its history and its prospects with ample knowledge and with real catholicity. He rightly gives prominence to the Wesleys, and traces their spiritual quest until that Pentecostal baptism in 1738 made them ready for their life work as heralds of the gospel. As the converts multiplied, Wesley kept up the high

moral standard, and inspired them with some of his own love of reading and his zeal for the salvation of others. He was supported by a noble band of lay preachers, in whose gifts he gloried, and he set Methodism on the way to its triumphs in the United States by his ordinations in 1784. Mr. Brash traces the rise and development of the work in America, and shows that 'the Methodist Church was in its inception missionary and has striven to be true to its genesis. Its parish is the world, and its gospel is for the individual and for the whole of his life.' Methodist union draws nearer and will bring together those who have always been one in doctrine, in evangelical passion, and in missionary enterprise.

Reminiscences. By J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

Friends and admirers in all Churches and in many parts of the world will be grateful for this intimate set of Reminiscences. Dr. Lidgett's grandfathers were both Yorkshire men. John Lidgett was born in Hull in 1800 and became a London shipowner. As a boy he had been led to decision by an old Methodist gate-keeper, and he found a wife in Anne Hyett, who had come to London to fare for herself because of family opposition on her having turned Methodist. Their two sons married the daughters of John Scott, the first Principal of Westminster Training College, and Dr. Scott Lidgett represents both of these honoured families. His heart was set upon going to the Bar, but Providence marked him out for the ministry, and in 1890 gave him his great sphere as Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, which he still holds. It naturally led to his election as Guardian and School Board Manager and finally as member and Alderman of the London County Council. As an educational reformer, a theological thinker and writer, and a leader in Free Church and Methodist circles, he has nobly served his generation, and won the high regard of all Churches. This book shows how unwearied and wisely directed his work has been for the social and religious uplifting of England.

Day In, Day Out. By Mrs. Aubrey le Blond. (John Lane. 12s. 6d.)

Mr. E. F. Benson's Foreword speaks with admiration of the endless and varied activities which his friend describes in these reminiscences. She found everything she put her hand to the most interesting job in the world. Her father, Sir St. Vincent Hawkins Whitshed, went all through the Crimean campaign as a mere youth, married the daughter of the Rev. the Hon. J. Handcock, and died when his only child was eleven. The Trenches were their neighbours in Ireland, and some amusing stories are told of the Archbishop's absent-mindedness. Miss Whitshed married Fred Burnaby when she was eighteen, and gives a vivid account of his balloon adventures, his ride to Khiva, and his death at Abou Klea. Her book is dedicated to his friend,

Valentine Baker, who was 'practically blameless of the offence' which led the War Office to cashier him. Her personal adventures began in the Alps, where she had twenty years of mountaineering. She might have written the whole history of winter climbing, up to 1888, but 'I climbed like a child, ardently, engrossingly, thinking not at all of onlookers, and indeed unaware that such even existed, and when one day I came across an allusion to myself in a paper as "an Aipinist of world-renowned fame" I wondered what idiot could have written it.' After the death of Colonel Burnaby she lived almost entirely in Switzerland. Next to mountaineering her great interest was photography. Lantern-slide making led to lectures on climbing, and Lady Bancroft advised her to make her voice *hard*. 'Don't shout, and above all, don't raise the pitch! Go slow!' During war-time she did valuable work in hospitals, and after the Armistice went to the various commands lecturing the men. At Chatham the young engineers were eager to listen to her account of Overseas-France and the colonial methods introduced by General Gallieni. She had married Mr. Aubrey le Blond in 1900, and in 1912 made a tour with him in China and Japan. The example of their friend, Mr. E. F. Benson, had made Mr. Le Blond an ardent collector of porcelain and other things, and his collection was afterwards accepted on loan by the Victoria and Albert Museum. Visits to her son in California and to Morocco supply much pleasant detail, and 'Some After-thoughts' describe various pleasant meetings with Mr. E. F. Benson, Dame Ethel Smyth, and other celebrities. The accounts which Mrs. Le Blond gives of steamships, hotels, and railway routes in the United States will be useful to other travellers, and her chapter on the late Mr. Huntington and the pictures and books he bequeathed to the town of Pasadena is of special interest. The volume touches life on many sides, and is very brightly written.

Reconsiderations. Literary Essays. By E. E. Kellett.
(Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.)

There are thirteen essays in this volume, ranging from Chaucer and his Influence to Pitfalls in Shakespearian Criticism, Milton and Dante and Wordsworth, Swinburne and Conrad. The two essays on the Translation of the New Testament and Macaulay and the Authorized Version are of very great interest. Mr. Kellett pleads for a translation which would make the writers speak out to us in our mother tongue. We have to think of them as men and not as automata, and this we shall never do till the antique style in which a false reverence has made them speak is discarded for ever. The study of Thomas Fuller brings out many of his pointed sayings which were the natural overflow of a quaint and richly endowed mind. He had a peculiarly lovable, kindly, and gracious temper, and it is doubtful whether English literature has any books more uniformly delightful than his. Swinburne, Milton apart, is our greatest master of sound, pure and simple. Three great motives inspired him—love, mankind as a

whole, and the sea. Every essay has its own force and suggestiveness, and the book will give lasting pleasure to all who read it carefully.

Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi. Edited, with revised Text, Introduction, Notes, Indices, and Appendices, by P. R. Coleman-Norton, A.M., D.Phil. (Cambridge University Press. 15s.)

Mr. Norton is Assistant Professor of Classics in Princeton University and was a Rhodes Scholar at Christ Church. He dedicates his learned work to the professors and students of both universities. It was presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Oxford, and embodies various suggestions made by the examiners. The Dialogue was written about A.D. 408 by the Bishop of Helenopolis, and is the best authority for Chrysostom's life. Palladius was born in Galatia in 368 or 364, and in his twenty-third year became an ascetic on the Mount of Olives. After three years there he went to Alexandria, where he spent two or three years. After various wanderings he was made bishop, and was called on to assist Chrysostom in a synod at Constantinople, which had to investigate charges made against Antonius, Bishop of Ephesus. He was actively engaged in the controversies which centred round Chrysostom, and went to Rome in 405 to plead his friend's cause. On his return he was arrested, and, after eleven months in a gloomy cell in Thrace, was sent into exile at Syene in Egypt. His *Dialogus* quickly vindicated Chrysostom's character from the scurrilous slanders of his enemies. Its scene is laid in Rome shortly after Chrysostom's death in September 407, and a bishop answers the questions of a deacon who wishes to discover the true facts about Chrysostom's character and conversation. His reforms at Constantinople are described, and an authentic account is given of his abstemiousness, his ill health, his humour, his ideals, his outspokenness, his self-control, his love of retirement, and his religious life. Mr. Norton discusses the authorship of the *Dialogus*, and gives the text with various readings and learned notes. It is a piece of work which does honour to the editor and both the universities that have equipped him for such a task.

John Bunyan: A Study in Personality. By G. B. Harrison, M.A. (Dent & Sons. 6s. net.)

This is a beautiful and suggestive study of Bunyan as revealed in his life and his writings. Two Puritans contributed important works to our literature—John Milton and John Bunyan. The latter remains as the essence and epitome of English Puritanism. Mr. Harrison regards him as the Convert, the Prisoner, the Pastor, and the Writer, drawing illustrations from the manuscript 'Church Book of Bunyan Meeting' and the history of the time. *Grace Abounding* is not only a rare account of a Christian soul called by God, but a 'work of art, akin to the great spiritual autobiographies in the

English language, and not the least of those books which have led men to be absorbed in the workings of the human mind.' The critical notes on the *Pilgrim's Progress* are discriminating, and we also feel there is nothing in Bunyan so movingly beautiful as the gentle close of the second part. *Grace Abounding*, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, *Mr. Badman*, and *The Holy War* stand out 'perennial monuments of a man who was greater than his creed. These are alive with the abiding spirit of man.'

The Legacy of Bunyan, by W. F. Fullerton, D.D. (Ernest Benn, 8s.), has five chapters on Bunyan in our day and in his own; the Allegories; the Legacy and the Codicils. That is certainly a suggestive approach to the study of Bunyan. 'Not many men, three hundred years after they were born, exert a greater influence than when they lived and walked amongst their fellows, but Bunyan is one of them.' Dr. Fullerton finds Bunyan's appeal in the fact that he makes it clear that there is a Celestial City and a City of Destruction, and does not blink the question of sin. His life history is pleasantly told, and the three great books which are his legacy are described with forty-five extracts. Many books on Bunyan are appearing, but this one should not be overlooked.

The Letters of Robert Burns. Selected, with an Introduction, by B. Brimley Johnson. (John Lane. 6s.) Burns was beset with weaknesses which made sad shipwreck of his life, and Mr. Johnson does not cloak these in his Introduction. Yet he helps us to see the better side of the poet as well—the good nature and the burning desire 'to wipe away the tears of mankind' which made the countryside talk of him with enthusiasm, and sometimes with deep feeling, as he lay dying. In the first of these letters he describes married life as 'only friendship in a more exalted degree.' He is more pleased with the last three verses of Revelation vii. 'than with any ten times as many verses in the whole Bible, and would not exchange the noble enthusiasm with which they inspire me for all that this world has to offer.' He speaks of his favourite authors—Shenstone, Thomson, Sterne—and Mackenzie's *Man of Feeling*, 'a book I prize next to the Bible.' 'The joy of my heart,' he tells his old schoolmaster, 'is to study men, their manners, and their ways. There is a painful outburst against Jean Armour, whom he had wronged, and who afterwards, as his wife, 'gave him the only fixed happiness and steadying self-respect he ever enjoyed.' His Kilmarnock poems brought him fame and flattery, which did him no little harm. He was glad to return to his farm and to find a home of his own with Jean Armour, to whose placid good nature and sweetness of disposition he pays warm tribute. He became exciseman, and suffered much from his connexion with the hard-drinking gentlemen of the country, but nothing was allowed to interfere with his punctual and efficient survey of ten parishes. He tells Mrs. Dunlop, in 1789, about a sermon which had displeased him, and adds, 'I will go further, and affirm that from

the sublimity, excellence, and purity of his doctrine and precepts, unparalleled by all the aggregated wisdom and learning of many preceding ages, though, *to appearance*, he himself was the obscurest and most illiterate of our species; therefore Jesus Christ was from God.' He tells Alexander Cunningham that he 'will deeply imbue the mind of every child of mine with religion,' and one wishes that it could have saved him from the evil things that brought him to an early grave.

Clapham and the Clapham Sect. (Baldwin. 7s. 6d.) This book is published for the Clapham Antiquarian Society by the proprietor of the *Clapham Observer*, in whose columns the articles first appeared. It begins with a reprint of the Clapham section of Manning and Bray's *History of Surrey*, which will be of great service to those who can only consult that work in libraries. This is followed by a list of the rectors of Clapham from Stephen, whose date is about 1281-8. Many interesting details have been added by the Rev. J. C. Dale as to the rectors of later date, and various tablets and memorials. Mr. Rudolf gives an account of early residents which is based on search among the old wills at Somerset House. He tells how Henry Maynard, secretary to Lord Burleigh, was 'scared with a message' that Queen Elizabeth proposed to visit the Manor House and sought to get Her Majesty to give up the visit. A great deal of interesting information as to the parish is given. Mr. Rudolf also writes brief biographies of the leaders of 'the Clapham Sect.' Some pages are devoted to notices read in the Parish Church, 1797-1808. Mr. Michael Burgess tells the story of the houses in Clapham Park and their past residents. The land was leased to Thomas Cubitt in 1825, who was the great London builder of the time and died at Denbies, Dorking, in 1855. Mr. Dale gives an account of the Atkins family, who bought the manor in the reign of James I; and of Clapham Common in the time of Charles II. Mr. Gordon Maxwell brings out the romance of old Clapham to-day, and there are fourteen illustrations of churches, houses, monuments, &c., which add to the interest of a singularly instructive survey of a parish which has filled a large place in religious life through the world-famed Clapham Sect.

Persian Pictures. By Gertrude Bell. With a Preface by Sir E. Denison Ross. (Ernest Benn. 10s. 6d.) These sketches were published in 1894 without the author's name, and the only copy known to Sir Denison Ross is that from which the present edition has been made. She fell under the spell of the East in 1892, when she visited her uncle, Sir Frank Lascelles, who was Minister at Teheran. Her pictures carry us straight into the bustling bazaars, into the gardens with their unexpected charm, and into Persian homes with their lavish hospitality. The travel pictures are not the least exhilarating, and the dainty meal spread before them by an unknown traveller was one that they never forgot. The mourning for Hussein; the cholera invasion, where the American missionaries did heroic

service; Ramazan in Constantinople, and the vivid descriptions of shops and shopkeepers, and travelling companions, make this a very pleasant book; and the Preface, with its sketch of Miss Bell and the one letter of hers from Persia which has been preserved, adds to the interest of a delightful book.—*Johnsonian Gleanings*. By Aleya Lyell Reade. Part V.: The Doctor's Life, 1728–35. (Lund, Humphries & Co. 21s.) It is four years since Part IV. of these Gleanings appeared, but no one will wonder at such an interval when he realizes the unceasing labour which the new volume has involved. The lists of Johnson's contemporaries at Pembroke College has alone cost a year's work. Mr. Reade has set at rest the long controversy as to Johnson's residence at Oxford, which really lasted only thirteen months, from November 1728 to December 1729. An Appendix on the Buttery books shows how this conclusion has been reached, and gives some impression of the zeal and success of the investigation. Light is thrown on Johnson's uncomfortable days as usher at Market Bosworth, and on his literary ventures at Birmingham. There he made suggestions to Edward Cave, the founder and editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, which give promise of future distinction, and there he married Mrs. Porter. Part VI. will deal with the years 1735–40—a scarcely less troubled period of his life. The work is attracting the attention of all students of Johnson, and its value is plainly seen from Appendices which cover more space than the main body of the volume, and are not its least interesting feature.—*Sussex*. By S. E. Winbolt. (Bell & Sons. 6s.) The sixty-four illustrations from photographs by Edgar and Winifred Ward are a special feature of this guide. The subjects have been selected with great care, and the double-page views of Arundel, Cuckmere Haven, Beechy Head, Bodiam Castle, and other scenes are very fine. Mr. Winbolt has been rambling over the county for half a century and divides the guide into nine regions. Shipley had the church and hamlet of the Knights Templars eight centuries ago, and a day in and around the place will transport you to mediæval life in an extraordinary degree. Christ's Hospital has probably a larger acreage than any school in England, and is no longer 'an arrogant red-brick town,' but is mellowed and becoming a harmonious whole, thoroughly in keeping with the Wealden landscape. This is a workmanlike guide, one of the best we know on Sussex, but we miss any reference to Dr. Neale in the account of East Grinstead.—*Seiji Noma* (Tokyo) is a sketch of the 'Magazine King' of Japan. One of his monthlies, the *King*, has a circulation of a million and a half, and his nine monthlies have about ten million readers. He was once a teacher, and learnt that children can be taught important truths through stories. He became a clerk in the Imperial University at Tokyo, and his wife taught in a primary school. Then he began a magazine to help young speakers, out of which his other enterprises have grown; 350 of his workers are under twenty years old.

GENERAL

Things to Come. By John Middleton Murry. (Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d.)

THIS volume of essays is a sequel to that entitled *To the Unknown God*. Mr. Murry says: 'In spite of the Church (or the *Church Times*), and in spite of the rationalists, I claim to be, in my own peculiar way, a Christian. I am as fully entitled to my share of the Christian heritage as any believer.' The essay on 'Christ and Christianity' acknowledges the writer's debt to the Church, without which the memory and the knowledge of Jesus would have been impossible for men. He therefore owns, with gratitude, that he is a son of the Church, though he thinks it has done its work and is no longer adequate to the religious consciousness of modern times. We cannot follow Mr. Murry when he asserts that man's experience forbids him to believe in God the Father. He thinks that those who had deepest religious experience in the past had not experience of God the Father, but 'an unutterable experience of an unutterable God, of something—a power—a soul of which all life is the bodily garment.' The God of Jesus was 'the most loving of all gods, because He was the most loving of all men. Therefore he created God the Father.' That by no means shakes the Catholic doctrine that Jesus revealed God in new lights as His Father and ours, and the troubles of the world are themselves proof, as the Epistle to the Hebrews argues, of the fatherly discipline which perfects character. Mr. Murry does not hesitate to say that 'a drunken tramp who pads the highway unknowing whence his next meal will come is nearer to following Christ than the whole bench of bishops. Christ, the friend of publicans and sinners and harlots, would have chosen swiftly between them.' Such a tramp may indeed be nearer to Jesus through his poverty, but how much further from Him in his conduct. The essay on 'The Parables of Jesus' is beautifully suggestive. His words prove the historical existence of Jesus, for they are the utterance of one of the greatest men that ever lived. These stories 'stand apart in all the literature of the world, not for their beauty, though it is surpassing, but for the conception of love which they enshrine.' To Mr. Murry, Shakespeare is 'the first man of truly commanding genius, since Jesus Himself, who had fought himself free of orthodox religion.' As to Jesus and Shakespeare, he knows of no two spirits more profoundly alike than theirs. This sweeping statement fails to carry conviction, but it sets one thinking, and that is the real value of these sincere and devout studies of a seeker after truth who is sure to get clearer vision as he sits at the feet of Jesus and learns of Him. In his interrupted correspondence with William Archer, he states that, though he does not believe in personal immortality, he does 'most strongly believe that something survives, and is immortal.' The man who has gone so far is sure to get light that will carry him further.

Realism : An Attempt to Trace its Origin and Development in its Chief Representatives. By Syed Zaafarul Hasan (Cambridge University Press. 16s. net.)

In a brief Foreword, Dr. Smith, the Waynflete Professor of Metaphysical Philosophy at Oxford, describes Dr. Hasan's work as an extensive, patient, and sympathetic account of the published doctrines of the Realistic school, which he has read more than once with enlightenment to himself. His old pupil is now Professor of Philosophy in Aligarh University, and defines realism as the doctrine which maintains that the external world exists and is directly apprehended in perception. His Introduction discusses the doctrine from both its positive and its negative side. 'The common consciousness of man affirms it with an unambiguity hardly surpassed by any of its other convictions. And it is a self-consistent position—it offers the solution of the only real difficulty that can reasonably be raised against it, viz. the relativity of sense. All other difficulties are *ab extra*—they have no footing in fact and experience, and are purely metaphysically motived.' The struggle of the realistic instinct against its negation begins with the doubt of Descartes and fills three centuries, broken up into two distinct eras. The first is marked by the struggle against subjective idealism in Descartes and Berkeley, and is chiefly interested in maintaining the independent *existence* of the external world. Descartes, Locke, Reid, and Hamilton are its chief representatives, and their position is clearly described. Scripps, Mach, and Averinus are mainly concerned with the directness of perception and the nature of objects. The independence of objects is brought out by Meinong, Stout, and the American 'Critical-realists.' The third chapter deals with the development of realism. All the modern schools hold that we apprehend this world directly in perception. The empirical realism of Alexander, Holt, and Russell regards sense, and not objects, as real. Bertrand Russell's doctrine ends in Humean sensationalism. Professor Hasan holds man's deep-rooted conviction of realism will find its way to complete philosophic justification, and his valuable critical survey will certainly promote that end. An Appendix gives a brief account of the position held by other thinkers, and there is a bibliography of the chief works discussed in the volume.

The Thirsty Earth : The Theory and Practice of Irrigation in all Countries. By E. H. Carrier, M.A., M.Sc., F.R.S. (Christophers. 10s. 6d. net.)

The actual geographical conditions calling for irrigation in various parts of the world, and the methods by which irrigated agriculture is carried out, are here described in two sections dealing with irrigation in the ancient and the modern world. Irrigated crops and fruits have certain advantages, both in the yield per acre and the quality of the product. Provided the temperature is suitable, irrigated agriculture may be carried on continuously. An interesting account is

given of irrigation in ancient times, but the most valuable part of the work is concerned with modern methods. Agricultural operations depending on the waters of the Nile have recently been greatly extended in the Gezira Plain south of Khartum, where 500 square miles are under cultivation. It would be possible to develop ten times this amount, and a scheme for constructing a second dam higher up the Nile is already under consideration. The subject is one of world-wide importance, and this luminous presentation of it by a geographical expert will be of great interest to engineers and others who have large responsibility in the matter.

Beau Ideal, by Percival Christopher Wren (Murray, 7s. 6d.), is the last of the Foreign Legion trilogy which has furnished such exciting adventure in scenes that tested the courage of brave men, and, if possible, braver women, to the uttermost. In Mr. Wren's galaxy there is no finer figure than Beau Ideal, whose quest of John Geste is a marvel of devotion and resourcefulness which comes out in triumph after unbelievable exploits. Isobel is the queen of the story, but the Angel of Death, despite all appearances, runs her close for the rôle of heroine, and the way in which she really rescues the family from its tyrannical head is only to be realized as we reach the end of the story. The volume is a striking close to the trilogy, and makes us regret that there is not more to follow it. L'Adjutant Lebaudy seems to embody all the unflinching temper of the Legion, but he softens at the end when the 'Emir' rescues him from the Arabs. There is no set of stories so full of dramatic scenes as this Beau Geste series.—*The Devouring Fire*. By Lord Gorell. (Murray. 7s. 6d.) A novel reader who rejoices in sensation and tragedy will find them here in full measure. There is a double trial for murder, with long consultations between the zealous police sergeant who wins promotion by his masterly handling of the case. There is an heir who is threatened with ruin, and a woman who has been the mistress of the murdered man, and, when one tragedy is over, a blacker one opens and fills us with amazement. The story is written with rare power, and the report of the assize trial shows a skilled hand, but the death-bed confession is the most thrilling scene in a book that gets on one's nerves.—*His Elizabeth*. By Elswyth Thane. (John Murray. 7s. 6d.) Tommy Chandler falls in love in Paris and follows the girl to the South of France, where he wins and loses her. He is a poet, and has had other affairs of the heart, which now bring him into trouble. Fortunately, he has a mother, clever and wise and far-seeing, who comes to the rescue of her son, whom she cures of his boyhood's fancy and puts him in the way to win the girl whom she recognized as 'both beautiful and vertebrate.' The love-making has a poet's rhapsody about it, and it is no small relief when the wedding bells are about to ring.—*When West was West*. By Owen Wister. (Macmillan & Co. 7s. 6d.) Mr. Wister is a literary artist, and the life of the Western States of America a generation ago gives him ample scope for his description of manners and his discernment of character. We do

not keep very pleasant company, but that makes his stories more unusual and more exciting. The Indian guide, Sun Road, and his boy make a splendid pair, and one shudders over the final tragedy. The English exile of a noble house is a fine man spoiled, and 'Lone Fountain' is a strange study. The army doctor and his friend Hugh have some lively times in their strange surroundings, and every story seems to bring to life the vanished past and to make us thankful that it has gone never to return.—*The Battle of the Horizons*. By Sylvia Thompson. (Heinemann. 7s. 6d.) This story will be as eagerly read as the *Hounds of Spring*, which laid the foundation of its writer's reputation. Athene Reid is an American beauty in love with England, and marries both Geoffrey Graham and his country. Her disillusionment is a painful matter, but it leads to a new understanding of herself and her husband. The least attractive character is 'Moloch' Denis, the satirical novelist, and Patricia Graham, the sculptress, is perhaps the finest. She wins a great victory, and one regrets that no sunshine seems lighting up her future. Her sister Bobs, with her husband and baby, is the ideal wife and mother, and there are many exciting moments in a very fine story, which throws light on social conditions on both sides of the Atlantic.—*Swan Song*. (Heinemann. 7s. 6d.) This is the sixth novel of the Forsythe drama, and Mr. Galsworthy has written nothing more powerful. The description of the Great Strike, and Fleur's Canteen, with her lady helpers and her old lover's work as stoker, could not be more realistic. Soames comes out grandly, and Fleur's husband and boy both capture one's imagination. Fleur herself comes to grief in a way that surprises us, and we could wish that Mr. Galsworthy had spared her that indignity. But Michael Mont bears the blow nobly, and Soames himself dies in the fire—'a proper champion,' as his chauffeur put it. It is real art, and we only wish that Fleur and Jon had not soiled their record.—*Andy Man*. By Amy le Feuvre. (Pickering & Inglis. 2s. 6d.) Andy first appears playing the part of a policeman, with all the boys and girls of the London slum representing the stream of London traffic. When he leaves school he sets out to push his fortunes, and finds a master for whom he would have laid down his life. They set up house together in a country village, and make friends with every one. It is a story that warms one's heart for both John Dunstan and his amazing little retainer.—*Tales of Our Village*, by Mrs. Coulson Kernahan (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.), gives twelve pictures of country life, each complete in itself, but all linked together with true artistry. They are delightful stories, and overflow with kindly sympathy. Such a book makes one in love with human nature.—*Partners*, by Estelle Gwynne (2s.), belongs to a fishing-village. George King has no honeymoon, but his marriage means a life of joy and growing success. The children are a set to be proud of, and there are three weddings in sight before the happy story ends.

The Unconscious in Action: Its Influence upon Education. By Barbara Low. (University of London Press. 5s.) The object of

this book is to show the bearing of psycho-analysis on education. The first necessary equipment of the teacher is held to be a realization of the unconscious mind and its influence upon consciousness. Complicated emotional issues revolve round the relationship between teacher and pupil. The way these hinder intellectual processes is described, and some cases are analysed. We do not find these very convincing, nor does the suggested treatment of sex matters seem very wise, but the book has its own interest as a description of the way in which the unconscious is studied by Freudian methods.—*The Liberal Policy for Industry*, by Stuart Hodson (Ernest Benn, 6d.), is a shorter version of *Britain's Industrial Problem*, prepared by one who was in touch with the inquiry there reported, and shows in more condensed form the need for a policy of industry and the line that reform of British business and industrial relations should take. It is a book which ought to be in every one's hands.—*War and Human Values*. (Hogarth Press. 1s.) In this second Merttens Lecture, Mr. Pollard shows that the conduct of States towards each other has always been upon a lower moral scale than that of individuals. War seems divorced from conscience, though that does not mean any reflection on many noble soldiers. This Lecture points to a new era, and it does it in an arresting and inspiring way.—We have received from the Natural Resources Department a set of views of Canadian cities as they appeared in 1867 and as they appear to-day. It is a wonderful transformation, and gives an impressive bird's-eye view of sixty years of astonishing progress in a Dominion which has boundless possibilities before it.—*Moslem Mentality*, by L. Levonian (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), is by an Armenian who was Professor of Turkish Literature for fourteen years in one of the colleges in the Near East. The attitude of the Old Moslem mentality towards women and family life has poisoned the morality of the people. It is a promising sign that the need of a moral basis for civilized life is being felt more and more in Moslem circles. That is a great opportunity for Christian Missions. The Moslem peoples are passing through a transition period. There have been more changes in the last thirteen years than in the previous thirteen centuries. Christ must be presented as the revealer of a new life, as one who risked everything on the power of love. If Christian men and women show Christ's spirit, a new era will begin in the blood-stained life of the Near East. This is a book that deserves close attention. It is an inside view of the Moslem world which is really full of hope.—*Man's Energy Foods*, by Ettie A. Ront, is a reprint from *New Health*. Starch is the principal energy food, which native races take in the form of roots, and civilized man in the form of cereals. Methods of cookery are suggested, and the mode in which natives prepare their food is shown by many interesting illustrations.

Periodical Literature

BRITISH

Edinburgh Review (July).—Captain Loder, in 'Egypt during and since the War,' says that the declaration of February 1922 incidentally protects Egypt from all other foreign interference. Great Britain has 'greater freedom of action, more scope for interference, than if bound by obligations to which Egypt was a party. Will Egypt recognize the facts and realize that a wider independence may, in truth, be hers if she willingly submits to its limitation in certain directions for the sake of peace; or will she continue to be a running sore in the body politic of the world? Great Britain can do no more. Egypt must choose.' Sir W. R. Lawrence thinks there is ample room in India for many experiments in government, and 'one of the causes of the present discontent is the drab monotony which runs through every province, blurring the bright colours of a land which longs for many hues.' In 'A Church Tolerant' Sir Alexander Harris discusses the situation caused by the rejection of the Deposited Book. The chief difficulty of the bishops is with the Anglo-Catholics, who 'have lost in great measure their sense of loyalty; their very enthusiasm and devotion are blind guides in a narrow and difficult path.' 'If half the earnest sympathy which to-day strives for reunion had been available for John Wesley and his followers, it is probable that what is now the powerful body of the Wesleyan Methodists would never have established a separate Church.'

Hibbert Journal (July).—In the first article Dr. A. Mansbridge discusses the well-worn subject of 'The Re-assertion of the Faith.' He suggests that 'representatives of the Churches and the universities might take deliberate counsel together' concerning a restatement of the Christian faith in the full light of new knowledge, following lines of thought sketched out in this article. It is, perhaps, not very likely that such a round-table conference would result in anything worth calling a 'Faith.' Three able articles, by Lord Haldane, Dr. Turnbull, and Mrs. Rhys Davids, deal with the three cognate subjects, 'East and West,' 'Hinduism and Christianity in India,' and 'Buddhism not a Negative Gospel.' A following paper, entitled 'Harnack and Liberal Protestantism,' deals with the marked decline in the influence of Harnack as a religious teacher. The currents of religious thought change so rapidly to-day that already Harnack's 'Liberal Protestantism' is left more or less stranded; but Dr. Inge contends that, in his 'attempt to disengage the essential features of the Galilean gospel in their permanent significance, Harnack has

rendered a very important service.' Professor Sorley's article on 'Industrial Ethics' should be read in conjunction with Dr. J. A. Johnston's essay on the 'Philosophy of Industry.' Both afford food for thought on the leading economical problems of to-day. Other interesting papers in this excellent number deal with 'Self-Realization,' 'Marriage in Cultural History,' and 'Schleiermacher's Catechism for Noble Women,' which Mr. Joseph King here introduces to English readers. The last article, by Dr. E. Barthel, describes 'Dr. Albert Schweitzer as Theologian.' The writer's main thesis is that Schweitzer's conception of Jesus and primitive Christianity, which was at first fiercely attacked, has 'gradually won its way through to acceptance.' That is probably to state the case too strongly. Schweitzer's views have not so far prevailed, but they have exercised a widespread influence of late years, whilst Liberal Protestantism has declined. Of Schweitzer as missionary hero the record has yet to be written.

Journal of Theological Studies (April).—Professor Burkitt contributes three articles to this number, the most important of which contains a valuable description of 'The Mandaeans,' interest in whom has been revived by recent discoveries on the banks of the Tigris. A paper on 'The Form of a Dove,' by the Rev. W. Telfer, puts forward the view that this symbol is 'a fitting emblem of the unique moral character of the ministry of Jesus,' while the symbolizing by the dove of the Holy Spirit must be regarded as a 'product of subsequent Christian thought.' The Rev. W. L. Prestige contributes a scholarly examination of 'Παριχώρησις in the Fathers,' and Professor C. H. Turner's paper on 'Marcan Usage' is the ninth in a long and most interesting series. This latest instalment contains Lexical Notes of great value; an enormous amount of careful work is condensed into these pages. The reviews occupy half of this number of the Journal, and they are full of theological instruction—e.g. Dr. Oman's criticisms of Streeter, Mackintosh, and Maréchal, and the careful examination of Dr. N. P. Williams's Bampton Lectures on 'The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin,' by the Rev. J. Boys Smith.

Expository Times (June).—The Editorial Notes deal with the Temptation and Resurrection of our Lord, and Müller's 'Jesus as I see Him.' Dr. Peake's series of notes on current Commentaries is packed with useful information. Dr. Prideaux, Principal of Salisbury College, puts in a plea for the study of theology, and Lieut.-Col. Stevenson contributes 'A Suggestion on the Origin of the Hebrews.' The whole number is full of valuable 'suggestions.'—(July.)—Dr. R. Dunkerley contributes the first of two papers on 'The Gospel according to the Hebrews,' and the Rev. D. Baillie continues his series upon the 'Sermon on the Mount' by describing 'How Jesus Dealt with Worry.' Dr. Rendel Harris's article, 'A Lost Verse in the Gospel of Mark,' forms an admirable example of conjectural criticism. Dr. Lowther Clarke answers, in his own way, the question, 'Was St. Paul a

Stammerer ?' A notable paper by the Rev. A. Gordon James, of the West London Mission, pleads that, in the religious controversies of to-day, the 'specialists' should furnish the 'evangelists' with better—that is, more modern—ammunition and weapons of defence. Mr. James's exposition of 'Jesus our Advocate' proves him to be well able to provide serviceable ammunition, as well as to use it.

Science Progress (July).—Professor Boyle writes on 'Ultrasonics,' waves of sound at pitches too high for audibility. The article describes researches which have been carried out largely through the help of the Canadian Research Council. There are other important technical scientific articles. Sir Ronald Ross gives a brief account of his younger twin brothers, who joined the Royal Navy as medical officers about 1902 and died in 1926 and 1928. E. H. Ross almost changed Port Said, where he was health officer. He cleared out most of the cesspools under the houses, and reduced very largely the mosquitoes, as well as the scoundrels who made it one of the most disgusting holes on the face of the earth. The brothers were unfortunate in their relations to the authorities, but both did valuable research work. Another note states that malaria has entered into Barbados through dangerous mosquitoes. Malaria generally doubles the death rate, and is an enormous tax on agriculture.

Church Quarterly (July).—Judge Dowdall says, in a valuable study of 'The Word *Person*,' that its historic theological use to mark the distinction of the 'Persons' in the Trinity is a source of confusion from which there is no obvious means of escape. Mr. Ferrar describes 'The Great Days of St. Martin de Tours.' The visit to his tomb was the recognized French pilgrimage in the fifth century. Professor T. R. Robinson surveys 'Recent Research on the Book of Psalms.' We care little to-day about the actual date of a Psalm; what matters to us is the place it took in the life of the individual or the community.

Holborn Review (July).—A varied and excellent number. Dr. W. F. Lofthouse's tribute to the honoured memory of Josephine Butler is timely and admirable. He closes with words of her own, 'There is no evil in the world so great that God cannot raise up to meet it a corresponding beauty and glory which will blaze it out of countenance.' Amongst the literary articles are an exposition of Ibsen's *Peer Gynt*, by Rev. I. W. Richardson, and a thoughtful paper on Browning's 'Ferishtah' by the Rev. T. W. Bryan. The latter shows wisdom in preferring the lyrics between the dialogues to the laboured and often unconvincing arguments of the main poems. The songs breathe more of Browning's early spirit, and better represent his religious faith. A pleasant picture of 'Life in a Country Town' is contributed by the Rev. E. E. Fisher, while readers who prefer something gritty to sharpen their critical teeth upon may turn to Mr. Braham's essay on 'Kant and the Organic World.' Dr. Peake's

Editorial Notes deal chiefly with contemporary German theologians. He also writes, for the Study Circle, on the Fourth Gospel. The section on Current Literature is full of valuable notices and criticisms.

Congregational Quarterly (July).—In 'A Rebirth of Protestantism' Dr. Selbie says if there is to be a Protestant revival it must be more than a negative anti-Catholic propaganda. The root ideas which created the life and dominated the thought of the Churches of the Reformation must be revived and recast in modern terms. To see God as Jesus saw Him, and enter into free loving and obedient fellowship with Him as Father and friend, is the conception which makes Protestantism the only truly Catholic form of Christianity. Mr. Clarkson's *Reminiscences* are pleasant reading; Mr. Bristow's 'Christianity in Roman Asia in the light of Epigraphy' is a valuable study of inscriptions and epitaphs, and there is much besides of interest in this varied number.

Cornhill (July—August).—Mr. Weyman's serial, 'The *Lively Peggy*,' holds our attention fast until the last page. The story ends well for Peggy and her brave husband whose reunion is the gem of the number, though the love-story of Charlotte and Sir Albery Wyke is a rare piece of work, and fitly crowns their devotion to Peggy and the lieutenant. Mr. Hubback, whose grandfather was Jane Austen's elder brother, throws light on the pen portraits in her novels. 'The Wreck of the *St. Abbs*' describes a thrilling shipwreck in 1855, and Gunning's pages supply a lively picture of university life in Cambridge after 1790. 'William Cory,' by Mr. Madan, gives an interesting account of his writings in prose and verse.

Eylands Bulletin (July).—Among the special articles are 'The Art of Jane Austen,' 'The City of Ur,' 'John Bunyan and the Higher Criticism,' 'Paul the Apostle,' and Dr. Mingana's *Woodbrooke Studies*, with an Introduction by Dr. Rendel Harris. The editor gives an account of the new Louvain Library.

AMERICAN

Princeton Theological Review (April).—The first article, of more than seven pages, by Professor R. D. Wilson, deals with 'Foreign Words in the Old Testament as an Evidence of Historicity,' and it is the third in a series of essays in the Old Testament criticism. Experts must judge of the value of evidence so carefully adduced by a biblical scholar. 'An American Doctor Looks at Luther' is the title of an article by Professor J. A. Faulkner, who reviews certain chapters in a *Life of Erasmus*, published in 1927 by a Roman Catholic layman, J. J. Mangan, M.D., of Lynn (Mass.). The third

of the three leading articles is on 'The Roman Doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance,' written by an ex-priest of the Roman Catholic Church, whose name is naturally withheld. His testimony, proving that the confessional of the Roman Church is to Protestants, not 'a recognition of human craving,' but something very different, is first-hand and practically conclusive. The reviews of books are full and valuable, as usual.

Methodist Review (New York: May—June).—The opening article is by Dr. Knudson, Dean of the Boston University School of Theology, who here publishes a part of his Presidential Address before the American Theological Society, under the title 'The Theology of Crisis.' It deals very ably with the views of Barth and Brunner, who have recently made such a stir among German theologians by what may be called their 'Fundamentalist' publications. Three articles in this number deal with aspects of Methodism—'The Sesquicentennial of American Methodism,' 'John Wesley's Attitude to Learning,' and 'Robert Strawbridge and American Methodism,' the last by Dr. Frank Porter of Baltimore. All are interesting and 'up to date.' Professor Morey writes on 'Music in Worship,' and Dr. C. Wilson on 'Christ, the Reformer.' The latter article deals chiefly with Temperance Reform. Thoughtful papers for thoughtful readers are, 'Changing Belief and Keeping the Faith,' by A. S. Mowbray, and, 'Faith or Experience,' by Professor König, of Bonn, Germany.

Anglican Theological Review (Lancaster, U.S.A.; published in England by H. Milford, Oxford University Press).—The April number contains papers on 'Should the Present Canon on Divorce be Altered?' 'English Church and State in the Feudal Anarchy,' and 'Contemporary Theories of Primitive Religion,' also a useful paper by the well-known theologian, Dr. F. J. Hall, on 'The Study of Dogmatic Theology: a Reading Course for the Clergy.'

Christian Union Quarterly (July).—The editor pays tribute to Dr. Shakespeare's passion for the unity of Christendom, and defends the Lausanne and Baltimore Conferences from charges made by Baptist critics. A 'thrilling and heartening' letter from Dr. J. R. Mott says the Jerusalem Conference surpassed all expectations. It was 'unmistakably creative and dynamic.' There is much about the Baltimore Conference, and many extracts show what people and papers are saying about Unity.

Canadian Journal of Religious Thought (May—June).—Samuel Mercer describes 'Excavations in Palestine since the Great War.' One of the finest pieces of work has been done on the Eastern Hill at Jerusalem. Earliest Jerusalem, it was shown, had been occupied by the Canaanite Jebusites; Jerusalem was strongly

fortified when David attacked it. Mr. Brett describes 'Life in Eastern Lands,' and S. P. Rose pleads for 'Good English in the Pulpit.' He has never weighed the use of the split infinitive in any instance where he did not feel that the sentence had been weakened.

FOREIGN

Analecta Bollandiana (Tomus XLVI., Fasc. i. et ii.).—M. Devresse writes on the Life of S. Maximus the Confessor, who was born at Constantinople of a noble family and became secretary to the Emperor Honorius (610–641). When the monothelite heresy developed, he entered a monastery, and afterwards made a bold struggle against it in Egypt, where he gained a high reputation. There is much other matter of hagiographic interest in the number.

Ars Medici (July), the Journal of the American Medical Association of Vienna, is the only English medical paper appearing on the Continent. It gives reviews and abstracts of Viennese and German medical literature, and articles on the progress of the work in Continental hospitals and clinics.

Calcutta Review (May).—Sir Michael Sadler's address at the annual meeting of the Indian Students' Union and Hostel is here given in full. He says every university has always been the scene of political discussion. The hardest questions of belief and duty, both in religion and in politics, cannot be evaded by old or young in any centre of sound learning. The first duty of a university, and all who work in it, is to get at the truth. If the conditions of life in a country are unhealthy, political talk may become feverish and unbalanced. That calls for special steadiness in judgement, and courage in standing for what is best. 'A Pilgrimage to the Excavation Site at Paharpur' is the subject of another interesting paper. 'Youth Movement and Students' Association' describes these kindred movements in Germany in the first four decades of the nineteenth century.—(June.)—Mr. Skrine's 'Calcutta Memories' describe his introduction to India as a young Civil Servant in 1870, when Calcutta was without pure water or scientific drainage, and had no motor-cars, tramlines, or electricity. London could, however, show nothing comparable with Fort William, Government House, the tropical foliage of the Eden Gardens, or the forest of masts which fringed the majestic Hugli.—(July.)—Dr. Gooch's *Recent Revelations of European Diplomacy* is discussed, and the extended study of W. B. Yeats deals with symbolism and mysticism in literature.