THE BIBLICAL WORLD

A Journal of the Awakening Church

Volume LII SEPTEMBER 1918 Number 2

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, *London and Edinburgh*
THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA, *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka, Sendai*
THE MISSION BOOK COMPANY, *Shanghai*

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

FOUNDED BY WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER

THE HEBREW STUDENT, Vols. I, II, 1882–1883
THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vols. III–VIII, 1883–1888
THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT, Vols. IX–XV, 1889–1892
THE BIBLICAL WORLD, New Series, Vols. I–LII, 1893–1918

SHAILER MATHEWS, Editor
With the Co-operation of the Members of the Divinity Conference of the University of Chicago

Vol. LII

CONTENTS FOR SEPTEMBER 1918

No. 2

The Biblical World is published bimonthly by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, in the months of July, September, November, January, March, and May. ¶ The subscription price is $2.00 per year; the price of single copies is 50 cents. Orders for service of less than a half-year will be charged at the single-copy rate. ¶ Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States, Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, Panama Canal Zone, Republic of Panama, Hawaiian Islands, Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoan Islands, Shanghai. ¶ Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada, 18 cents on annual subscriptions (total $2.18); on single copies, 3 cents (total 53 cents). For all other countries in the Postal Union, 30 cents on annual subscriptions (total $2.30); on single copies, 5 cents (total 55 cents). ¶ Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to The University of Chicago Press in postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized to quote the prices indicated:

For the British Empire: The Cambridge University Press, Fetter Lane, London, E.C. 4, England. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, 10s. each; single copies, including postage, 2s. 3d. each.

For Japan and Korea: The Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha, 11 to 16 Nihonbashi Tori Sanchome, Tokyo, Japan. Yearly subscriptions, including postage, Yen 4.60 each; single copies, including postage, Yen 1.10 each.

For China: The Mission Book Company, 18 Peking Road, Shanghai. Yearly subscriptions, $2.00; single copies, 50 cents, or their equivalents in Chinese money. Postage extra, if mailed direct outside of Shanghai, on yearly subscriptions 30 cents, on single copies 5 cents.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit. Deliveries are not guaranteed within the war zones of Europe, nor in other countries where transportation is disturbed by conditions incident to war.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

Communications for the editor and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of THE BIBLICAL WORLD, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, January 28, 1893, at the Post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 15, 1918.

The Biblical World for November

The Church and the Coming Social Movement

By REV. WORTH M. TIPPY, *New York City. A succinct presentation of the social crisis which the church will face after the war.*

The Moral Meaning of the War

By REV. SAMUEL ZANE BATTEN, *Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. A valuable contribution on the doctrine of sin.*

The Nicene Idea of God

By CHARLES L. DIBBLE, *Kalamazoo, Michigan. A discussion of trinitarianism from a lawyer's point of view.*

Christian Union after the War

By REV. ROBERT A. ASHWORTH, *Milwaukee, Wisconsin. A forecast of the future from a study of the psychology of the soldier.*

Preaching in a World at War

By REV. OZORA S. DAVIS, *Chicago, Illinois. A continuation of this very timely and helpful series of articles.*

How to Interpret Old Testament Prophecy. Study I in an Outline Bible-Study course by Professor I. G. Matthews of McMaster University.

The Religious Significance of the Present Crisis. Part I of a reading course for ministers, to which important contributions will be made by those best prepared to speak on this subject.

Information Service

The Bureau of Information of The Religious Education Association is at your service without charge. Questions on literature, methods, and materials of moral and religious education may be sent to the office of the Association.

While the service of the Bureau is free to all persons, membership in the Association, costing $3.00 annually, secures the publications of the Association, including the magazine "Religious Education."

Associated to Serve

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
1440 EAST 57th STREET
CHICAGO

A military victory is necessary but is it enough?

"*. . . . The common man is fighting for a world in which wars like the present cannot occur again. It is the right use of victory after it is attained that counts.*—THE DIAL, July 18, 1918"

RECENTLY THE DIAL has extended its editorial policy to include the discussion of reconstruction after the war, particularly as it applies to American conditions. Week by week those minds most alert to the forces making toward a new order attack the problems of industrial, educational, and international readjustment.

AT the same time THE DIAL remains the only critical survey of the whole field of contemporary letters. It reviews as they come from the press those books which no informed person can ignore. For each book it selects the critic best qualified by his special knowledge, his point of view, and his readability.

Broadly, THE DIAL'S policy is one of free inquiry and liberal interpretation. It believes there is need for fresh examination of the texture of American life—as revealed in our art, our theater, our books, our social institutions. It publishes articles on all these subjects, judging contemporary tendencies and old survivals in terms of our growing experience and our new insights. It is hard-hitting, yet tolerant; authoritative, yet without bias.

THE DIAL

Published weekly after October 3. $3 the year—$1 for four months

GEORGE DONLIN, *Editor* HAROLD STEARNS, *Managing Editor*

SPECIAL RECONSTRUCTION NUMBERS

[illegible] special Reconstruction Number, including discussions of specific problems of reconstruction, will be published under the editorial direction of John Dewey, Thorstein V[illegible] and H[illegible] Marot.

Special Offer for New Readers Only

H. G. Wells's *"Joan and Peter"* ($1.75) and The Dial for 4 months (18 issues) **$2.25**

Mr. W[illegible] novel is a story of educa[illegible] brilliant manner. It [illegible] interest of every parent [illegible] "Britling" it is the best story he [illegible] since *Tono Bungay*. To be pub[illegible] Macmillan the middle of September.

FILL OUT THIS COUPON

Dial Publishing Co., Inc.
152 West 13th St., New York

Enclosed is $2.25. Put my name on your subscription list for four months and send me a copy of Wells's JOAN AND PETER as soon as it is off the press.

Name

Address

ON SALE AT ALL THE BETTER NEWSSTANDS

THE BIBLICAL WORLD

VOLUME LII SEPTEMBER 1918 NUMBER 2

SHALL WE NEED CHURCHES?

By churches we mean what the word usually stands for—local bodies of Christians who have organized for the purpose of maintaining worship, observing the sacraments, giving religious education, and acting as the moral and religious leaven of the community. The Young Men's Christian Association, Red Cross societies, and similar bodies are not churches. They are due to the influence of the churches, they may express the spirit of the churches, but they are different sorts of institutions.

Are these organizations to replace the churches?

We do not believe that such a replacement is possible in the sense that the churches will cease to exist and in their place will be these various social and philanthropic institutions.

But to be frank, we believe that the next few years will determine whether the churches as actual organizations are needed. For they will be outgrown if they have no real leadership in their communities.

Notice that we say churches—not Christians. The Christian point of view has gained enormously both despite of and because of the war. We are in an age that is rapidly bringing to fruition social forces which have been growing more powerful for the last generation. Middle-aged people have not lived in vain. The world is fighting to protect institutions and ideals which in essence are the development of biblical ethics and religion as they culminated in Jesus. The Christianity of Jesus is not in question.

But will the churches, as in the past, be the social expression of this spirit, or shall we come to a time when churches will be outgrown because other institutions better express the spirit of Jesus?

Churches will not be needed as mere competitors in philanthropic and humanitarian activity. Churches without such activity will

decline into inconsequential clubs supporting piety and their private chaplains, but churches that have only such significance will decay. They cannot hope to compete with highly specialized philanthropies.

Churches must lead in spiritual things and serve in temporal things. To imitate Jesus is to pray as truly as it is to heal the sick or to assist the poor.

Just now, when an exhibition on a wholesale scale has been given of the altruistic qualities of Christian people, churches face their opportunity too indifferently. They are patriotic but not prophetic.

Church leaders who today stress points of denominational difference, make theological formulas essential for participation in social service, divorce religion from devotion to one's fellows, are threatening the very existence of the churches. But just as truly church leaders should be repudiated who belittle religious beliefs, put social service over against trust in God, make agnosticism in religion a prerequisite for sacrifice to human needs.

Churches will be needed according to proportion in which they make human fraternity the outward expression of an inward sense of divine sonship.

If present indications mean anything, the religion of tomorrow will have profound if simple beliefs and extensive as well as intelligent social service. It is suicide for the churches not to seize the opportunity to lead and educate this new religious spirit.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING

PAUL HUMBERT
Professor in the University of Neufchâtel, Switzerland

We do not mean to publish in the BIBLICAL WORLD *articles of any considerable length. But we make exceptions in this number, among them this striking article by Professor Humbert. The treatment is so sweeping and so penetrating that it carries a message to our present world as it passes through its own valley of the shadow of death. It thus takes its place in that field of vital religious thinking into which a proper study of the Bible always leads.*

Many remember doubtless the beautiful cry that Aeschylus places in the mouth of Atossa: "Friends! the experience of unhappiness teaches us that when man is assailed by the wave of misfortune, everything inspires him with fear; but if ever fortune is favorable, he thinks that the wind of prosperity will blow forever! Today everything terrifies me, everything presents before my eyes adverse deities!"[1] Thus speaks Atossa and thus we feel also. Today everything terrifies us, our eyes are fixed on the dark realities of life, and the suffering of humanity forces itself on us more painfully than ever.

What place does the Old Testament give to the problem of suffering? and what answer did Israel give to the tragic questions: What is the reason of suffering? Why does God let us suffer?

Our study is quite naturally divided under two heads: the problem before Ezekiel and after Ezekiel, for the thought of that prophet marks, as we shall see, an important and decisive turning-point in Israel's way of looking on the subject we are considering. Let us notice at the outset that the solution Israel gives to this problem is intimately related to the solution given to other problems: relation to the progress of monotheism and moralism, relation to a solidaristic or individualistic conception of life, relation to the idea of life beyond, and finally to that high school of adversity on whose discipline Israel was so long trained.

We must not of course expect to find any systematic solutions of this problem of suffering. Few nations besides the Israelites have been as ignorant of logical thinking and systematic syntheses, being satisfied with individual views. We do not find any philosophical deductions or universal solutions, but assertions expressed separately.

The Old Testament does not afford us any systematic views of the initial stages of Israel's religion; there are only some more or less clear, rapid glances and involuntary allusions. In those far-away times it is animism that prevails; man is at the mercy of innumerable spirits always ready to hurt him, or at least to play tricks on him. From them come the evils of man. The Old Testament

[1] *Pers.* 598 ff.

has kept us a well-known though rather dull echo of this mentality: it is the scene of Peniel (Gen., chap. 32). Is it the wrestling of a man in prayer? No, for it is not in that kind of struggle that one strains one's hip; but, according to the Jahvistic transposition, it seems to be the story, full of primitive flavor, of a spirit, of a demon—probably the numen of the torrent Jabboq—which attacks the venturous man who tries to pass over the ford. But the sun rises, and like all those of his kind, the spirit disappears.

This seems the evidence of a time when jealous, cruel spirits spied on man, ready to inflict on him all sorts of evils; the evidence of a time when the Israelite connected the human suffering with the inauspicious actions of the spirits and demons and with their jealousy.

So there are sufferings due to the enviousness of the spirits; this seems to have been the most ancient opinion that one meets with in the Old Testament. Thus demons command illnesses and regulate accidents, as in the Assyro-Babylonian religion. But later on, with the progressing evolution of Jahweh's worship, this last-named pushed his rivals back into the shade, but he himself kept some of their atrocious features. This Jahweh, in sudden fits of jealousy and savage moods of caprice, inflicted the most cruel evils on man. Thus one evening, as Moses, tired by his journey, is going home to rest for the night, Jahweh suddenly assails him and tries to deal him a deadly blow (Exod. 4:24–26). He will have as peace offering the blood of circumcision, and Zipporah must, by an odd rite, calm the incensed divinity. It was to the blows of that still barbarous and whimsical Jahweh that one considered one's self exposed, for he was ready to make men endure the worst sufferings if they did not quench his thirst for blood. A mere ritual mistake, one moment of forgetfulness, and the divinity burst on you with a whole train of evils! At those remote origins suffering came accordingly from the spirits and gods; its causes could not be foreseen; the caprice of the god had a big part in it: in short, mere suffering without any other object than vengeance and the desire to harm or to play a bloody trick on man.

However, from the oldest sources of the Pentateuch a more systematic answer comes also down to us, though isolated and without much echo in the rest of the Old Testament. It is to be found in the Jahvistic account of Gen., chap. 3. The first human couple is in Paradise and has by its sin lost its sexual innocence. What is the object of this narrative? Does it relate the origin of sin? No, not so much that as, before all, the origin of suffering. The base crawling of the serpent, the travail of childbirth for the woman, the afflictions of the man, their hard labor, whence does all that come? From a divine curse which condemns man to bear forever his lot of misery. But we find, moreover, in this passage (Gen. 3:16–19) some traces of the ancient magic conceptions, for the malediction works magically. This account of Gen., chap. 3, is an interesting attempt at explaining the general character of human suffering in time and in space, and at explaining it by a unique principle. Mankind is cursed because of a transgression which made it pass from the Golden Age to the Age of Brass. It is an attempt at going back to the very

first beginnings of the race, a bold assertion of the solidarity of the whole race.

Shall we speak here of heredity? The modern conception of this term is evidently unknown to the thinker of old; he no doubt believes in a curse acting always anew, and does not think of its particular mode of transmission. As to the "Fall," it is not in itself the aim of this account, but only an episode in the primordial drama, and the author's object is to find out the very origin and reason of suffering.

Now this account is interesting even in other respects. Death is for us part and parcel of the problem of suffering; nay, is its most cruel and distressing enigma. Nothing of that kind was true in ancient Israel, but an absolute fatalism and the unanimous conviction that there is nothing strange in death, that man being dust must return to dust (Gen. 3:19: "for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return"). Death is a natural phenomenon which cannot be taken notice of without sadness, but provokes neither complaint, nor protest, nor dread. Death is in no wise either mysterious or disturbing. Such a state of mind we can hardly conceive, but we must at least recognize its existence.

That story of Gen., chap. 3, brings us into close contact with a characteristic feature of ancient Israel's mentality, one which occupies a most prominent place in the question of suffering: the solidarity of the successive generations. In those remote centuries the individual was merged in the community, absorbed in the clan; the members of the same tribe were all jointly accountable, and the old vendetta struck as often as it could the murderer and all those of the same blood. In the realm of suffering we find the same blotting out of the individual: the members of the same family are all at one in suffering; all take part in the suffering of a near relation; God is "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generations" (Exod. 20:5; 24:7; Deut. 5:9). Some sufferings fall therefore to our lot just because we are partly accountable for the faults of our ancestors and consequently have a part in their punishment. This should not be taken in the modern sense of biological heredity; it is God himself who extends over several generations and over a whole community the punishment deserved by one sole individual. An opinion of that kind takes us back to a time when the individual was still hardly conscious of his own dignity. We have here undoubtedly an attempt at giving an explanation to the problem of suffering: there are evils which we are not responsible for, and which fall on us only because we are the descendants of a guilty man. But it should be noticed that this explanation, though partly true, could only satisfy such souls as were not yet autonomous nor conscious of the individual man's rights. It remained, however, the answer in vogue in Israel for a long while, even down to the prophets. As to the aim of that collective suffering, it actually seems to have been only punishment for punishment's sake, without any pedagogical idea at the back of it. The guilty must suffer in that larger self represented by his descendants. Needless to quote any examples; there are a number of them in the historical books of the Old Testament.

However, step by step, a revolution took place, beginning with the first prophets. Individualism came slowly to light; the prophets gradually called for a more personal faith than in the past years. To this should be added that they had also displaced the axis of religion; instead of working by rites, it worked henceforth by ethics. This is what happened in a marked way from Amos onward, and what Moses had perhaps more or less clearly foreseen. The divine being, from being capricious and amoral, becomes moral and just. Also, ancient polytheism and polydemonism are progressively replaced by the Jahvistic monolatry, and later on by monotheism. In the presence of this single and moral God the individual personality comes forth from its century-long effacement, and entirely new relations are established between the divinity and its worshipers—personal and essentially moral relations. Moreover, we witness at the same time the dawn of universal monotheism. Jahweh is no more the master of a small district of the earth; he is promoted sovereign of the world and of the whole universe (for reasons which we cannot examine here—partly moral, first, and partly drawn, without doubt, from the spectacle of the great oriental monarchies). A just and moral God thus becomes the master of all; the divinity being individualized and moralized, his worshipers also become moralized and individualized. The result of all this will be, by degrees, a totally new attitude toward the problem of suffering.

So it is that, under the impulse of the prophets, the conception of divine justice is forced upon the Israelite's mind, and these two factors are henceforward facing each other: divine justice and suffering. In other words, it is the problem of theodicy which is forced upon the Hebrew mind, however little given it may be to rational thinking; the suffering of mankind must be put in harmony with divine justice. Previously considered from an individual and no more from a general point of view, suffering must henceforth be looked on in the light of justice. And then, since on the other hand Hosea laid special stress on divine love, how are we to reconcile our miseries with this feature of the Godhead?

We accordingly see the prophets turning around the problem of suffering; it is they who actually stated it; it is they who brought it before the Israelitic thought. Indeed the question of divine retribution assumes a paramount importance with the prophets. Instead of a national, collective, and unconditional election Amos lays down the thesis of a conditional election; the ethical values now come to the foreground in the divine calculations. The sufferings of the nation are the inevitable result of the reaction of the moral God against the unworthy behavior of his worshipers: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Amos 3:2). Only, although in the earlier prophets the calls are of an individual stamp, solidarism still has the upper hand in applying the theory of retribution. The retribution is a righteous punishment, but the righteous are included in it together with the unrighteous; all succumb in the great national retribution, as the destiny of each individual remains linked with that of his people. The individual, however

upright he may be, suffers for the crimes of the guilty nation. And let nobody object that the earlier prophets made use of the term "remnant"; they did not mean by using that word to satisfy the demands of the individual retribution and secure to the righteous the propitious career that they deserve. The doctrine of the remnant contains an especially strong menace; it is a figure of speech meant to bring home to the sinners' minds the extent of the divine punishment and national catastrophe.

This thesis of the just retribution of the nation's sins by a moral God, this essentially prophetic theory found its classical expression in the Deuteronomist's philosophy of history. I need take no other example than the deuteronomic frame of the Book of Judges and the preface which is at the same time the outline of the whole book (Judg. 2:6—3:6). The prophet's thesis is here most rigorously put into practice and uttered in an almost dogmatic tone. The nation's history is subject to a fatal rhythm: the Israelites having bowed down to foreign Gods, Jahweh punishes them in abandoning them to their enemies; they repent; a judge rises and delivers them; then, after an interval of quiet, idolatry starts anew, and that rhythm in four beats continues. Such is the doctrine which, widely spread, was meant to explain the numerous turns of fortune in the national history and, at the same time, the collective suffering. In this kind of deuteronomic philosophy, all evils come from Jahweh, an idea contrary to the old popular religion, in which other godheads acted toward the same end. This one fact should be duly noticed: those sufferings are due, according to the Deuteronomists, most of all to moral motives, but also to ritual motives: for instance, to sacrifices made in some other place than Jerusalem or to some mistake in the offering of a sacrifice. Later on, and especially in the legislation of the Priestly Code, punishment and sufferings are provoked mainly by ritual and not by moral faults.

A big step forward was soon to be made by Ezekiel. Indeed it was he who secured to the individual element its proper place in the problem of suffering (and in the problem of evil). Till then suffering had hardly been considered otherwise than under its collective aspect, a mode of thought which necessarily calls forth several new considerations: Is it worthy of the just God of the prophets to punish the righteous and make them suffer as well as the evildoers? This is nothing else than individualism asserting itself more and more, and consequently the doctrine of divine retribution is going to be interpreted in new ways. That difficulty seems to have been taken notice of even before Ezekiel, for there is in the Jahvist a passage of probably later inspiration in which the problem is already brought up: it is the account of Abraham's intercession for the righteous of Sodom (Gen. 18:17 ff.): "That be far from thee to do after this manner, to slay the righteous with the wicked, that so the righteous should be as the wicked; that be far from thee!" Abraham declares to God, and the solution given in this passage is that a sufficient minority of righteous can obtain the salvation of the wicked. But in Ezekiel the objection is even more clearly expressed and the difficulty is resolutely solved in a really original way,

under the pressure of the prevailing circumstances: the men of the exile were evidently astonished at God's treating the innocent in the same way as the guilty and inflicting on the children's generation sufferings that were actually deserved by the foregoing generation. Ezekiel was heir to his predecessor's efforts and pushed his logic even farther than they: God is just, therefore he treats the individuals—not only the community—according to the rules of strictest justice. Alluding to the proverb then current, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Ezek. 18:2)—a proverb which illustrates the idea that the children undergo the consequences of their fathers' sins—Ezekiel declares without the slightest circumlocution: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die" (Ezek., chap. 18; cf. 18:17–20). And he expounds with pitiless logic the theory of the specifically individual retribution: the son never suffers owing to his father's faults, nor the latter owing to his son's, but every man's suffering comes from his own individual sins. And in another place, in the fourteenth chapter, Ezekiel sets up against attempting any solution like that of Gen., chap. 18: three proverbially righteous men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, could not save a guilty people; they alone would be spared on account of their own righteousness. This solution pretends to justify the demands made by divine justice and divine love; for God takes no delight in the death of the wicked, but had "rather that he should return from his way, and live" (Ezek. 18:23). That theory of Ezekiel's reflects credit on his moral conviction if not on his clear insight. He must indeed have been a character of quite exceptional stamp who dared launch forth such an assertion into the world and give a solution both so simple and so clear to the problem of suffering. Suffering comes from sin, and strictly personal sin, as a just punishment. Such is the logical conclusion of the premises which were given by the first prophets when they became the heralds of divine justice and called every individual to a clearer consciousness of his worth as well as to more personal relations with the divinity Ezekiel's theory is a splendid challenge thrown to the old Jewish reasonableness, which perceived quite well that there are certain sufferings for which we can be only indirectly responsible, out of solidarity with the preceding generations and with our contemporary fellow-men; but this theory is also a vigorous effort to give its fullest force to the gravity of sin and to lift up the individual responsibility.

Strange to say, that explanation, however contrary to sound common sense and actual experience, had the greatest success, and the doctrine of strict individual retribution became the leading dogma of Judaism from the exile on. In what was henceforth formally established as Jewish orthodoxy, suffering came to be systematically connected with sin, individual and personal sin. That solution of Ezekiel was fitted to every case with automatic regularity and became the one and only way of accounting for all human suffering. That is the official and prevalent point of view adopted in almost all the post-exilic literature. It is clearly marked in a great many passages of the Book of Proverbs and in a great number of Psalms; it is explicitly stated by Job's

friends and is to be found everywhere in the Chronicles, though in the latter book with this additional shade that suffering is often caused by mere cultural mistakes.

In this respect it is most instructive to compare the Chronicles with the Book of Kings. So great is the prestige of the theory which connects suffering with sin that in order to justify the misfortune of a righteous man told of in the Book of Kings the Chronicler feels bound to recall some failure of this righteous man (II Chron. 25:14–24). In the Proverbs the author sometimes goes even so far as to say that there is an intimate relation between the nature of the punishment and the suffering on one hand, and the kind of sin indulged on the other: "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein; and he that rolleth a stone, it shall return upon him" (Prov. 24:27). Piety and prosperity go hand in hand, good and bad fortune depend directly on our own conduct. "Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished being innocent? Or where were the upright cut off? According as I have seen, they that plow iniquity and sow trouble, reap the same" (Job 4:7, 8). So deep-rooted was this doctrine that even in the time of the Gospels Jesus had to contradict those who declared that the victims of the tower of Siloam had brought on themselves such a terrible death by some exceptional crimes (Luke 13:2). Again, in the Fourth Gospel the disciples ask if the affliction of the man born blind is due to the sins of his parents or to his own failings (John 9:2).

In real life this explanation of suffering was obviously confronted by all sorts of impossibilities, for even the most superficial man cannot help noticing that many kinds of suffering do not come from our sins, and especially that many righteous men are unhappy and many wicked prosperous. Ezekiel's theory was thus to bring soon to the fore the problem of the suffering of the righteous. And the solutions given to that problem introduce a little variety into the almost uniform monotony of the dogma of retribution in the Jewish times. But this point should be insisted on: from Ezekiel on, the universally recognized and only orthodox doctrine is that all suffering is due to personal sins and that all sin unfailingly brings on suffering for the sinner. Such is the background against which, ever since the sixth century, a few more or less original and varied solutions stand out in strong relief.

Brought face to face with this novel aspect of the problem of suffering (i.e., the suffering of the righteous), many saw no other issue than blind faith in the orthodox dogmatics, and were then forced up against the desperate casuistry of all orthodoxy. The author of Ps. 37 is a typical representative of this category of people. He blocks up all paths of access to evidence and simply denies that the problem should exist at all: "For yet a little while, and the wicked shall not be: Yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and he shall not be. But the meek shall inherit the land, and shall delight themselves in the abundance of peace" (Ps. 37:10, 11). And farther down, calling back to mind his past experience, the Psalmist declares: "Yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging the bread" (Ps. 31:25). The sufferings of the righteous are but for a day, like thistledown before the wind, and as to the wicked who prosper,

their hour will soon come and their good fortune will disappear. In other words, we must know how to wait a little while and not judge from the passing appearance. Have patience and you shall see that life conforms sooner or later to the dogma.

The illusions of orthodoxy had so strongly settled in the minds of the people that they were mistaken for truth itself. This is what stands out too in the First Psalm, which is much like a preface to the whole collection and sings the blessedness of the righteous man, comparing him with a tree planted beside running waters, as against the misfortunes of the wicked man, who is like chaff that the wind driveth away. Suffice it to mention these few examples, for numbers of them are to be met in every page of the post-exilic literature. Let us remark, however, that certain minds came perforce to acknowledge the fact that the righteous do suffer (such was the case of the author of Ps. 57, for instance), but that they hurriedly postponed the practical solution of the distressing enigma of the sufferings of the righteous until the great eschatological crisis (notice, e.g., the burden of this psalm, vss. 6 and 12). The dogma of retribution was thus satisfied. As to the reason of those sufferings, it lay doubtless in their pedagogical value and in their importance as tests of man's faithfulness.

A few independent minds nevertheless did not fall into line with the official doctrine of Judaism as to the problem of suffering; they are few in number anyway. The spectacle of reality impressed them too deeply to allow them to be satisfied with the makeshifts of contemporary apologetics. Free of spirit and frank of conscience, they stir us with the earnestness of purpose which drove them to strike their own solitary paths and raise their voices against the universally accepted theology of the Jewish church.

It seems to me that the first anticipations of the breakdown of orthodoxy are to be found in the popular story of Job, i.e., the prose frame of the poem of Job (chaps. 1, 2, 42:7–17), which seems to be of an earlier date than the poem itself.[1] As a whole, this story follows the doctrine of retribution. Job, whose sufferings are but for a time, is duly repaid for his piety and owns at the end of his life "more blessings" than he ever had at the beginning of his career: 14,000 sheep, 6,000 camels, 1,000 pair of oxen, 1,000 she-asses, 7 sons, and 3 daughters; besides, he lived 140 years, lived among his own descendants until the fourth generation, and "died, being old and full of days." All that is orthodoxy itself and the exact application of the dogma of retribution. However, the cause itself of Job's sufferings is not at all orthodox in this popular account, for there is no sin. Job suffers because, on Satan's suggestion, God says that he shall prove to his court of divine beings, beyond the possibility of doubt, the disinterestedness and consequently the genuineness of his servant's piety.

We have here the implied acknowledgment that some sufferings are not due to sin; then an attempt is made at justifying God with the explanation just described. It seems to me that we find here the following idea: many happen-

[1] G. Duhm, *Commentar, ad loc.*

ings which seem mysterious to us would come out perfectly clear if we could see their working from a better vantage-ground. There may be in the celestial court, in the mind of such and such an angel or heavenly spirit, some doubts concerning the righteousness of one or another good man, and our sufferings are accordingly inflicted on us only to drive those misgivings away. This same conception of the trying of our piety by pain is also found in Ps. 66:9–12: "For thou, O God, hast proved us; thou hast tried us, as silver is tried. We went through fire and through water; but thou broughtest us out into a wealthy place." The only difference is that we have here no more, as in the popular story of Job, the obscure idea that all our troubles cannot be accounted for by purely human conceptions of human reason, and that the explanation is sometimes far beyond the world of human and earthly things.

There had already been before Ezekiel an echo of the anxiety caused by the problem of the righteous man's sufferings. Even before the future doctrine had been stated in all its precision and universality by Ezekiel, Jeremiah had already experienced in his own person the agonizing problem of the suffering of the innocent. In a passage of the most vivid and moving sincerity[1] Jeremiah gives free vent to his deep distress: "Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee; yet would I reason the cause with thee: wherefore does the way of the wicked prosper? Wherefore are they all at ease that deal very treacherously?" and after this complaint the prophet, in his martyrdom, cries out to the Heavens this bloodthirsty call: "Pull them out like sheep for the slaughter, and prepare them for the day of slaughter." Here is a piece of fanaticism which betrays all the sharpness of the problem; Jeremiah saw the only possible solution in a sudden and miraculous intervention of God, and his passionate prayer shows the depth of his moral anguish. This most instructive acknowledgment of the conflict between life-experience and theory is met again in that admirable psalm in which, notwithstanding the mystic fervor in which the Psalmist is lost while face to face with the All-presence and Omniscience, he cannot help crying out in fierce hatred against the wicked who are still alive in spite of their iniquity (Ps. 139:21–22).

But those utterances are hardly anything else than the evidence of negative resistance offered against the prevalent solution; more positive answers were not slow in coming to the light. The life of Jeremiah already contains an implicit one. Indeed, what is it that upholds him every time in his moments of discouragement? The certainty that he is innocent and is suffering because of his prophetic call and for his people. We find here in germ the idea of a suffering which is not the punishment of sin, but which one takes upon one's self for others' sake.

But the hymns of Jahweh's servant, which are found in Deutero-Isaiah, give us the classical expression of this solution. Jahweh's servant, the Ebed-Jahweh, is the everlasting type of the suffering righteous. Whether he is an individual or the personification of Israel as a people, that makes no difference

[1] Jer. 12:1–6.

here; his suffering is none the less a substitutive suffering, a sacrifice, in the deepest meaning of this word, the death of an innocent instead of the guilty and for the guilty. The sufferings of the servant of Jahweh have the redemption of the world for their *raison d'être* (the redemption of the Jewish or the gentile world); his sufferings belong to his divine mission. He himself, the truly righteous and innocent, willingly accepts the sufferings which the wicked deserved to endure because of their sins; he takes on himself the sins of others; he becomes of his own accord answerable together with them and assumes the punishment which should have visited them:

> Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed. . . . . the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. . . . . He poured out his soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.[1]

So here the suffering of the righteous has the true character of an atonement. The moral relation between the suffering of the righteous and the sins of the guilty is quite an original and a fruitful element; never perhaps did the Jewish thought more accurately fathom the mysteries of the sacrifice which the apostle Paul, with his usual vehemence and at the same time the greatest depth of thought, bluntly calls "folly." Here suffering and death are no more a hopeless puzzle or the mere matter to a syllogism both narrow and strict; they are on the contrary the highest and grandest reality of human life, the spontaneous, voluntary, and fruitful sacrifice, the religious act *par excellence*, viz., the divine becoming human.

It has been said, we think rightly, that the author of the hymns of Jahweh's servant was not only influenced by the writings of Jeremiah, but that the life of the great prophet also impressed him deeply, the life of that righteous man who loved his people with the utmost unselfishness and actually gave his sufferings and his life for the salvation of the guilty.[2]

However this may be, this particular problem of the righteous man's suffering receives in those hymns a solution as deep as it is original. On the other hand, the general question of suffering is left untouched, doubtless because it was too theoretic, too philosophical, for the time; only later will the Jewish thought dare to tackle it.

Indeed, the first to consider the problem of suffering from a universal as well as from an individual point of view was the wonderful author of the poem of Job, who probably lived after the exile. It may well be said that the whole poem revolves around this torturing question: Why does the righteous man suffer, and why does suffering in general exist at all? Considering the size and the importance of this book, it seems worth while to examine it with the closest attention. In fact, in all the Jewish literature it is the only work in which the problem in hand is considered in its fullest meaning.

[1] J. P. Peters, *The Religion of the Hebrews* (1914), p. 323.

[2] Isa., chap. 53, *passim*.

The hero, who largely voices the poet's own ideas, is Job, a choice soul among the choicest, a profoundly religious heart, a sincere conscience; in short, a righteous man. Now it happens that this man is stricken with a most filthy disease, leprosy. What a tragic contrast between his easy life and his unhappy condition! The hero cannot restrain his distress, and in a torrent of bitter clamors he expresses this one and only idea: Would that I were dead! A terrible "why?" sounds through the whole poem. Job stands here face to face with the very problem of suffering and of theodicy: Why do I, who am righteous, receive nothing but grief and pain at the hands of God? And, in a more general way, why do the wicked so often have a blissful life, while the righteous are doomed to the worst misfortune? Job protests with all his energy and his most cutting irony against the orthodox dogma of retribution impersonated by his three friends. It is with admirable art that the poet has known how to contrast those two attitudes: on one hand the admonitions of dogma, on the other the man who lives and suffers and whose thought wholly proceeds from real life. Job has nothing but sarcasm for the doctrine of retribution, which ignores life. In answering the apologists' empty phrases and foolish theories, Job simply produces as a set-off bare reality painted in the harshest colors:

> For ye say, where is the house of the prince? And where is the tent wherein the wicked dwelt? And where is the way? Have ye not asked them that go by the way? And do ye not know their tokens? That the evil man is reserved to the day of calamity? That they are led forth to the day of wrath? Who shall declare his way to his face? And who shall repay him what he hath done? Yet shall he be borne to the grave, and shall keep watch over the tomb. The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him.[1]

When Job, turning his eyes away from human beings, goes down to the depths of his inner soul, what fiery professions of innocence surge up to his lips! He will not be made amenable to the orthodox syllogism, "If man is righteous, he is happy; therefore if man is not happy, he must inevitably be unrighteous." He upholds the rights of his conscience with genuine passion and proclaims with resolute assurance the supremacy of conscience over dogma. Job is no doubt aware that, like all men, he is a sinner in a general way, but he denies the fact that sin is a sufficient reason for all his evils; he sees no proportion whatever between his present misery and his past conduct: "If I have sinned, what do I unto thee, O thou watcher of men? Why dost thou not pardon my transgression and take away my iniquity?" (Job 7:20 21.) And here is one out of a hundred other manly cries of that manly heart: "Till I die, I will not put away mine integrity from me. My righteousness I hold fast, and will not let it go: my heart shall not reproach me so long as I live" (27:5, 6).

As a contrast with the calmness of the three friends and their simple-minded apologetics, the poet shows us in Job the real man, alive and suffering, who searches in great distress for an answer to the puzzle of suffering, allows himself to be deceived by no theory, and dares to

[1] Job 21 28 ff.

open his eyes on the unveiled reality. The others, his friends, are the theologians, the easy-going, weak apologists of divine justice; but he, Job, in spite of his doubts and blasphemies, believes in God with far stronger faith and defends him in a way far worthier of his majesty. He openly charges God with injustice, but in so doing he gets a far more vivid experience of the divine world than his gainsayers. With him we have the end of a dead orthodoxy and the birth of a new theology. While the author of Ps. 139 makes us almost dizzy with his enthusiastic description of the holy Omnipresence, Job sighs for God without finding him: "Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him" (23:8). Indeed, how could Job forbear to charge God with injustice since for him the solution of the problem of the righteous in distress could not be postponed till the Great Beyond? For after death there is Sheol: "Before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and of the shadow of death; a land of thick darkness, as darkness itself; a land of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is darkness" (10:21, 22).

On one side are the theologians, who have found God but have in reality lost him again, and on the other stands Job, who has lost his God but who seeks him unceasingly and does possess him just because of his indefatigable searching. Over and beyond all his hardships he strives toward God; his friends of course see the reason of his suffering in man, and he sees it in God. And his God is not the God of strict justice, but he does what Mohammed many centuries later will advise the believers to do: he tries to find in God a refuge against God himself (Sur. 9:119).

And little by little a change comes stealing over Job's soul; he slowly turns toward God, toward a God who might be standing by his side, even though he did not always understand him. He does not turn to God so much to implore help as to come to his rights near him. He has at first a few short outcries of hope. Such are the deeply pathetic lines in which Job tells God that he will be some day sorry for his cruel silence, but that it will be too late then, for Job will already have broken down (7:8; cf. 9:35). When God does not even grant him time to swallow, he prays: "Only do not two things unto me, then will I not hide myself from thy face: withdraw thine hand far from me, and let not thy terror make me afraid; then call thou and I will answer; or let me speak, and answer thou to me" (13:20–22).

In another place Job asks God to allow him, after his death at least, an hour's interview in which he may prove his righteousness, and God acknowledges his servant's rights (14:13 ff.). He feels, in spite of all, that God is the supreme warranter of his rights (16:18–21). And finally, in the obscure passage of chapter 19, with a splendid beat of the wing, Job rises up to the idea of a life after death, temporary though it be. In that well-known passage Job mentions neither resurrection nor eternal life; but he is so sure that his conscience is in the right that he rises to the pitch of hoping for a divine testimony of his righteousness, even after death. Duhm has put it with unusual depth: "The two factors working here were on one hand the need of the moral personality to uphold its own

rights against the oppression of an unfair fatality, and on the other the need of the religious personality to see God and enjoy His love."[1]

Job had come to doubt the love, the wisdom, and the justice of God; the whole world seemed to him a world of disorder, of injustice, of moral chaos. As a matter of fact, the poet offers us no satisfactory answer to the "why?" of the righteous man's suffering; he succeeds neither in explaining nor in understanding the wherefore of his evils; he is only able to cling to God through thick and thin. Strengthened by his good conscience, he unflinchingly shouts out his innocence and fights himself through to the hope (at least the temporary hope) that God is, in spite of contrary appearances, the ally of that good conscience and the vindicator of its innocence. The dreadful puzzle is not solved; it is even more embarrassing than ever before, since, although God is standing by the suffering man's side, his condition is none the less unfortunate. This same God who destroys his bodily being will be the staunch abetter of his moral personality. Such an attitude at once calls to mind those few lines in Flaubert's *Letters* (I, 196): "Happiness is a lie, the searching for which causes all the calamities of life. But there are moments of serene peace which look very much like happiness, and are perhaps better."

Thus the poet does not set one theory against another; *theoretically* he gives up solving the tragical enigma, but *practically* he has found an issue: he believes with all the faith and strength of his moral self that God, over and above all appearances, is the defender of his righteousness. God's divine attributes are safe, but suffering remains unaccounted for. Nowhere else in the Old Testament do we find a soul more painfully writhing in its dire struggle against the problems of life; we have here nothing of a cool-headed and systematic study on the problem of suffering; we are watching the human soul itself as it is looking for God.

However, suffering remains unexplained; the poet even goes one step farther and says that it cannot be explained. The problem which is here assuming its general character seems so strewn with difficulties to the old thinker that he brings in God himself to help those that seek (chaps. 38–41). This God whom Job is sighing for, this God whom he longs to see in order that they may converse, as it were, man to man, this God suddenly appears to Job; but instead of coming for a quiet interview, as Job dreamed it, God manifests his presence in a storm. That alone is already meant to show men how far God is above us and how miserably small we are when it comes to a discussion with him.

It can be said that Jahweh well-nigh crushes Job under the multitude of questions he asks him point-blank: "Gird up now thy loins like a man, for I will demand of thee, and declare thou unto me" (Job 38:3). God carries Job from one end of the world to the other, he unrolls before his eyes the whole of nature, he overwhelms him with the unfathomable mysteries (unfathomable to the man of those times) that break out on all sides in the universe of God's

[1] Duhm, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

creation—a feverish headlong flight through and around the limitless expanse of the heavens and the earth! Can Job understand and explain the wonders of the universe? Can he give an account of the laws that rule the lives of living creatures? Can he grasp as much as one particle of the order of the cosmos?

When at last Job is as good as stunned by the complexity of all those things, and fairly breaks down under the weight of the unutterable mystery which encompasses the universe, God hurls forth at his face that supreme piece of irony: "Shall he that cavilleth contend with the Almighty? He that argues with God, let him answer it." Then Job answered the Lord and said: "Behold, I am of small account; what shall I answer thee? I lay mine hand upon my mouth. Once have I spoken and I will not answer; yea, twice, but I will proceed no further" (40:2–6). And after a second long rebuke of God, Job bows down again; the terrible divine apostrophe has shattered to bits whatever continuous line of thought he may have had before: "I know that thou canst do all things, and that no purpose of thine can be restrained. Who is this that hideth counsel without knowledge? Therefore have I uttered that which I understood not, things too wonderful for me, which I knew not. Wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes" (42:2–6).

The concluding addresses of Jahweh are meant to make Job understand that man is by no means the center of the world which overlaps him on all sides. The world is greater than man, and the latter is neither the measure of all things nor the sole object of divine Providence. The unfathomable harmony of the universe carries the poet far beyond the human microcosm. What proportion can there be between man and the universe? What a fool man makes of himself by daring to pass judgment on the Master of this inscrutable universe! God does not act after the way of our minds. He acts according to his boundless might, and his actions consequently assume the same baffling character. God is above our puny criticism, above all our theodicies.[1] The bodily happiness of man is not an aim in itself for the Creator, and the plans of divine Justice are far above our yearnings for material well-being. Let then man have full trust in this just God who is the surest warranter of man's most invaluable possession—his conscience. Besides, let man submissively accept to be nothing but a mere atom in the ever-moving stream of cosmical life. At the end the poet comes to deny implicitly all sort of relation between our bodily fate and our moral behavior. But here is something more: if one reads between the lines one feels that God is actively at work in the universe. His breath enlivens and permeates it, his intelligence, his will, his might, rule its destinies. He is a God of life and a mighty God. Is it doing violence to the poet's idea to admit that according to his thought this life-giving breath must warm up poor and pitiful mankind?

Lastly, this God's wisdom is so far above our intelligence that man ought never to question his actions. It is a mysterious and troubling wisdom, an unlimited strength; let man then bow down. As Hamlet says,

[1] Köberle, *Sünde und Gnade im religiören Leben des Volkes Israël* (1905), p. 384.

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

Is that a really satisfactory theoretical solution? No, for in truth it is nothing but an acknowledgment of powerlessness and a more sentimental than rational one at that. But practically the poet has found an issue: man, were he even of a Titan brood, like Job, must bow down and hush before the incomprehensible God whose true essence by far surpasses our human formulas; he must deliver himself entirely into the hands of this living and dreadful God. In contemplating nature man enters into a state of deep humility and becomes aware of his altogether relative importance. The conclusion to be drawn from all that is submissiveness as far as our bodily happiness is concerned; this resignation of self is, however, tempered by a slight breath of hope: though the world be greater than man, it is still God's world.

To sum up, here is what seems to have been the aim pursued by the author of the book of Job—an aim kept in view through many a side turn and stated with more lyric than discursive means. He first showed, in a pitiless analysis of reality, the utter failure of the dogma, formerly established by Ezekiel, of the exact retribution of good and bad, in doing which he showed himself a realist of prime force. He set opposite a more or less scholastic theology, life, life with all its contradictions, life that baffles all dogmatic reasoning. Then, with a most impressive moral depth, he laid stress on the self-sufficiency and authority of moral conscience (the name of the thing may not be there, but the thing *is*). He described, with admirable sincerity and in all its nakedness, the agony of a soul which truly searches for its God. Against a cold and authoritative proposition he refused to set up another thesis; all he opposed it with is just man's soul, wavering and changing, hoping and again losing all hope, cursing, rebelling, but rising in spite of all nearer to God. Both rebellious and submissive, despairing and confident, such is man. And his conscience is there too, on which he can and must entirely rely until his last day. Strengthened by the testimony of his conscience Job feels ready to stand the awe-inspiring sight of his Creator and magnificently proclaims his immovable assurance. He feels ready to undersign all the declarations of innocence he has made up to now: "Oh, that I had one to hear me! Lo, here is my signature, let the Almighty answer me: and that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written! Surely I would carry it upon my shoulder; I would bind it unto me as a crown. I would declare unto him the number of my steps; as a prince would I go near unto him" (31: 35–37).

As we have seen, the poet considers the problem of suffering not only in an individual but also in a general way. He rises on one hand to the hope that at least in his personal case God will grant him—the suffering, righteous man—a last supreme voucher of divine justice, were it even on the edge of his tomb. On the other hand, he proclaims that suffering in general is beyond man's explaining, because God surpasses us too much in might and wisdom for us, poor mortals, to judge him according to our human measurement. So man—every man—

must just keep silent. The tragedy of things stays on, but the soul has risen above all passion; it is now set up on conscience as firmly as on a rock and commits itself to the hands of the almighty and immeasurably wise God, of the living and mysterious God.

In reading this poet one certainly rises above the ordinary level of Hebrew thought; a soul of towering genius is there revealed to us, a soul as little Jewish as can be. Its dramatic utterances are one long, mighty effort made to break with the traditional solutions of the problem of suffering and to clear a personal line of thought. Only the conception of the hymns of the Ebed-Jahweh can compete with the poem of Job in originality and depth, in religious and moral pith. But with Job the thought is more philosophical, the solution less individual and more systematic. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is the problem of suffering and of the divine ruling of the world tackled in such a universal way; and yet this masterly attempt got no farther than a few negative results; the cause of suffering has not been traced in that book. In this respect other conceptions, those of the hymns of the Ebed-Jahweh, for instance, and even such as did insist in olden times on the solidarity of successive generations, contain the elements of more positive truth. Yet the poem of Job will last for all time. As Renan beautifully said: "The blasphemy in it is little short of a hymn, or rather is in itself a hymn, for it is nothing but a cry to God against the failings that conscience finds in the work of God."[1]

[1] Renan, *Job*, p. lxii.

The voice of the great tragic bard raised no echo in Israel; the official theology offered a much easier way of turning the difficulty: you just have to throw everything back on sin, and when you speak about sin the least scrupulous often are the quickest in acknowledging it and talking of its sad reality. Only a few choice souls could free themselves of the tutorship of a solution which is as superficial as it is easy. Perhaps we must count among those the author of Ps. 88. This psalm is nothing else at bottom than a long cry of dark despair. A man tortured by sickness is struggling with death and throws up to God his dismal "why?" This psalmist, it is true, never recalls his sins and never chooses to see in them the wherefore of his torments. Nevertheless the author is so far from any solution that his prayer ends without one word of hope; neither the cause nor the aim of his evils is lit up by the faintest ray; it is just a mournful complaint interspersed with sobs.

But what best proves how unpopular the leading thought of the poem of Job was is the adding of the talks of Elihu to this poem. With those chapters (32–37) —in my opinion undeniably spurious— we again fall back to the level of more or less traditional ideas. The addresses of Elihu are an attempt to bring into the Book of Job a new thought—an interesting one, indeed, but one which stands in no relation whatever to the way in which the problem of suffering is understood in the rest of the book. The Book of Job only seeks for the wherefore, the efficient cause of suffering. The talks of Elihu also try to trace its aim and finality; suffering is the best way of schooling man; it

is the means that God uses to purify and sanctify us. "God," Elihu declares, "delivereth the afflicted by his affliction and openeth his ear in oppression" (36: 15). Suffering breaks up our pride, compels us to look into ourselves, and awakens us to salvation. This same idea is met with in other passages too; for instance; in Prov. 3:12, where the wise man declares that "whom the Lord loveth he reproveth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth." In a very suggestive disquisition Elihu declares to Job that God has at his disposal two different ways of warning men: dreams first, then pain (Job 33:14 ff.):

> He is chastened with pain upon his bed, and with continual strife in his bones: so that his life abhorreth bread and his soul dainty meat. His flesh is consumed away, that it cannot be seen, and his bones that were not seen stick out. Yea, his soul draweth near unto the pit and his life to the destroyers [33:19-23].
>
> Lo, all these things doth God work, twice, yea thrice, with a man, to bring back his soul from the pit [33:29].
>
> For the work of a man shall he render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways [34:11].

And somewhere else:

> He preserveth not the life of the wicked; he giveth to the afflicted their right. He withdraweth not his eyes from the righteous; and if they be bound in fetters, and be taken in cords of affliction, then he sheweth them their work, and their transgressions, that they have behaved themselves proudly. He openeth their ear to instruction, and commandeth that they return from iniquity. If they hearken and serve him, they shall spend their days in prosperity [36:5 ff.].

The idea of suffering as a means of schooling man was of course likely to reassure many hearts and spur them on to faithfulness.

However, as time went on, Palestine came more and more into contact with the neighboring countries and foreign civilizations. New seeds were thus sown on Palestinian soil and new paths were opened for Hebrew thought. And it is no doubt after having tasted at these new springs that one particular Jew, at a rather late period, dared to break off definitely with the traditional theology of his time. I mean that strange Qoheleth, the author of Ecclesiastes. What is peculiarly disconcerting among his many bold views is his absolute denial of all divine retribution. Qoheleth throws fearlessly and cold-bloodedly overboard that dogma of the Fathers: "There is a vanity which is done upon the earth, that there be righteous men, unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked; again, there be wicked men to whom it happeneth according to the work of the righteous" (Eccles. 8:14). And again: "All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the clean and to the unclean, to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not" (9:2 ff.).

So Qoheleth sees the gaping abyss between theory and reality, but, while Job feels its existence in a deep, tragic mood, Qoheleth just records the thing in a cold, matter-of-fact way. He perceives no sanction; everything seems to him to go the wrong way, and suffering itself has no moral cause and cannot be rationally explained. But on the other hand Qoheleth believes in God. Renan expressed it pointedly: "You may find him a sceptic, a materialist, a fatalist,

and before all a pessimist, but one thing he most decidedly is *not*, and that is an atheist."[1] He believes that God is the sovereign ruler of the world; God gives us life, sets us our task here below, assigns to us wealth, good, and evil (7:14). And yet, as we have just seen, Qoheleth gives clearly to understand that no particular sanction distinguishes the good from the wicked (9:2 ff.). So we have the feeling that Qoheleth strikes against the conflict between faith and real life. The only way out that he finds is to proclaim that God's action and way of ruling the universe are beyond our understanding: "I beheld all the work of God, that man cannot find out the work that is done under the sun: because however much a man labour to seek it out, yet he shall not find it; yea, moreover, though a wise man think to know it, yet shall he not be able to find it" (8:17).

Thus we see that like Job he turns the difficulty by passing on human reason a sentence of powerlessness. Like all the other problems of life, the problem of suffering accordingly remains in his eyes an insoluble puzzle. But, contrary to the great lyrist Job, he does not allow his lips to shape as much as one word of downright blame to God. It must also be said that the God whose existence he continues to assert looks uncannily like the antique Fatum. Face to face with the Godhead, man has so well realized his humble condition that there is left in him neither distress nor rebellion. The problems of suffering and theodicy are no longer torturing him; a fair share of the philosophical mind enables him to become reconciled with the imperfection of all things. In so far he is more of a Greek than a Jew, and so much impassiveness already points to a period of religious decline. What is to be done in this world of incoherence and misery? Let us gather the joys that pass within reach of our hands; let us enjoy, while there is still time, those short moments of pleasure, which are also perishable and delusive. When all is joy around us, we must give ourselves over to joy, but in thinking ahead of the evil days to come, "go thy way, eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a merry heart, for God hath already accepted thy works; let thy garments be always white, and let not thy head lack ointment. Live joyfully with the wife whom thou lovest all the days of the life of thy vanity" (9:7–9).

"Carpe diem," that is what seems to be the only practical solution of the problem of our life of suffering. Old age will soon come. Then, as our life-organs are wearing out with the passing years, our ability to enjoy gradually shrinks, then altogether disappears, and, according to the doleful description of Qoheleth, "thou shalt say: I don't take any pleasure." It is the time "when the almond trees blossom, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and the caperberry shall fail: because man goeth to his long home, and the mourners go about the streets" (chap. 9, *passim*). On the whole, the horizon of the author remains limited by the old Israelitic belief that all is over with death, "and the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit return to God who made it" (12:7).

As was to be expected, the ideas of Qoheleth shocked his contemporaries;

[1] Renan, *L'Ecclésiaste*, p. 20.

and that is why they inserted into his book glosses which are meant to tone down to a certain extent his revolutionary thought, while supporting among other things the time-honored doctrine of retribution. "Fear God, and keep his commandments," the glosser says, "for this is the whole duty of man; for God shall bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil" (12:13–14); and somewhere else: "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment" (11:9). This is proof enough of the grasp that the dogma once established by Ezekiel still had on the minds of a large majority.

I mentioned before a few foreign influences which worked more or less directly on Qoheleth; they appear even elsewhere. So it is that Israel got from the Iran, after the exile, the belief in resurrection, which, spreading in wide, popular circles, gradually took the place, though rather late, of the ancient belief in the shadows of Sheol. The belief in a life after death cannot of course have failed to further in many ways the solution of the problem we are studying; that is what we notice in the Book of Daniel, i.e., in the time of the Maccabees (165–164 B.C.). Why does suffering exist? In order, Daniel answers, to try the faith and virtue of the true worshipers of Jahweh. Suffering staunchly borne, were it even to the degree of martyrdom, is a homage paid to God; the three young Jews in the furnace continue faithful to their religion and are thus instrumental in making the might and glory of their God shine resplendently before the eyes of the Gentiles. Daniel himself is thrown into the lion's den, but God's majesty is made manifest by his deliverance, and the king is obliged to acknowledge the God of the Hebrews as the only living God. On the whole, for the author of Daniel, the problem of suffering can be summed up in these words of the Revelation: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life" (Rev. 2:10). And indeed for him the horizon of man is not that of this earth and of this life, for there is resurrection and life hereafter, in which all the problems left unanswered in this world receive a complete solution: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. 12:2, 3). Thus brought into relation to the Great Beyond, the problem of the suffering righteous lost some of its tragic sharpness, since whatever sanctions are not of this world come from the world beyond. The claims of theodicy were thus more or less fulfilled.

Among the many attitudes taken in the Old Testament with regard to the problem of suffering there is one which we must mention in concluding; though of a more practical than theoretical nature, it is nevertheless very deeply thought out, and perhaps it is here that the Old Testament reaches the high-water mark of lofty thinking and poetic perfection. I mean Ps. 73, that finely wrought jewel. Here also the question of theodicy is under discussion, that problem which comes up with the suffering

of the righteous and is often raised by the happiness of the wicked. It is the admirable confession of a soul which lays itself bare without hesitation, with all its distress and all its heart-rendings. The Psalmist scans the difficulty with perfect clearness; he shows it with complete frankness; nor does he forget the trouble this intricate problem has cost him: "And so I thought how I might know this, a trouble was it in mine eyes" (Ps. 73:16). But a moving transport of faith enables him to get over the formidable problem; he simply throws himself into the arms of God! He communes with his God in a flash of admirable and fervent mysticism. What is the earthly happiness of the wicked, what is the suffering of the righteous compared with the intimate communion of a soul with its God? *That* is real happiness, the only one that cannot be lost. To feel in one's self the presence of God, that is the greatest treasure of the righteous, a treasure that the wicked will never possess, a treasure of which the unrighteous will forever be deprived. This is the real punishment of the unrighteous; never will they taste of the ineffable sweetness of God's presence. That is, on the other hand, the real reward of the faithful: they always remain in the bosom of God. From this point of view all apparent injustice disappears; viewed from those towering heights of pure faith the sufferings of the righteous are but accidental, the happiness of the wicked is merely accessory, and this is the only supreme reality that stays: the mystic communion with God! And the righteous alone can enjoy this ineffable mystery. Neither suffering, nor death, nor all the miseries of life can divert a faithful soul from its communion with God: "Nevertheless I am continually with thee: thou hast holden up my right hand, thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: but God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever" (Ps. 73:23 ff.). What else does this mean but that there is nothing more precious than to feel one's self quite near to God? And then, after the dark passage, will be the "glory," i.e., the life of the soul near God in that heaven where God will take up the faithful as he took up in olden times Enoch and Elijah. In other words, it is the glorious thought of immortality that inspires the Psalmist; there he will have his share of the ineffable raptures of those who are forever in the immediate presence of God; in him the ancient covenant proclaims like the new that whatever be the sufferings that fall to our lot, deserved or seemingly undeserved, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God" (Rom. 8:38–39). This is in our opinion the highest pitch that a victim to suffering has ever risen to in Israel. It is no more, as in Job, the awful struggle of one fighting to prove his righteousness and find out the meaning of his evils; this idea does exist in Ps. 73, but the author goes even farther; the soul partakes of the divine mysteries of a mystic communion and rises to an immovable assurance of the faith that lifts up

mountains, even the mountains of pain. It is no more, as in Job, the struggle to grasp God; it is the full possession of God and supreme peace in this possession.

Israel has shown no metaphysical genius. Israel remained alien to philosophical thought. But what it does show us is how the men of the Old Testament were also tormented by the problem of suffering. Little by little, slowly but unswervingly, Israel became aware of the many aspects of the problem. Every one of the solutions contains a few seeds of truth, and step by step all those attempts culminate in a more and more original, more and more personal attitude. None of those thinkers riddled the puzzle, Job being the only one who spanned it in its whole breadth. They were as a rule only stopped by the elemental obstacle of the righteous man's suffering. Though the Hebrew thought as such eventually had to recognize that it stood completely powerless before the tragic problem of suffering, yet Israel's faith did triumph over it by means more than once inconclusive (especially those of orthodoxy), but often also by bold intuitive flashes like those found in Isa., chap. 53, or in Ps. 73. These supplement each other just because they are contraries: sovereign efficiency of suffering when it is the self-willed sacrifice of the innocent for the guilty; nothingness of suffering compared with the blissful communion of a soul with the God it loves and of whom it is loved.

THE CHRISTIAN WORLD-ATMOSPHERE

A SERMON

W. H. WOOD, PH.D.
Professor of Biblical Literature in Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

I John 5:19: The whole world lieth in the evil one.

Acts 17:28: In Him we live and move and have our being.

One of the modern principles largely used in scientific study is phrased: Geography makes history. This principle is an attempt to state the truth that geographical location and climate have an important influence in determining human occupations, character, social and political ideals, and even moral and religious outlook and character.

Excessive heat enervates and tends to produce irritability of temper and quickness of passion. Excessive cold produces inwardness of life, lack of sustained energy, lack of change, and little progress. Island isolation tends to develop narrowness of outlook, contracted sympathy, local feeling,

and traditionalism; while life in contact with other peoples and other types of civilization tends to broad-mindedness and universalism in thinking. Our long-continued isolation and hundred years of peace with our nearest neighbor may help explain the strength of enervating pacifism which came to expression at the outbreak of the present struggle. In general it is true that civilization follows the boundaries of the temperate zone. Absence of extremes, variety, change, the push of physical necessity without the enervation of the extremes, make this the reality. No great poets, thinkers, reformers, moral or religious leaders, have arisen outside these boundaries.

This principle, if not pushed too far, is seen at once to be a very valuable one. It is suggestive, however, of another line of thought. Is there a specific soul atmosphere, a climate while not absolutely independent of the physical one yet distinctive enough to be discovered? Is there a soul climate specifically operative upon the inner self just as there is a physical climate specifically operative upon the physical body? In the language of geography, is there a temperate zone of the inner self?

If we take this question with us as we mingle with our fellow-men an answer in the affirmative is soon reached. Some people chill us as though a breath from the North Pole had swept down upon us. Some warm us as though we had suddenly encountered a breath of summer in midwinter. Some are like a garden in which blooms the perpetual rose, while others are a barren desert. Some men repel, others inspire. No man ever visited Napoleon who did not leave his presence a changed man. There does seem to be an independent qualitative soul atmosphere which not only determines the quality of the self but extends its contagiousness to others.

A comparison of the two statements chosen as the background of this study offers further confirmation. To a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Palestine in the times of Jesus the belief was firmly fixed that this world belonged to the evil one. The whole world lay in the evil one in an altogether too literal sense. An evil spirit caused pain and disease. Another seized the Roman emperor and he taxed and persecuted his subjects. Another seized the taxgatherer and he increased the taxes. A legion entered into another and he went out and lived among the tombs. Demoniacal possession was the glaring example of this world-domination by the evil one. A distinct soul atmosphere was thus operative in which sanity was well-nigh impossible but in which pessimism and body-cutting were perfectly natural. No man can believe that this or any age is an evil one or that the forces of evil have the upper hand and retain any moral or religious sanity of mind.

In contrast to this inner world stands the one revealed in the words: "In Him we live and move and have our being." What a different atmosphere! Despite all the negations of our highest hopes and ideals, in the very face of pain, ugly expressions of evil powers and despondency, one can still say this world is God's world.

The belief that wrong will be worsted and right will finally triumph created an inner climate in which sanity of mind increased, energy of activity grew stronger and stronger, and optimism suffused the whole inner self. From this hidden source God's colaborers and martyrs drew their inspiration and in a deeper sense grew a soul. Christianity surely accomplished a great thing when it could change for men this depressing and soul-destroying atmosphere for one which developed and sustained courage, optimism, dare, faith, and the true life.

The claim that Jesus changed the whole religious climate of the world seems thus to rest upon good grounds. He was essentially a teacher, but this must be interpreted in the full sense of creative efficiency. His knowledge of God and of the true life illustrated and vitalized in his personality created this new world. His knowledge and experience of the eternal realities reveal an inner world of unique religious character, and his aim seems to have been to make this the universal world atmosphere. That Paul so understood him is evident from the words quoted above from his thinking.

Jesus cast out devils. Exorcism was prevalent, but he does not seem to have practiced it because he did positive soul-building as well as house-cleaning. He did not cast these out by an authoritative word nor by any magic power, if due consideration be given to this constructive side of the process. He did it by illustrating the principle of overcoming evil with good. He stood before the man under this evil influence and declared to him that this is God's world and not the devil's. He asked him to consider that so intimate was the Father's interest in and knowledge of men that even the very hairs of the head were all numbered in his sight. God's hand in the universe was also so strong and eternally active that not a sparrow ever fell to the ground without his notice. Evil might seem to dominate, but never for one moment did it have the upper hand. By this method Jesus transported the poor unfortunates from the frigid zone into the temperate, and thus set them into the soul atmosphere which changed the whole life. May this insight not explain why Jesus had such success with unlettered disciples? Being free from the hardening influence of traditionalism and the freezing force of clericalism these men were good material round about which Jesus could throw his new creative religious and moral influences.

Jesus' teaching and experience of God, the Father, made belief in the eternal realities a soul-growing climate. Jesus' relation to, and teaching concerning, the Father is religious rather than philosophic. He taught little about God, but he did teach God. He lived in this world, found a life worth while, moved himself with inner-soul freedom, and in the eternal sense had his being. He found this world a good place for a good man and would not that any should miss all the good by being transported bodily out of it. He thus gave force and atmosphere to the religious knowledge of God, life, and the world. It is philosophy or doctrine reghant in personality which creates soul quality. Real revelation comes primarily through personality. Discussions about the primary

reality, whether it be substance, or God, or God-substance, are necessary to arrive at truth; but when one says I and the Father are one, and men reply that in seeing and knowing Jesus of Nazareth there is nothing left to be known concerning God there is present soul-growing atmosphere. Jesus' experience which he calls God is the supreme soul atmosphere.

The presence of this new creative inner world may be discovered again in Jesus' interpretation of the universe in terms of human beings. We use the expression "interpretation," but it is the practical rather than any merely theoretical meaning which is stressed. The latter follows from the former. Jesus lived and worked as though this universe existed solely for the growing of great souls.

Today this view is in disrepute because it is argued that the contracted view of the universe dominant in early times is responsible for this contracted outlook. When one takes the larger view, sees this earth of ours as small as it really is, and then sees the history of the evolution of the worlds and of man, he cannot but see that man hardly deserves this place of supreme importance. Modern science has saved the present generation from such narrow theology.

There is, however, one very important fact bearing on this line of thinking which cannot be overlooked. We know the force of the principle that geography makes history, and we are all evolutionists. There should be no disposition ever to turn a deaf ear to our brilliant leaders in science. We are relegating to the past many of our traditional beliefs, such as that the world was created by fiat out of nothing, or that God is an absolute *ab extra* wholly supernatural Deity. But when we would place evaluation upon man and this material universe there should be no question as to where the higher value is to be placed. The reasons for this are primarily practical ones. Any theory or teaching which depreciates the eternal value of every individual human being and which loosens for one moment the grip upon the eternal values stands immediately self-condemned. Men become men through faith in the certainty that each is a potential son of God. Call a man a lump of clay or a beast and he will deteriorate. Make his deities sacred animals and his life will be bestial. Talk up his material side and the civilization will take a sad turn in this direction. Believe that man is absolutely caught in a web of organic development and that the fittest by strength to survive will survive and you can become an uncivilized barbarian, as the world-enemies in Germany have become.

The one outstanding reason for the increasingly strong hold the Bible and the teachings of Jesus have upon men is that on every page glows this absolute certainty that men are made in the image of God, that men who strive are always triumphant, that God cares in an eternal sense for every human individual, and that life finds its true meaning only when men exercise themselves unto godliness. There is more than passing significance in the fact that Jesus lived and died for mankind and for individual men and women. It was this undoubted character of his inner self which added to the strength of the

new Christian atmosphere of the world which he created.

If there be then this world within the world we have both an explanation why the pain and growing sorrow of our time is being borne so cheerfully and, further, we have a gospel to preach which can carry us triumphantly through our trying times. Pain in the physical body is nature's signal of danger. It reveals disorder and diseased conditions. Is this not what it is in a spiritual sense? The parallel cannot be applied on all fours since there is the natural pain which follows the loss of our friends. But there may be an acuteness which indicates that we have loved our material things more than we thought. The pain may uncover a selfishness deeper than we knew. It may reveal that we have been living in the atmosphere of selfish gain and enjoyment and have neglected to feed the soul. There is a vital difference between mere sorrow and pain and *Christian* suffering. It is the difference between an inner self developed in the atmosphere of selfish pleasure, self-indulgence, self-gain, and self-idealism and the self grown into the likeness of God environed by the Christian soul atmosphere of faith, hope, love, service, aspiration for Godlikeness. It is a fact of historical knowledge that Christians never deteriorate, but grow during times of hardness and suffering. They live and move and find their being in God.

This gospel is the one peculiarly fitted for a time of conflict and war. The Christian atmosphere is not one from which conflict is excluded. Jesus' attitude toward life is not the abstract one that life is or ever shall be peaceful like the frozen stream. Life was to him, as it is to every thoughtful man, eternal conflict. Life is equilibrium of forces. Christian character is not a gift but an achievement. Life is growth and growth is change with progress through victory. The effeminate gospel of indolent and supernatural salvation which has robbed so many honest men of vital soul growth and driven others into a selfish pacifism is an unworthy caricature of the militant Jesus of Nazareth. He would not pray that any should be taken up out of the world, but he could believe that men could escape the evil of soul dwarfing in a world of eternal conflict.

Like all the real things of life, the experience of this Christian atmosphere comes not by observation. The door of entry, however, is wide open. It is the study and the companying with this great Soul of Nazareth. To know him and his experience of God is to find a new life.

PREACHING IN A WORLD AT WAR

II. MATERIALS AND SUBJECTS

OZORA S. DAVIS, PH.D., D.D.
President of the Chicago Theological Seminary

Where to Find the Sermon Stuff

This is a practical question of the greatest importance. Just as a carpenter must know where to find his tools and materials, and must be able to turn to them quickly, so the preacher in these busy days must know where the stuff for his sermons is to be found and with what kind of tools he can work most swiftly and surely as he constructs his discourse. The preacher is a literary craftsman as well as a prophet. Unless, therefore, he is swift and skilful in commanding his time, tools, and material, he will work in clumsy fashion.

a) The products of earnest thinking.— The world-situation challenges the preacher today as never before to be a serious, alert thinker. The first demand upon the person who is to speak to the people in these days is that he shall have come to close grips with the big ideas that are bombarding us. This means thinking—and thinking is hard work, harder than sawing four-foot maple butts into stove lengths with a dull saw. As a matter of fact, there are relatively few ministers who are in the habit of thinking steadily and consecutively for thirty minutes without being interrupted by the disturbing idea of a parish problem or a raise in their salary. We dawdle and indulge in reverie, but we do not think; and these are times that call for the most serious engagement of the preacher's mind with the situation in which we are to lead the people.

Thinking is facing the new world in a new temper. At a reception a gentleman remarked, as he looked over toward a Doctor of Divinity who seemed deep in solitary meditation apart from the crowd, "Dr. X seems to be thinking deeply!" "No, indeed," replied the friend, "Dr. X is not thinking; he is just rearranging his prejudices." There is a subtle danger that all ministers will fall into a habit like this and think that they really are thinking when all that they are actually doing is to review, renew, and readjust their well-committed a priori notions.

When Catch-my-Pal Patterson gets an audience on its feet to register their resolution concerning the use of strong drink he asks them to double up the right fist, punch an imaginary antagonist, and say in unison, "We will see this thing through." It is high time that the Christian ministers of America doubled up a vigorous intellectual fist and gave an uppercut to the modern religious problems, saying together, "We will think this thing through."

In preaching today the first necessary task of the preacher is not to find a text or to read a book, but to think and think and think until he is fatigued and hungry. Then it is time to turn to the available sources and gather additional

materials for the sermon. It is not respectable to go elsewhere until one has exhausted his own mental resources; then let the reserves be brought up.

b) *The Bible.*—The Bible always has been the primary source of material for the preacher. It was the gospel that created the Scriptures, and therefore we return most naturally to them when we are seeking fresh definitions of the gospel. A period of war like the present sends ministers back to the Bible to discover the larger meaning of their message and the sources of comfort and hope that must be at their command if they would serve the people in a time of perplexity and pain.

There could not be a better preparation for preaching today than to read the Bible consecutively and carefully, with the needs of the hour uppermost in one's mind, in order to gain a new grasp upon the message of the Scriptures to our war-wasted world. Three months spent on "the Book" in this way would bring vision and power to every preacher in rich measure.

In reading the Bible through with this homiletic purpose in mind we do not need to use constantly the slow and painstaking methods of the exegetical scholar. What we are after is the message of the Bible to the life of today. Therefore we may read more swiftly than we could if we were carrying on technical Bible study.

Use a notebook, cards of standard size, or separate sheets of manuscript paper, and note, as you read striking texts, points that may be used in sermons already "on the stocks," appropriate illustrations that will fit the needs of the time. The product of one month's work in this way will furnish sermon subjects and vital material for preaching to cover well-nigh a year.

Go to the Bible first. Read and study the Bible as never before. Lay the whole universe under tribute for the material to be used in your sermon; but begin with the Bible and work out from it. Our preaching would take on new reality and power if we would thus restore the Bible to the pulpit as the first source of substance for preaching. No other single supply is so fertile and constant in truth for the times.

In thus reading the Bible through with the homiletic purpose dominant in our thought we shall find that the particular parts of the book take on new meaning. For example: The early records are full of suggestion concerning the preservation of the children of Israel in their escape from bitter bondage and their establishment in a new home. The Book of Judges gives us a vivid background for the teaching of the prophets and the ideals of Jesus. It reveals the way in which a partial conception of God, true for its time but not true for ours, inspires a kind of patriotism and religious passion that matches its narrow range and limited vision.

Then the preacher turns to the Psalms and finds them fertile in material for preaching in the present age. These great songs reflect the various moods of the individual and the nation in periods of peril from enemies, in captivity, and in restoration and renewal of life. The shock of war may be felt throughout the Hebrew Psalter. Run through the word "enemy" as it is found in a concordance and note how often it occurs in the Psalms. At least seventy times it

appears in Young. In the name of the nation during times of distress these old singers uttered their laments, their loyalty, and their faith in the future of the repentant people. This makes the Psalms a treasury for texts and material for our own age.

Then we turn to the prophets. Here we find ourselves at once in a world that is closely akin to our own. As has been said:

"It was the Assyrian terror, an incomparably worse thing, you remember, than any Belgian horror today (for the most ruthless Prussian is a very tame person, indeed, compared with the Assyrian), that awakened the soul of Israel."[1]

Any preacher seeking material for his work may turn to a fresh study of the prophets of Israel and he will be richly rewarded. He will discover the meaning of confident trust in God, an optimism that refuses to be repressed, and a final loyalty to the spiritual meaning of the universe. All these are necessary in the message of the preacher who is to bring real help to the congregations that are waiting for the voice of the modern prophet in a world of war and reconstruction. Then the preacher will study once more the gospels, in order that he may gain a new conception of Christ and the Kingdom of God. These two great subjects are central in any distinctly Christian message to the modern world. Every Christian preacher today needs a new conception of Christ and a clearer vision of the full significance of the Kingdom of God. Many books have been written about these two Christian ideas; but it is more important to experience a fresh and thorough re-reading of the gospels than it is to work through books on the person and teaching of Jesus. Such a careful study of the Four Gospels, with a careful discrimination between the synoptics and John, will give a preacher a wholly new, firmer grasp on his message.

Then, in order that the significance of personal union with Christ and the ideal of the Kingdom may be understood, the Epistles ought to be studied once more. They have more life than doctrine in them and they yield many a suggestion as to how Christian truth is to be applied concretely in the actual conditions under which men and women live today.

c) *The war literature.*—The mass of literature that has been poured out from the press during the past four years is so vast and bewildering that one is inclined instinctively to turn from it in dismay. If there were time to read it all, or even if the best volumes were available on the meager book money of the average minister, it might seem as if we were warranted in trying to work through this vast field with some degree of profit. As it is, we tend to give it up.

Look first at the books which have been sent to the majority of ministers in regular pastorates without cost. The larger part of this, of course, has been concerned with the moral aims of the war. After making a fair number of inquiries one is satisfied that only a small part of this free literature is read by the average minister. As a matter of fact, we do not prize highly that for which we pay nothing. But there have been many valuable books and pamphlets distributed from England and

[1] *Christ and the World at War*, p. 43.

America which would have been well worth reading by the ministers to whom they have come without cost. Among these are Cardinal Mercier's *The Voice of Belgium*, and Arnold Toynbee's *The German Terror in France*. These are graphic and trustworthy. They give many a keen point for preaching in these days.

Turning to the more general literature, one is amazed at the fine quality of it. At the close of this study we shall give a selected bibliography of this material. Casalis, Hankey, Tiplady, Eddy, Jenkins, and many others have interpreted the meaning of the war on its moral and religious side in such a way that the preacher can speak to his people on the basis of their authority with clarifying positiveness. It is a joy to read this fine descriptive interpretation of the greatest events of history. One feels the kindling glow of it. It is easier to preach after an hour spent with Hankey. The whole is so human and real! The chaplains and padres are close to real men and actual life. Their reflections are not abstract. They have known and felt with the men who are fighting and suffering. It is stimulating. Religious problems take on reality; sins cease to be phenomena for theological investigation; they are real. The virtues walk the solid earth once more. The influence of this literature on preaching will be profound and wholesome.

d) Current magazines and newspaper articles.—The amount of writing that one finds in the magazines and newspapers bearing on religious subjects since the war began is astonishing. Almost every day in some one of the great city papers appears an editorial on some phase of moral or religious life. The magazines are taking up ethical and religious problems as never before.

There are two magazines which offer rich resources to the preacher. The first of these is the *Atlantic Monthly*. Every preacher ought to have access to this monthly magazine. The manner in which it has covered the moral and religious aspects of the war is most praiseworthy. The article by Dr. Odell challenged the preacher and woke us up. The writers are men and women of international reputation; their work is most valuable. The second magazine which is full of material is the weekly *Literary Digest*. The variety of matter to be found here is marked. The cartoons, the quotations, the religious section, the review of current events—all these are profitable to the preacher. It seems to us the best weekly for the minister's general purpose. It does not have the literary and original quality of the *Outlook* and the *Independent*. Probably mention should be made of other magazines; but these seem to the writer best adapted for the preacher's particular work.

Watch the editorial columns of the daily papers! There are utterances to be found there now that were unknown five years ago. Take such an editorial as this from the *Louisville Courier-Journal*, in which Henry Watterson writes:

> Surely the future looks black enough, yet it holds a hope, a single hope. One, and one power only, can arrest the descent and save us. That is the Christian religion. Democracy is but a side issue. The paramount issue underlying the issue of Democracy is the religion of Christ, and 'Him

crucified; the bedrock of civilization; the source and resource of all that is worth having in the world that is, that gives promise in the world to come; not as an abstraction; not as a huddle of sects and factions; but as a mighty force and principle of being. . . . . If the world is to be saved from destruction—it will be saved alone by the Christian religion.

Such an editorial as this can be used in a sermon with altogether unique and telling force. It does not come from a salaried and professional representative of a Christian body. It is the spontaneous expression of the faith and hope of a layman; as such it carries weight that a quotation from the Church Fathers never could convey.

A thoughtful preacher will be alert to clip and preserve articles of this kind for timely use in his preaching. In a recent address at Convention Hall in Kansas City one of the distinguished preachers of the Middle West used two such clippings from the daily papers most effectively. A dozen proof-texts would not have carried the weight of his single quotation from a cabled report of Admiral Beatty's words. The modern preacher has a mighty weapon put into his hands now by the current press.

e) *Soldiers' letters.*—Aside from the published volumes of letters from soldiers, the newspapers are printing many others which often have the added charm and effectiveness of local reference and thus mean more to the home folks. Sometimes copies of these can be secured during the round of parish visiting. Others may be found in the papers. In any event, if the use of them is dictated by good taste they will drive a truth home in a fine way. Here, for example, is part of a letter that was published in the *Wichita* (Kansas) *Eagle*, from Lieutenant Kenneth Cassidy:

Anyhow, you have the picture of me at mass at 6 A.M. on Easter Sunday, standing silent through a simple but impressive service with a thousand other Irishmen, heads bared, faces earnest. Probably in that assembly there were men of as many faiths as I could count on the fingers of four hands. Yet there they were joined in a mutual brotherhood, all gathered with the single purpose of worship, and as we stood there in the early dawn, listening to the few words spoken by a man loved as few men are loved, a man who fills the very atmosphere that surrounds him with holiness—for such a man is Father Duffy—I felt a stronger kinship for my brothers there than I have ever felt before. The picturesque landscape; the quaint old town; the battle-scarred ruins; the fresh, balmy spring air; and the quiet peaceful multitude—and I wondered why it was that men must be torn with such violent passions, why there must be war and ruin, rapine and bloodshed, and all the untold horrors being enacted here every day.

And then I thought of the common feeling of all gathered there and I wondered again that it was as it was, Catholic and Scientist, Protestant and nonsectarian, side by side. But, of course, the question thus raised in my mind was answered at once by the realization that the minor disputes were buried in the united desire of those gathered there to settle a dispute which for the time at least was greater and more potent than intersectarian squabbles. Then, as I continued to think along these lines, the belief seemed forced upon me that there was and is something fundamentally wrong with the very foundation of our modern ethics.

So, I wondered, Is it not natural that when the foundation of a great people, which is their religion, I believe, begins to crumble,

after a while the whole structure of their civilization will fall with a cataclysmic crash? When we can begin by being brothers in the fundamental thing I believe we can begin to hope to some day attain to that mythical utopia called by some one "lasting universal peace."

There is something refreshing and human about a letter like this in which a young fellow thinks aloud. The very fact that he is a Roman Catholic makes his letter all the more significant if it is used in a Protestant sermon.

Every week there are such letters printed in the papers. The preacher who is on the watch for this live stuff will find that he has material of the best kind to illustrate his war-time preaching.

f) Cartoons and pictures.—One of the ways in which a preacher's mind is stimulated to discover or discuss a subject is by a picture or cartoon. Never were these to be found in such abundance and variety as they are today. The value of pictures and cartoons is twofold: Often they suggest at a glance a subject or a point for a sermon. In an instant the whole matter comes before one's mind and the subject is defined by the picture. The working out of the subject requires thought and time; but the first definition came like a flash from the picture. Then one may often describe a picture briefly or refer to a cartoon which he is quite sure that the majority of the audience has seen, and in this way make clear and vivid a point that abstract discussion would not reveal with such immediate effectiveness. The filing cabinet that contains a section for cartoons and pictures will be found to yield rich profit.

Preaching on Patriotism

The nation is at war with the Imperial German government, and the pulpit must have a message concerning patriotism that will be positive and commanding. But before a minister can preach on this great theme he must be clear in his own mind as to what the term means. Under the stress of the war it is possible that a kind of shrieking and parochial patriotism will arise which is far from the real passion which brings forth the patriot ready to give his life for his country. Patriotism is in constant danger of drifting into a subtle form of group selfishness that asserts itself in disregard or defiance of the rights of other groups that are partners in the commonwealth of humanity There is no real patriotism that does not consist with recognition of and respect for the rights of other nations. Love of family, neighborhood, state, or country are perfectly consistent with the highest love for the welfare and rights of all mankind, similarly organized.

The sentiment of Stephen Decatur, which has been for a long time carried at the head of the editorial columns in the publication that modestly claims to be "The World's Greatest Newspaper," reads: "Our Country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong." At first glance this seems like an expression of lofty and unwavering patriotism. But a little reflection reveals the limits to which it would carry a man in a case where the country had taken a step which was contrary to the rights of other nations. Of course it may be said that we may be confident that the country never will

take such a step. The true patriot will be convinced in every case that his country is right, as undoubtedly the German people as a whole are confirmed in the belief that has been instilled into them that they are fighting a purely defensive war to preserve the integrity of their country and not to promote the program of a lawless and defiant despotism.

But it is perfectly possible to think of a case in which our own country may be in the wrong. In such a case it is sheer defiance of all the instincts of the Christian to demand that he shall give undiscriminating loyalty to the country that he loves. He may be silent; he may wait in patience for the dawn of a better mind; but he cannot join in Decatur's toast and he ought not to be asked to do so. This does not mean that he will set his individual judgment up against the majority and demand that the world shall swing to his center. But he will maintain his convictions even while he suffers in silence; and he will not surrender his soul even in the midst of frenzied and undiscriminating clamor for frantic boasts and idle words.

In this spirit of international sensitiveness the pulpit will speak on patriotism with clear accent. In preparing for the message which he is to give, the preacher today will find help in at least the following lines of reading:

1. The message of the Old Testament prophets lives again in the needs of the hour. This field is familiar, and it is probably like carrying coals to Newcastle to remind a preacher today of the great outlines in the patriotic message and example of these men who spoke long ago in the name of the Lord.

With what relentless urgency they brought to the mind and conscience of the people the reality and penalty of sin, especially in its social aspects! They were not so concerned with theological transgressions as they were with the practical and deadly evils that were apparent in civic life. As David could not escape that relentless forefinger of Nathan when he said, "Thou art the man," so the wicked nation could not shut its eyes or close its ears to the figure and voice of the prophet who dared tell them the truth about their sins.

How they comforted and assured the people in the long times of captivity and desolation! The prophetic note is keyed to the mighty words, "Comfort ye my people . . . . speak ye home to the heart of Jerusalem." Warning and comfort mingled in the message of these seers of the Most High.

Then these Old Testament patriots were men who had practical programs for the people. The words were not enough. They also knew what ought to be done. An academic patriotism that solves problems in the easy-chair and sets the world right from the observation car of a limited train is not profitable or reliable in the long run. Ideals have to be wrought into programs, and the constructive patriot is the man who can furnish a plan to match his dream. Therefore we turn with new satisfaction in these difficult days to the Old Testament prophets.

2. The words of Mazzini are full of fresh meaning just now. Not only for their intrinsic value, but also because the kindling messages that this fervid soul sent to his countrymen and to all mankind accomplished so much in the

interests of devoted patriotism, such a volume as *The Duties of Man and Other Essays*, published in Everyman's Library, is a vital book for the modern preacher.

The first respect in which the message of Mazzini touches the needs of the modern pulpit lies in the fact that he is intensely religious in all that he thinks and writes. "The origin of your duties is in God," he says. "The definition of your duties is found in His law. The progressive discovery and the application of His law is the task of Humanity."[1] The modern preacher does not need to come to Mazzini with any fear lest he shall find the atheist and the scoffer in this prophetic and patriotic mind. So a fair start is made when we turn to Mazzini for teachings concerning patriotism that are based on the profoundest religious convictions.

It is stimulating to read the words written in 1860 to the Italian working class:

If you would withdraw yourselves from beneath the arbitrary rule and tyranny of men, you must adore God. And in the war which is being fought in the world between Good and Evil, you must enrol yourselves under the banner of Good and combat Evil without truce, rejecting every dubious course, every cowardly dealing, and every hypocrisy of leaders who seek to compromise between the two. On the path of the first you will have me for comrade as long as I live.[2]

There is a certain prophetic note in Mazzini which is most suggestive. He wrote in *The Duties of Man:*

The map of Europe will be remade. The Countries of the People will rise, defined by the voice of the free, upon the ruins of the Countries of Kings and privileged castes.[3]

When we turn to the teachings of this great prophet of patriotism, moreover, we rejoice in the clarity of his insight and the force of his teachings concerning love of country. It is difficult to select passages that will fully illustrate the intensity of his affirmation of the duty of patriotism. He says, for example:

Without Country you have neither name, token, voice, nor rights, no admission as brothers into the fellowship of the Peoples. You are the Bastards of Humanity. Soldiers without a banner, Israelites among the nations, you will find neither faith nor protection; none will be sureties for you.[4]

The idea of country is simple as Mazzini interprets it:

A Country is a fellowship of free and equal men bound together in a brotherly concord of labor towards a single end. You must make it and maintain it such. A Country is not an aggregation, it is an *association*.[5]

On the basis of this noble conception of the country that unites all free men in its blessing and labor, it is not necessary for Mazzini to indulge in rhetoric as he urges men to love the land that they call their own. He insists that this love, in order to be genuine, must find expression in sacrifice and service. He calls his fellow-Italians to give their very lives for Italy.

But the significant point in the patriotic teachings of Mazzini in their adaptation to the needs of the present hour is the way in which he makes patriotism always consist in the larger and nobler

[1] *The Duties of Man*, p. 21.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 3.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

love for humanity. This is kept constantly before the reader in *The Duties of Man*. The whole subject of loyalty to country is approached through the greater truth of loyalty to humanity. He appeals to his Italian readers in these glowing words:

> You will never deny the sister nations. The life of the Country shall grow through you in beauty and in strength, free from servile fears and the hesitations of doubt, keeping as its *foundation* the people, as its *rule* the consequences of its principles logically deduced and energetically applied, as its *strength* the strength of all, as its *outcome* the amelioration of all, as its *end* the fulfilment of the mission which God has given it. And because you will be ready to die for Humanity, the life of your Country will be immortal.[1]

This is the point of view which makes Mazzini one of the most profitable masters to the preacher of the present. For, as we have noted, there is great need that the pulpit shall know how to combat the grave error that lurks in all patriotic appeal, namely, that it will be made apart from the consciousness and claim of the race and thus degenerate into a form of selfishness. This suffering prophet of freedom is clear-eyed at this point and he has no desire to promote a patriotism that is faithless to the larger claims of humanity as children of God.

3. We have come to the time when we appreciate more than ever before the meaning of the words and spirit of Abraham Lincoln. A united nation pays its tribute of sincerest honor to the man who embodied the cause of human freedom and national unity in the greatest civil conflict that the American people ever have experienced. He did this, however, with such firmness for the right and such sympathy for the men who fought bravely against him that in the end the representatives of both parties give him supreme honor.

Lincoln becomes in these testing hours a trustworthy guide to the only right form of patriotism. His name has come to stand for the noblest type of love and loyalty to one's country. There is no longer any danger of arousing partisanship in urging his ideals upon Americans. Therefore the time has come when the preacher can use material drawn from the life and words of Lincoln with certainty that it will be appreciated by all classes of hearers.

The Lincoln literature is so vast that one is perplexed rather by its abundance than its lack. Among the biographies which are most interesting are those of Miss Tarbell and Mr. Rothschild. The main events in the public life of President Lincoln are so well known and the prominent traits in his character are so well defined that it is not necessary to review them at any great length in order to make effective use of them in preaching today.

The most profitable part of the Lincoln literature is the material that is to be found in the presidential speeches, addresses, and letters. There are many collections of these available; one was published in 1907 by the Current Literature Publishing Company and is inexpensive and convenient.

In order to illustrate the value of Lincoln's words in these times of war and reconstruction, let us turn to certain of

[1] *The Duties of Man*, p. 59.

these speeches. One of the noblest addresses that Lincoln ever gave was the brief farewell that he spoke on the rainy day when his old neighbors gathered to wish him Godspeed as he left Springfield for Washington, February 11, 1861. His words were burdened with gratitude, courage, and faith in God. He spoke them with deepest feeling and they were understood by his neighbors as reflecting the inner purpose of their friend as he left them for his great task at the capital city:

> I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell.

The simple dignity and sincerity of these noble words are self-evident. Here was a great soul, standing on the threshold of a supreme human experience and going to meet it with the faith of a trustful child. Lincoln was great enough to confess his utmost dependence and he did not feel ashamed to speak of God's care and his need of the prayers of his old friends and neighbors. This is a needed lesson in days when men are sorely tempted to boast or to forget God. Lincoln was too great to do either.

There are many brief addresses which express the same fundamental faith in God and in the religious meaning of human life. A reply to an address by Mrs. Gurney, in 1862, speaks of his own life and work as instruments in the hands of God "to work out his great purposes." So in every interpretation of his life Lincoln was constantly interpreting his purpose as definitely concerned with doing the will of God.

But it is in the Second Inaugural of March 4, 1865, that the words of President Lincoln rise to their supreme height. Indeed, although the Gettysburg Address is far more widely known, the Second Inaugural is probably the greatest single short utterance of Lincoln. In spite of the fact that the concluding paragraphs are so well known, it is worth while to read them again at this point:

> Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with, or even before, the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible, and pray to the same God; and each invokes his aid against the other. It may seem strange that any man should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces; but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered—that of neither has been answered fully.
>
> The Almighty has his own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh." If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through his appointed time, he now wills to remove, and that he gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern

therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondman's two hundred and fifty years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations.

These noble words give us certain principles that are as valid now as they were in 1865 and upon which our Christian people will do well to think as preachers bring them to their minds and hearts.

First there is the grace of the generous judgment that is not made charitable simply by obliterating fundamental distinctions, but keeps true to the command of Jesus. It was a time of bitter passions and of right arrayed against wrong; but the antagonists were praying to the same God and had the right to claim that their motives should be mutually understood. And this is what Lincoln did. He understood and appreciated the South with a degree of insight that hardly any other northern leader possessed. Time has revealed this fact.

In the heat of conflict it is impossible to see all reasons clearly. But there is no less demand now that we shall use discrimination even in our estimate of the purposes and acts of our enemies. There is no other voice that will be raised as clearly as that of the preacher in the plea for the subjection of a wild and cursing wrath to a sympathetic and charitable appreciation even of the motives of the German people. This will not involve the loss of patriotism but rather its deliverance from the fury of an undiscriminating hatred. It will bring our people nearer to the motives of Jesus which inspired him in his treatment of the Pharisees on the one hand and all the actual "sinners" on the other.

Another point at which the words and work of Lincoln aid the preacher today is in their illustration of the unyielding confidence in a right cause. The great President knew that he was right and that his antagonists were wrong. Because this was so he knew that his cause must ultimately win. The war might continue in spite of all that he or any other man could do to prevent it; but so long as the moral order of the universe stood, the right cause must finally triumph.

The modern preacher needs to take a fresh hold on this mighty fact. America and her Allies are fighting the battle of eternal truth against falsehood. Germany is wrong and America is right. Since this is so, the issue of the conflict must finally be decided on the side of the truth. The question is not whether America is to win at all but only how soon the victory is to come. This depends upon the resources and the wisdom of our defenders. Our enemies may win temporary victories; but they cannot triumph, if God is moral and the universe is right. There may be lost battles; but there cannot be a lost cause for America

and her Allies. This truth should be driven home to the mind and heart of our people in days when we tend to waver in our confidence of the final victory that must come to a just cause.

In spite of the perplexing issues involved in the proposition, Lincoln held steadfastly to the truth that God is actively on the side of those who fight for the truth. He thought of himself as the agent of the moral God; he relied upon the resources that God would bring to him and to his cause. With Lincoln the words "the will of God" stood for something that had reality and power in it.

He made a clear distinction that we would do well to keep in mind when it is so easy to prate about the partnership between man and God. The famous reply made by Lincoln to a minister who said that he hoped that "the Lord was on our side" points the truth that ought to be frequently emphasized in the preaching of today. "I am not at all concerned about that," replied Lincoln, "for I know that the Lord is *always* on the side of the *right*. But it is my constant anxiety and prayer that I and this nation should be on the Lord's side."

This phrase "on the Lord's side" has become an item of the trite language of Zion; but it contains a mighty truth which must be brought back into the thinking of our people through the pulpit. America is right; but we must be sure of it and constantly verify the grounds of our certainty. Again and again we need to define our grounds and to exhibit the warrants for our action. Sermons must be preached in a time of war and reconstruction which set forth the content of the nation's ideals so clearly and with such convincing power that the people will see them in all their force and believe in them with the tenacity that is born of clear, deep conviction.

Another fact that appears from the words and life of Lincoln is the humility and tenderness that were born of his sense of dependence upon God. He never boasted. Saber rattling is as far from Lincoln's thought as its opposite is distant from the characteristic action of the German Kaiser and his strutting court. He walked humbly with his God and not majestically ahead, as the Kaiser invariably does. Cruel and terrible as war is, it is utterly impossible to think of Lincoln as sanctioning for an instant the common practice of relentless cruelty and fiendish frightfulness that has marked the conduct of the Great War by Germany. The love and tenderness of Lincoln was as contrary to all this German program as evil is contrary to good.

Here also the modern preacher finds material for sermons that shall help our people when they are tempted by the report of the ravage of Belgium and the slaughter of Armenia to indulge the spirit of revenge and be burned by hate and the lust for retaliation. No right-minded person can fail to flame with indignation at the authentic records of what has happened; but every Christian can hold his wrath in the leash of the spirit of Jesus and not fall into the mistake of thinking that evil can be finally overcome by evil. Retaliation was discredited long ago as the final means of conquering wrong, even if it must be temporarily indulged for a time. At last we must use the better method that Jesus used and of which Lincoln was so conspicuous an example.

4. We can touch only briefly upon another source of material for preaching on patriotism. The days of the Civil War in the United States lie far behind us now and we can begin to understand the values in the struggle that were unseen until recently. North and South alike have come to appreciate the personal character and the loyalty of Robert E. Lee. As a Christian and as the defender of what he thought to be the truth his work was filled with devotion and high-minded sacrifice. It is possible to turn to his life for illustrations of patriotic service and feel that the passage of time has brought a merited honor to his name.

5. Another character which the preacher can turn to in preaching patriotism today is Carl Schurz. The eager devotion of this intrepid defender to the cause of freedom ought to be emphasized in order that the people may understand that there once was a Germany that produced men of this mold. Not only for what he gained from America but for what he gave her, Carl Schurz stands among the noblest and bravest of patriots.

Every preacher can rejoice in the fact that when the time came to choose America cast the force of her arms on the side of justice and mercy. We have nothing to apologize for. Rudyard Kipling was true to his old inspirations when he wrote:

THE CHOICE

THE AMERICAN SPIRIT SPEAKS

To the Judge of Right and Wrong
  With Whom fulfillment lies
Our purpose and our power belong,
  Our faith and sacrifice.

Let Freedom's land rejoice!
  Our ancient bonds are riven;
Once more to us the eternal choice
  Of good or ill is given.

Not at a little cost,
  Hardly by prayer or tears,
Shall we recover the road we lost
  In the drugged and doubting years.

But after the fires and the wrath,
  But after searching and pain,
His Mercy opens us a path
  To live with ourselves again.

In the Gates of Death rejoice!
  We see and hold the good—
Bear witness, Earth, we have made our choice
  For Freedom's brotherhood.

Then praise the Lord Most High
  Whose Strength hath saved us whole,
Who bade us choose that the Flesh should die
  And not the living Soul.[1]

The immediate duty of the American minister as he preaches on patriotism, therefore, is to exalt the worth of true loyalty to one's country, to insist that this shall be maintained in right relations to international consciousness and responsibility, and to warn the people faithfully against the peril of becoming *Prussianized* while we seek to defeat *Prussianism*.

This last point is such a clear and urgent duty that we dwell upon it now for the sake of added emphasis. Our most thoughtful preachers have seen the danger and have been faithful in proclaiming the peril and in suggesting practical ways in which to meet it. Robert E. Speer says:

> If . . . . we are justified in this one more war to stop war, it does not follow that we are free to yield to the spirit that we set out to

[1] *A Treasury of War Poetry*, p. 3.

destroy. Precisely otherwise. If this view now allows and warrants war, it also warns and cautions and sobers us. It bids us be rid of our prejudice and passion, to chant no hymns of hate, to keep our aims and our principles free from selfishness and from any national interest which is not also the interest of all nations, to refrain from doing in retaliation and in war the very things we condemn in others, to avoid Prussianism in our national life in the effort to crush Prussianism, to guard against the moral uncleanness which has characterized past wars as against pestilence, to magnify the great constructive and humane services for which humanity calls in every such time of tragedy, to love and pray for our enemies, to realize that the task set for us is not to be discharged in a year or five years, not by money and ships and guns, but by life, that it is a war to the death against all that makes war possible. We have to replace an order of selfishness and wrong and division with an order of brotherhood and righteousness and unity. Whatever stands in the way of that new order in our nation or in our hearts is an ally of the ideals and spirit against which we contend. To tolerate or to conceal behind our armies the policies, the prejudices or the passions which are before them is disloyalty. To try to make our own hearts pure and our own hands clean so that we may be worthy of being used to achieve victory and peace is loyalty, and it is the only kind of loyalty that will stand the strain that we must now prepare ourselves to meet.[1]

Concrete Suggestions for Patriotic Preaching

We venture now to offer specific suggestions to help a preacher today in presenting the subject of patriotism from the religious point of view in sermons. It is understood that such a preacher will be thoroughly Christian in his discussion and application of these truths. He may use Nehemiah as an example; and, obviously, Nehemiah never had a distinctly Christian experience. But the modern preacher will charge the whole subject with religious passion and Christian feeling.

Let it be clear in all suggestions that are offered that it is not intended here to present a series of "canned outlines." Nothing would be farther from the writer's ideal of what it means to be a preacher. These plans are presented in order that they may suggest similar ones which a preacher may be stimulated to work out for himself. On the other hand, there is no reason why anyone should not be perfectly free to use any of these suggestions as they are given or to improve them and then preach on them. They are merely suggestive and no plagiarism would be involved in their use.

Suggestion 1

"Why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?" (Neh. 2:3.)

An Old-Time Patriot

An outline study of Nehemiah, the patriot. The following points are indicated in the text and are pertinent to modern conditions:

I. Loyal to native land in exile and prosperity (1:2).

II. Recognizing dependence on God (1:5–11; 5:15).

III. Forming practical plans for patriotic work (2:7, 8).

IV. Careful survey preceding service (2:13–16).

[1] *The Christian Man, the Church and the War*, pp. 30, 31.

V. Detailed organization under leadership (4:16–20).
VI. Governor without graft (5:14–18).

Suggestion 2

"Only thou shalt not bring my son thither again" (Gen. 24:6–8).

AMERICANIZED

In order to work out a new destiny in a new land, Isaac must remain in Canaan and not return to his father's early home. This indicates three points:

I. The gift of the old land to the new.
II. The welcome of the new land to the old.
III. The union of old and new in the future state.

Suggestion 3

"I will not take a thread nor a shoelatchet nor aught that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich" (Gen. 14:23).

LEADERS WITH CLEAN HANDS

I. The place and power of leaders in a democracy.
II. The peril of graft and gain.
III. The true leader a man with clean hands.

Suggestion 4

"And my wrath, it upheld me" (Isa. 63:5).

THE STRENGTHENING GRACE OF A GREAT PASSION

The folly and failure of neutrality and indifference when justice and truth are in danger. The necessity of great, compelling ideals; of hatred for evil and love for the truth. Therefore these points:

I. Defining a nation's ideals and loyalties.
II. The steadying power of a great ideal passionately defended.
III. The final victory of a great passion for truth and justice.

Suggestion 5

"Only behave as citizens worthily of the gospel of Christ" (Phil. 1:27).

RELIGION AND CITIZENSHIP

The margin correctly reproduces the figure involved in the Greek verb. This suggests:

I. Religion is a civic power; Christianity has a direct reference to the state.
II. Civic life needs religion to cleanse and ennoble it.
III. Religion and civic duty must co-operate constantly in a world at war.

Suggestion 6

"Oh, my lord, if Jehovah is with us, why then is all this befallen us?"

"And Jehovah said, Go in this thy might, and save Israel" (Judg. 6:13, 14).

HOPE IN DARK DAYS

Gideon, beating out wheat in the wine press to deceive the Midianites, was in despair.

I. The mood of despair. Its cause and curse and cure.
II. The strength of God in a national crisis.
III. The mission of the patriot.

Suggestion 7

"By the watercourses of Reuben
There were great resolves of heart.
Why sattest thou among the sheepfolds
To hear the pipings for the flocks?
At the watercourses of Reuben
There were great searchings of heart"
(Judg. 5:15, 16).

THE CALL OF THE CRISIS

I. The pipings for the flocks. Security; comfort; safety; industry; home life; peace.
II. The searchings of heart. Justice violated; truth defied; mercy set at naught. Chivalry; loyalty; humanity; religion.
III. The patriot's response. The flocks exchanged for the camp.

Suggestion 8

"Then I said, Here am I; send me" (Isa. 6:8).

VOLUNTEERS

I. The call is personal.
II. The call is specific.
III. The call is urgent.
IV. The call involves sacrifice.
V. The call ennobles the volunteer.

Suggestion 9

"That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world" (Phil. 2:15).

IDEAL CITIZENS

I. Negatively: free from wrong doing.
II. In the midst of life and not isolated from it.
III. Positively: like the light, energetic and constant in the creation and support of life.

Suggestion 10

"Then render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" (Luke 20:25).

PATRIOTIC OBLIGATION AND RELIGIOUS LOYALTY

I. Our country rightly claims our service.
II. Our God also rightly claims our service.
III. Neither conflicts with the other.
IV. One complements the other and both together make life sane and good.

The Worth of Humanity

Here is a paradox: at the very moment when human life is being extinguished with such reckless prodigality, the worth of the human soul is being revealed in all its divine and eternal value. The very experiences which seem to obliterate the worth of the individual are setting such value upon human life as never appeared before.

Of all the doctrines of religion that practically influence the preacher none has a more radical meaning than his conception of human nature, what it is and what it is worth. If man is of little value and his destruction is an unimportant matter, the preacher has no urgency to impel him to plead for the salvation of the soul. Nor has he any compelling sense of the meaning of sin. For all the significance of sin depends upon the value of that which is destroyed by it. To spill ink over a mop-rag involves no disaster; to dash it across a piece of old lace means dire loss. It is the worth of that which is injured which determines the character of the force that works the injury. And so no preacher ever can speak with conviction concerning the fundamental truths of religion unless he has first of all a clear idea of the nature of man and the worth of human life.

Probably there is no more conspicuous example of this than Phillips Brooks. The one ruling idea in his mind was the worth of life and the majesty of human nature. If one grasps the practical meaning of the simple sentence, "all men are the children of God," the master-motive of the great preacher's work is immediately clear. To him humanity seemed infinitely precious. Jesus came into a human experience from the heart of the Father God in order that he might show us how noble and good it was to live as the Father would have us. Phillips Brooks made every appeal to what he conceived to be the real person, the divine image in the human.

However we may regard the fundamental theology of this position, it is

undoubtedly true that it gives the preacher a tremendous faith and mighty appeal. If humanity is worth so much to God we must do all we can to bring it to self-expression; we must fight with all the forces at our command the influences that put it in peril at any point. Therefore let us see what the Great War has been saying concerning the worth of human life. Has it made it cheap or has it made it great?

First of all it is apparent that the war has subjected men to such tests as have revealed their innate character. We were drifting along quite easily and there were no searching situations to call for great decisions. Then the challenge came. Donald Hankey has shown what this involved in the following words:

> In the trenches the real white man finally and conclusively comes to his own. The worm, no matter how exalted his rank, automatically ceases to count. The explanation of this phenomenon is very simple. In the moment of crisis the white man is always on the spot, while the worm is always in his dug-out.[1]

This soldier's use of the term "white man" is exceedingly suggestive, for it comes from the trenches where men with black skins are fighting side by side with Caucasians, and the words used here are not ethnological. They refer to the soul and not to the complexion. They describe character and conduct.

At another time Hankey writes:

> I have been discovering human goodness. . . . . And oh, I have found it! In Bermondsey, in the stinking hold of the Zieten, in the wide, thirsty desert of Western Australia, and in the ranks of the Seventh Battalion of the Rifle Brigade. I enlisted very largely to find out how far I really believed in the brotherhood of men when it comes to the point—and I do believe in it more and more.[2]

Thus out of the blood and dirt and death of the trenches comes the revelation of new worth in the humanity crowded in there under most abnormal circumstances for the purposes of fratricidal war.

Hankey is not the only witness on this point. In order that the evidence may be still more convincing we cite the following. Sherwood Eddy, after visiting the Western Front, wrote:

> The war, like a great searchlight thrown across our individual and social lives, has revealed men and nations to themselves. . . . . It has shown us the real stuff of which men are made.[3]

Thomas Tiplady, whose service as a chaplain has issued in the production of two of the most illuminating books of the war, interpreting with wonderful sensitiveness and skill the spirit of the British army, writes:

> When one remembers that the prodigies of valour daily seen on the Front are performed by just ordinary men, such as we used to see on football grounds, or in city offices, workshops, and churches, a new faith in humanity and its future is begotten.[4]

There is another witness, whose words are so convincing and whose spirit is so full of manly charm, that his testimony becomes the most significant of all. Coningsby Dawson was already master of an assured literary career in America when the war called him to volunteer in Canada for service overseas. His

[1] *A Student in Arms*, Series 1, p. 32.

[2] *Ibid.*, Series 2, p. 29.

[3] *With Our Soldiers in France*, p. 129.

[4] *The Cross at the Front*, p. 146.

father writes concerning his spirit, revealed in his published letters:

> Hating the brutalities of war, clearly perceiving the wide range of its cruelties, yet the heart of the writer is never hardened by its daily commerce with death; it is purified by pity and terror, by heroism and sacrifice, until the whole nature seems fresh annealed into a finer strength.[1]

Dr. Dawson also describes the soldiers in general:

> They know themselves re-born in soul, and are dimly aware that the world is travailing toward new birth with them. They are still very human, men who end their letters with a row of crosses which stand for kisses. They are not dehumanized by war; the kindness and tenderness of their natures are unspoiled by all their daily traffic in horror. But they have won their souls; and when the days of peace return these men will take with them to the civilian life a tonic strength and nobleness which will arrest and extirpate the decadence of society with the saving salt of valor and of faith.[2]

These are interpretations, however, and are far less significant than the words of the writer himself, written down in letters that quite unconsciously and therefore all the more accurately reveal the changes wrought by the war in his own spiritual temper.

It is difficult to maintain proper reserve in the desire to quote from these revealing pages. Only the following out of many paragraphs equally expressive are transcribed:

> Things are growing deeper with me in all sorts of ways. Family affections stand out so desirably and vivid, like meadows green after rain. And religion means more. The love of a few dear human people and the love of the divine people out of sight, are all that one has to lean on in the graver hours of life. I hope I come back again—I very much hope I come back again; there are so many finer things that I could do with the rest of my days—bigger things. But if by any chance I should cross the seas to stay, you'll know that that also will be right and as big as anything that I could do with life, and something that you'll be able to be just as proud about as if I had lived to fulfil all your other dear hopes for me. . . . . I've become a little child again in God's hands, with full confidence in his love and wisdom, and growing trust that whatever He decides for me will be best and kindest.[3]

Once more Mr. Dawson writes:

> This war is a prolonged moment of exultation for most of us—we are redeeming ourselves in our own eyes. To lay down one's life for one's friend once seemed impossible. All that is altered. We lay down our lives that the future generations may be good and kind, and so we can contemplate oblivion with quiet eyes.[4]

One more quotation from these letters contains a vivid reference which throws into clear relief the experience of meeting the war's most urgent stress:

> You know how I used to wonder what I'd do under such circumstances [shell fire]. Well, I laughed. All I could think of was the sleek people walking down Fifth Avenue, and the equally sleek crowds taking tea at the Waldorf.[5]

The biting irony of this last reference is self-evident. In contrast with the realities and nobilities of the trenches the

[1] Rev. W. J. Dawson, Introduction to Coningsby Dawson, *Carry On*, p. 8.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

small talk and complaisant satisfactions of the Waldorf tea-sippers appear as contemptible as they really are. Surely the soul does not come into the heritage of its ultimate nobleness in such places. The trenches have called it into being.

From these more elaborate pieces of literature let us turn to the newspapers to see what sort of stuff the Great War is showing in our homes and villages. On May 14, 1918, Lieutenant Harry D. Preston, a Chicago aviator in the Canadian service, lost his life in combat with German planes. When the news reached his mother this is what she said: "He died for the cause. I shall continue to live for it. Tomorrow I shall go about my Red Cross work as usual." What a glorious spirit! Let no one think that it did not go along with the keenest suffering and intensest sense of loss. But it is the soul triumphant. The editorial writer in a Chicago paper remarked concerning the simple, brave words: "It is the spirit of thousands, hundreds of thousands, of aching hearts in Europe. They have not grudged the great price."

There is a most courageous and heroic incident narrated in the *Red Cross Magazine* for August, 1918. An Italian woman whose son, Italo, had been killed sent a letter to an officer thanking him for his kindness. She could not write herself, and the letter was composed by her grandson. The last paragraph ran thus:

> Was it you, signor Captain, who gave my name to those gentlemen who came to bring me money because Italo was dead? It was not from pride, nor to mortify anyone, but I could not take it. You see, for me to take that money would be like having sold my son. I have *given* my son.

[1] *A Treasury of War Poetry*, p. 223.

Now the person who can read that with no choke in the throat and with dry eyes has lost something which is more precious than anything else on earth. The editor put this caption to the incident: "She Could Not Write, but What a Soul!"

How, then, shall we preach about the soul? Is our humanity totally depraved and beyond commendation? Or does redemption depend for its final justification on the worth of that which is redeemed? Rupert Brooke has answered the question in one of the noblest sonnets evoked by the Great War:

THE DEAD

Blow out, you bugles, over the rich Dead!
There's none of these so lonely and poor of old,
But, dying, has made us rarer gifts than gold.
These laid the world away; poured out the red
Sweet wine of youth; gave up the years to be
Of work and joy, and that unhoped serene,
That men call age; and those who would have been,
Their sons, they gave, their immortality.

Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our dearth,
Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.[1]

Suggestions for Sermons on the Worth of Humanity

Suggestion 1

"Yet now is our flesh as the flesh of our brethren, our children as their children: and, lo, we bring into bondage our sons and our

daughters to be servants, and some of our daughters are brought into bondage already: neither is it in our power to help it; for other men have our fields and our vineyards" (Neh. 5:5).

The Worth of a Man

The circumstances: Economic slavery. Nehemiah's anger.

I. Master and servant, usurer and debtor are one.
   A. Same physical bodies.
   B. Same common hopes and struggles.
   C. Same death.
II. Economic subjection makes slaves.
   A. No ambition.
   B. No progress possible.
   C. Greater loss constantly "to him that hath not."
III. This bondage must be broken. Restoration imperative (vs. 11).
   A. First, the means of life.
   B. Then the people would *restore themselves.*

Suggestion 2

"And God said, Let us make man in our image" (Gen. 1:27).

The Majesty of Man

What is it to "bear the image of the heavenly"?

I. Our mental life. We are able to think God's thoughts after him. The quest of knowledge is the effort to reach God's mind.
II. Our moral life. We discover the right and seek it in correspondence with the moral will of God. The only reason why we should be holy is because God is holy.
III. Our spiritual life. We yearn for the perfect and seek it through struggle and pain. Our spiritual goal is to be like God, to see him as he is.

Suggestion 3

"Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, and such are ye" (I Cor. 3:16, 17).

God's Temple Is Man

Treat this proposition according to the analogy of a temple, for example:

I. The place of the temple in the community.
II. The preservation of the temple.
III. The use of the temple.
IV. The Deity in the temple.

Suggestion 4

"And a man shall be as a hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest, as streams of water in a dry place, as the shade of a great rock in a weary land" (Isa. 32:2).

"How Good Is Man's Life"

This text has been handled with a degree of insight and comprehensiveness which leaves nothing more to be said, by George Adam Smith, *Isaiah* (I, 251–57). His outline is as follows:

I. A philosophy of history.
II. A great gospel.
III. A great ideal and duty.

Suggestion 5

Exposition of Luke 15:11–32.

The Lost Boy

The parable of the Prodigal Son is a most appropriate subject for preaching today. It was one of the great factors in the pulpit ministry of Phillips Brooks. This lost lad was worth so much! He was still the father's son, however he was debauching and despising his birthright in the far country. And when he really discovered his true self he saw that he was heart-hungry for home. So many lads are away from home now and in places of peril that the familiar parable is more vital in the pulpit than ever before. Handle it with the sense of the worth of the lost boy in the forefront of your thinking.

Suggestion 6

"What is man, that thou art mindful of him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God" (Ps. 8:4, 5).

EXALTED LOWLINESS

I. The majestic heavens.
II. The mighty God.
III. Exalted man. His power over nature; his moral insight; his quest of ideal ends; his immortal destiny.

Suggestion 7

"How much then is a man of more value than a sheep?" (Matt. 12:12.)

MARKET VALUES

Introduction. Need of a new scale of values.

I. How men regard sheep.
II. How men regard men.
III. How God regards sheep and men.

Suggestion 8

"The sword of Jehovah and of Gideon" (Judg. 7:20).

A TWO-HANDED SWORD

I. God and man worked together: there was one sword for both.
II. Thus God's will was done through human means.
III. Thus human hands were strengthened by divine aid.

Use as an illustration

"If my hand slacked
I should rob God . . . .
He could not make Antonio Stradivari's violins without Antonio."

THE RELIGIOUS RESPONSE IN A CANTONMENT

REV. JAMES M. STIFLER, D.D.
First Baptist Church, Evanston, Illinois[1]

There are many who are turning prophets as to what religion will be "when the boys come home." One cannot be far from the truth in the forecast that the religious life of the men in the camps will give us some intimation as to what these new interests in religion will be. In reading such descriptions it is necessary to allow for the constant temptation to generalize and homileticize interesting incidents. Dr. Stifler's discussion is particularly valuable in that, though brief, it avoids this danger.

One would be very rash to generalize about the religious reactions of the men of our National Army unless he had experience of many camps, for by comparison of experiences with others the writer found that there was a great variety in this respect between camps drawing troops from different sections of the country.

At Camp Dodge, Iowa, the men were drafted from southern Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and North Dakota. The

[1] Camp Religious Director for the Y.M.C.A. at Camp Dodge, September 1, 1917, to March 1, 1918.

majority of them, therefore, came from small towns and farming districts, and few from large cities—the twin cities being the only large municipalities in the entire draft area. The religious background of the men also plays a decisive part in the readiness and nature of their response. At this camp a fairly large proportion of the men were raised in the Roman Catholic church and about an equal proportion in the various branches of the Lutheran church. Of the evangelical denominations the Methodists considerably outnumbered the nearest denomination in numbers.

The first few weeks at camp proved the time when the men were most open to the religious appeal. At this time they were strange to their new life, apt to be homesick, and had not yet acquired the enthusiasm for the art of soldiering that was almost uniformly developed by the end of two months. The sympathy and friendliness of the religious workers was welcomed in those first days with pathetic eagerness. I sometimes thought that the hymns and the words of Scripture seemed to them to be a warm tie to remind them of the home and personal life that they had left.

The general effect of taking a young man out of civilian life and plunging him overnight into a great military camp was to give him a sort of anonymous feeling. He was depersonalized, and only gradually did he come to recover himself and find out that in spite of the great numbers of men each was still himself and that uniform clothes did not make uniform characters. During this depersonalized period it seemed to be a tremendous comfort to be in a place where a fellow human being treated him as an individual and where he could listen to a religious message which reminded him that God cares for the individual.

It was at such a period that on one rainy evening I spoke in a tent to some twelve hundred men. It was dreary enough outside, and the ground inside was churned to a fine pastelike mud. The talk was plain and simple on the theme that the same God that was in their church at home was in this camp and was adequate to help them in their new life. About two hundred men raised their hands in token of desire to be remembered in that closing prayer, and about an equal number sought to have a personal word with the speaker and other workers afterward. Their main impulse seemed to be to have a personal word with one who had encouraged them, and some dozen or more wanted to register themselves definitely for a religious life.

After two months had passed the situation was quite different. The homesickness was all gone, the regret at having left their civilian life had given way to a fine determination to master the art of soldiering. They knew more about the issues of the war, and for the most part were filled with an uproarious patriotism. When I asked a hutful one night what they considered the best thing that camp life had brought to them, the reply was, first the drill and the discipline. They were filled with enthusiasm for their officers and the army and never responded so readily as to some suggestion that they would soon be overseas where they would make the Kaiser wiser.

On the surface one might think that the religious appeal at this stage would

not meet with so ready a response. It is true that meetings were not attended in such large numbers. Military duties would account for some of that, and many other causes would tend to keep them away. But it was my opinion that the real spiritual convictions of the men were clearer and had more expression in conduct than at first. Moreover, it is to be questioned whether most of them were not leading more regular and cleaner lives than when they were at home.

At this stage we began to form Bible classes which met sometimes on Sunday morning and sometimes on a week night in barracks, mess halls, or Y.M.C.A. buildings. It was in these smaller groups, where one came face to face with a few men, that one was able to judge best of the spiritual reactions that were going on. Of course, there were many men who shunned all classes and meetings, but as near as I could judge most men were in some sort of religious meeting every two or three weeks.

Those Bible classes were a priceless privilege to the leaders, for no matter what the lesson might be the questions invariably drifted around to the problem of adjusting Christianity and the business of war, which they now clearly understood to be killing Germans. I used to think that there came a noticeable change over every company after their first few lessons at bayonet practice. I knew of some few men who refused entirely to go to religious meetings because they felt that a man could not be a Christian and a soldier. I shall hereafter have far more confidence in the grip that the Ten Commandments have in their literal wording. More than one of these men said: "The Ten Commandments say 'Thou shalt not kill,' and my business now is to kill, and I mean to do it; so I can't keep the Commandments and be a soldier."

Knowing that I had to meet this frame of mind, and realizing that I did not have a chance to meet it logically, I collected every telling incident I could of the lives of godly soldiers, Henry Havelock, General Gordon, Stonewall Jackson, General O. O. Howard, and many others, and the fact of these men having met and surmounted what seemed to them so impossible never failed to make an impression.

There were some regiments of picked men to whom it was a joy to minister. To one such, one cold winter night, I preached precisely the same sermon that I had the winter previously presented to a university audience. The theme was that God is a reality, he is found by action and faith rather than abstract thinking. It was a dramatic hour—a hundred and fifty men grouped in a dimly-lighted barracks messroom. There was very little appeal to the emotions but much to the conscience and head of a sincere man. At the close of that service there were thirty men who signed the war roll cards.

With another regiment, made up mostly of well-educated men who were volunteers and came from all over the Middle West and the eastern cities, I had a similar experience. It was my uniform observation that there was a more vital response to a clear-cut presentation of the character of Christ and his ability to impart that character to others than to any other subject.

They were not interested in abstractions to any great extent. A friend who has worked among the Jackies at the Great Lakes station tells me that those boys asked him the most impossible theological questions. He showed me a list of ten such that he had taken down. They would perplex a theological faculty. I suspect that this is partially due to the fact that the Jackie averages around twenty years of age, while our draft men were nearer twenty-six.

The religious work in a cantonment is very different from that which is either possible or desirable in the camps overseas. In the cantonment men are getting ready for a great strain. They are eager to meet it like men. The natural heroism of the soul is steadily stiffening to an entire readiness to make the great sacrifice, and as time goes on and the contest grows nearer, religion seems to come down to its simplest personal elements—a mighty belief in the God of right and justice, and a more or less confident faith that he who gave his own son to die that others might live will deal kindly with a man who knows that he is weak and wants spiritual strength to keep clean and fight bravely, and, if need be, die in hope of immortal life beyond.

RELIGION AND WAR

SHAILER MATHEWS
University of Chicago

Patriotism is indissolubly connected with war. Indeed, it is commonly most in evidence during times of war. Yet it is only a few years since war for America was a matter of hardly more than academic importance. We had peace societies, several of them heavily endowed, but their chief operation seemed rather dealing with anachronistic issues. We were altogether unmilitary as a nation, and as a nation the United States looked out upon war as something which might be expected in remote and backward regions like Africa, or in such turbulent and unmodern states as those which are to be found in the Balkans. We had even come to believe the peristent assertion that the Kaiser was the guardian of the peace of Europe. Few Americans were interested in international affairs, and even our relation with the dangerous Morocco question was that of benevolent aloofness. Our hopes were centered around the Hague Conference, and we had come to feel that the ever-increasing intimacy and interdependence born of commerce and the growing co-operation in the field of science—in a word that the whole course of civilization could be trusted to make wars cease. Peace was discussed in the genial atmosphere of banquets, and

pacifism in its more intelligent moments seemed destined to discover some moral equivalent for war.

It is easy now to see that we were not only overcomplacent, but that we were being led astray by an active propaganda conducted by those who wished to keep us in a state of military unpreparedness in the interest of their own programs and policies. Most of us did not see this in 1914. The outbreak of the war found us as unprepared in spirit as in all other particulars. In a way this national attitude was to our credit. We were living like a gentleman with the world, and we refused to believe that any civilized nation was less a gentleman than ourselves. It was not strange, therefore, that the shock of conflict was as great in the field of our spiritual interests as on the fields of France. The first horrors of the war left us not only bewildered but in distress of soul. Failing to understand the causes which had brought about the hostilities, many of us seriously protested that not only civilization but Christianity itself had collapsed. So accustomed had we become to mistaking what ought to be for what really is that we were in all but mental and moral chaos.

Our first reaction was to reaffirm our faith in the supremacy of moral ideals. We could not believe the stories of atrocities which came to us with increasing volume. The crime against Belgium seemed to belong to the people of another world. Our attitude of mind was not exactly ostrich-like, but it was the attitude of those whose spiritual eyesight had been so accustomed to the mist of idealism as to be untrustworthy in the light of reality. Religious leaders reasserted with new emphasis the ideals of Jesus, and we believed that Christianity demanded, if not actual nonresistance, both a political neutrality and a detached moral attitude as well. As Americans we felt that the war was born of conditions of such thoroughly continental pedigree as to make the war strictly European. Whatever may have been our personal sympathies, we demanded peace and determined to avoid every act and expression that threatened peace. Christianity we felt was opposed to war, and the choice between war and Christianity seemed absolute.

But I do not need to dwell upon the bitterness of the awakening. Our eyes were gradually cleared to see the real meaning of the war. At last we were forced to realize that whatever may have been the occasions of the conflict, its fundamental causes involved us as truly as any other nation. And with this awakening came fundamental questions which continue to present themselves, much to the disturbance of those souls which dislike to look at humanity as it is; for these fundamental questions focus in the challenge war makes to religion.

I

The conventional opinion of the relation of religion and war is that of antagonism. The awfulness of the one and the hopes of the other, once set over against each other, appear irreconcilable. It follows that the conventional opinion is apt to hold that the spread of religion would develop such hostility to war as to make universal peace a certianty.

But unfortunately the actual facts of human experience do not justify this opinion. Before it could be true, conceptions of religion which have been dominant must needs be materially changed. As a matter of fact, none of the great religions has been in practice frankly antimilitaristic. As a rule religion has always been a supporter of the warrior and has never been filled with a moral power sufficient to make war impossible.

It needs no argument to show that ancient religions were militaristic. Jahweh of the Hebrews was the God of battles who taught his followers the use of the bow and the chariot, and who was expected to fight with his people's armies. There are no more terrible stories in history than those which describe the treatment of the Canaanites by the followers of Jahweh. But in this the Hebrew religion was at one with other religions. Polytheism always had its god of war or its goddess of savagery, and one of the chief duties of the representative of religion was to prepare his people for war.

This is, of course, only to say that religion has partaken of the general ethical quality of the times in which its followers have lived. The history of humanity is a succession of bloody struggles. The moral content of religion has been drawn from contemporaneous ethical ideals, and these have not been so organized as to raise the question of the justice of war as an expression of the fighting instinct of the race.

When one looks for the causes of wars he finds religion oftentimes among the most potent. Mohammedanism has notoriously been a military religion, but it would not be safe to say in this particular that it has been any more pronouncedly militaristic than Christianity itself with its crusades and wars of religion.

This fact, when once analyzed, is seen to mean that religions have always failed to deal directly with the fundamental causes of wars. It goes without saying that unless the crises which have led to wars shall in the future be dominated by moral vision and idealism sufficient to bring about international adjustments through arbitration and mutual compromise, wars are inevitable.

To make this thesis more intelligible, let us ask the question: From what motives have wars sprung?

The wars of the ancient world were in most cases those of unashamed desire for conquest. That this desire had its unrecognized origins may be true. Those who see only economic determinism in human affairs posit for all social action some economic force which in turn rests on geographical foundations. And there is, of course, a large element of truth in such a contention. If we recall the turbulent course of history in the Western world, it is easy to see that the desire to trade with or to control the trade of other nations has led to war. Commercial expansion can be discovered in the struggles between the Greek cities inaugurated by Pericles. Doubtless, if we were better informed as to the century-long conflict waged between the nations of the Nile and the Mesopotamian valleys, similar causes might be found at work there. But in the consciousness of these ancient states such economic motives were secondary to the primary desire of conquest. For

conquest brought booty and slaves and tribute. To fight was the one way of expanding the income and the territory of the state. As one traces the rise of the ancient empires the conviction grows that the ambition for mastery led to vast wars of conquest. Powerful nations like Egypt and Assyria wished to subdue the land that lay between them and ultimately one another. These ancient wars fill the pages of the Old Testament. The Hebrew invaders of Canaan were primarily conquerors, who by force of arms took over a land flowing with milk and honey. The ruthless armies which swept down from the north and up from the south were primarily concerned in the building up of huge empires, within which there should be subject-cities and people. There is little evidence that Assyria or Egypt sought to control foreign markets, for commerce had not reached the development of modern times. The world was not industrial. The forces of production were very partially developed, and war sprang from primitive instincts rather than from economic policy.

The same is true of the wars between Persia and Greece. Persia wanted to expand her power and rule the world. Greece refused to be submerged, and the Persian wars, which forever put an end to Persian ambitions and delivered Greece from fear of the Orient, were due to no clearly discoverable commercial policy on the part of either of the two parties. Alexander, it is true, had Napoleonic plans for world-empire but died before he had transformed his newly acquired divinity into economic policy.

Similarly when Rome fought for supremacy in the Mediterranean basin. Its one great rival, Carthage, was a commercial city, but Rome had no commerce to be protected or extended. The issue was one for supremacy rather than for markets. The Roman Empire was born of a Nietzschean will-to-power.

The wars of the early Middle Ages were largely fought for the purpose of extending feudal states. It is not until the social forces began the organization of modern nations that wars were fought primarily for commercial ends. And even then the economic motives outside of that of possession of more territory were often not paramount. Lords fought lords and kings fought kings to gain new territories and extend their power. The long wars between France and England increasingly involved economic conditions, but the dynastic claims were especially potent.

With the dawn of the era when new continents were to be pre-empted the motives of nations became increasingly economic. Possibilities of trade with India led to international struggles, while the enormous wealth of South American mines and the vast opportunities for colonization offered by North America became increasingly significant causes of the wars which all but wrecked Europe before and after that mad epoch known as the Thirty Years' War.

But it was not until the industrial age fairly opened in the eighteenth century and nations were forced to find new markets for their rapidly increasing products that economic policy became militaristic. Imperialistic motives, particularly in the development of Great Britain and acutely in the career of Napoleon, were present; but the new nations, though fighting like the ancient

cities for territory and subjects, increasingly sought for economic supremacy. Modern wars have been very largely economic. Some nation has possessed the supply of raw materials which another nation lacked, wanted, and determined to have to perfect the interests of its industrial development. Nations that would be commercial lacked harbors and struggled for access to the sea. The rapidly narrowing opportunity for colonization incited nations to fight other nations for the control of land as yet unappropriated by European states. Modern wars are born both of a desire for immediate expansion of territory and for the control of world-markets. The great nations which have harbors and colonies have been increasingly anxious for peace, while nations like Russia and Germany, which lacked one or the other, or both, maintained war as a part of the national policy. Commercial expansion was to be forced by arms. The German's demand for a place in the sun is traceable in no small degree to a belief that political supremacy is necessary for commercial expansion. To Germany, as to Assyria and Ghengis Kahn, war is not a thing to be avoided, but to be expected, planned for, and declared whenever time seems favorable. Germanic patriotism includes and justifies this fearful purpose.

In our modern world there exist two views regarding war as a phase of patriotism. The one set forth in the past by world-conquerors of Asia and Europe and today by the German publicists, philosophers, and statesmen; the other that set forth by France, Great Britain, and the United States. In measuring the moral values of these two attitudes of mind it is not enough to say that the one is the expression of a growing state and the other the expression of a social mind of nations who have sufficient territory and commercial opportunity. The deeper question arises, Why, taking the world as it was shaped in the beginning of the twentieth century, was it necessary for one nation to expand at the expense of another? Granting, as we must, that economic expansion in the past has been justified by war and sanctified by religion, is there ground to argue that this must always be the case? In a modern world must commercial expansion be dependent upon military expansion, and must Christianity as a group attitude always leave the relations of nations to be settled by force? The history of Germany is the answer of the German philosophy of war. Leaders of German religious thought in published manifestoes have justified such an answer. True, the trade of Germany expanded enormously without appeal to military coercion. Its fleets were upon every sea, its merchants were in every port. There was no let or hindrance offered by any state to this expansion. Its trade with its rivals was enormous and was enriching all parties. The freedom of the seas was absolute. The passage of goods upon the land was unrestricted. If the history of the generation which made modern Europe shows anything it shows that governmental assistance to trade, with its consequent development, was independent of military forces. The war that broke out in 1914 had, it is true, economic motives, but it was not born of simple economic necessity. The trade of Germany would have been assured if there

had been no millions in arms. Deep, therefore, beneath the present world-conflict lie two different social philosophies and two conceptions of morality. On the one hand is the state philosophy which demands political control through military power and a religion that worships a German God of battles; on the other is the philosophy that seeks commercial development through the maintenance of peace, and an attempt, imperfect though it is, to apply Christian ideals to international relations.

Such a contrast, events have shown, involves not merely the policy of governments. It is the expression of the mind also of peoples. It embodies two conceptions of patriotism and religion. Germany, seeking commercial expansion through war, has trained its citizens —90 per cent of whom must always be subjects of a ruling tenth—to accept its philosophy and to identify national interests with militaristic policy. Democracies have trained their citizenship to a belief that the economic and the social welfare of a nation is to be reached through non-militaristic policies. If patriotism be a loyalty to a nation's ideals, we have, as has already been pointed out, two different qualities of patriotism, two different conceptions of the relation of religion to national policies.

II

The champions of the militaristic patriotism are not without argument. They have the alleged law of biological necessity. They have the history of the past with its great empires of the East, of Alexander, and of Rome. If social evolution has within it no idealistic creative power, if humanity is to be developed by rigorous determinism of inherited conditions and by the apotheosis of animal evolution, it is indeed hard to see why war is not to be inevitable and permanent.

The justification of war can use still other arguments. War certainly brings group solidarity, both for the group itself and for its individuals. The mere aggregation of numbers under a common discipline and for a common end has been of no small value. Practically all the modern nations have come into being through war. Humanity has always yielded to the enormous unifying power which lies in a socialized hatred. If you can get men to hate together they will act together. A nation's hatred reaches down into individuals, and every citizen finds himself possessed of a desire to injure those who have been declared to be the nation's enemies. Patriotism becomes a socialized hatred that unites as it maddens an entire people to fight for national goals.

Furthermore, we need no Bernhardi to point out that war has inspired nations to common sacrifice and to bravery in defense of what is regarded as a supremely important common good. One may even go farther and say that it is not impossible that war has stimulated moral attitudes. Few modern nations have entered war without an appeal to noble sentiments and the protestation of loyalty to noble ideals. Out from such an attitude of mind have come noble examples of individual and social sacrifice, and human hearts have been melted together by the fires of common agony. Our poetry is filled with war songs, and political leaders have very generally been soldiers.

But if war is thus not without its arguments, over against them must be others which modify the conclusions which have been drawn in favor of war. Not only does war plunge human life into abysmal misery—fathers and mothers weeping for their children and refusing to be comforted—out from the acute hatreds of war have come persistent hatreds which have perverted the relations of nations and have incalculably hindered the development of the finer things of life. Individualism has been lost in military organization; injury to nations and to individuals has been not only economic but moral; unworthy ambitions have been given new life; and social reforms have been obscured or abandoned because of military necessity. If it be true, as must be admitted, that out from war has come renewed confidence in immortality and in God, it must also be admitted that just as truly out from war has come a lowering of moral habits, the loss of momentum in social reform, a brutalizing of the thought of God, and a carelessness in the recognition of human rights.

How can those holding such divergent patriotisms profess the same religion?

In answering such a supreme question it is necessary first of all to look at facts rather than ideals. And the answer here is the same in the case of Christian as in that of non-Christian peoples. Christianity, like the religions of Assyria, Egypt, Judea, Greece, Rome, and Arabia, has been the servant and defender of war. Of course, such an answer is dependent upon our view as to what Christianity as an ideal religious system is. But such a Christianity never existed any more than the Republic of Plato existed. In this sense is there truth in the cynical apothegm that Christianity has not failed, because it never has been true. Christianity as a historical phenomenon is the religion of Christians, an actual social phenomenon; the mass of experiences, thoughts, institutions, and teachings of a social group. It is not what it ought to be, but what it has been and is becoming. And this church-Christianity has never been the religion of Jesus. It has had the gospel about Jesus, but it has minimized the gospel of Jesus.

According to the authoritative formulas of Christian groups, religious faith consists in the acceptance of certain truths as expressed in creeds, confessions, and rites. Every ecclesiastical orthodoxy has been developed in large measure outside the area of morality. The Apostles' Creed, for example, has within it no reference to morality. It sets forth certain things about God, about Christ, about the church, about the forgiveness of sins, about the Second Coming of Christ, and about the world to come. There is in it no reference to human relations, the need of love, the sinfulness of injuring one's neighbor. So far as the Apostles' Creed, the foundation of all orthodoxy, is concerned, the Sermon on the Mount is nonexistent. The more elaborate creeds of the Catholic church, those of Nicea and Chalcedon, introduce morals no more than does the Apostles' Creed. The Athanasian Creed puts the matter sharply: to believe in the Trinity, in the two natures of the Christ, is to be saved; to doubt them is to be lost. Even the doctrine of original sin, as organized by Augustine and embodied in practically the whole mass of Christian

theology, gets its moral element from the sin of Adam, which has corrupted human nature so that every person is born not only sinful but damned. It is true that some are elected by God for his own good pleasure, from this *massa damnosa*, as the theologians called humanity, but this election is explicitly said to be wholly outside the region of human morality. Arminianism, it is true, recognizes that God's election is conditioned by his foreknowledge of men's faith, but this faith is still largely assent to metaphysical and eschatological propositions.

It is not difficult, therefore, to see why Christianity thus conceived has never included opposition to war. To it war is in an entirely different area from that of religion. Combatants can pray to God for victory, but their salvation from hell is not determined by any moral attitude of their own. Although a church may be a phase of international life, religion itself has not been primarily, if, indeed, secondarily, concerned with the application of the principles of Jesus to the activities of social groups. Men have fought for their faith, but their faith has not kept them from fighting.

It is no accident, therefore, that ecclesiastically orthodox Christians have waged war consistently and almost continuously. There was nothing in their operating religion really to prevent fighting. When men like Francis of Assisi undertook to apply the moral principles of Jesus to life, their efforts involved the taking of individuals out from the social group. With St. Francis, those who sought to reproduce within themselves the life of Christ did so by withdrawing from the world, taking on the social attitude of beggary and the intermediate activity of charity.

A second interpretation of Christianity is the precise opposite of this ecclesiastical orthodoxy of other-worldliness. The followers of John Fox and Menno have emphasized mystical elements in religion, and in their morality have sought to produce an other-worldliness which, based upon certain of the teachings of Jesus regarding the state, elevated nonresistance to a moral imperative. The effect of such a view of Christianity as this has been to produce a quality of soul that is among our noblest inheritances. In the effort of the Society of Friends to follow the guidance of the Spirit we see a sincere and beautiful expression of the Christian spirit. They have endured the oppression of their enemies in the spirit of foregiveness, and they have given to the world noble lessons in peace of soul and simple faith in a God who is not far away, but present in the believer's heart.

Such an attitude of mind has always been hostile to war. The Quaker has consistently followed his conscience and the inner light in refusing to participate in war, though he has not refused to be a good citizen, and during war he has not hesitated to endure danger in the service of his fellows.

On March 29, 1918, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends issued this noteworthy statement:

> The basis of our opposition to war is much more than any single command of the Old or the New Testament. It is our faith that the way of love by which our Master, Jesus Christ, met and conquered evil remains for His followers today the true method of combating wrong. For us,

as for Him, this involves refusal to use means which, like war, violate love and defeat its ends; but it does not mean a weak neutrality toward evil. For us, as for Him, it means a life of action devoted to the heroic purpose of overcoming evil with good. The unspeakable sufferings of humanity are now calling us and all men to larger sacrifices and more earnest endeavors to put this faith into practice. To such endeavors we dedicate ourselves.

In accordance with this faith, we desire to maintain all our relationships today.

To our beloved country, we affirm the deep loyalty of grateful hearts. We long to help her realize her noblest capacities as a great Republic dedicated to liberty and democracy. But we believe that we best serve our country and all humanity when we maintain that religion and conscience are superior even to the state.

To President Wilson, we declare our appreciation of his steadfast and courageous efforts to keep the aims of the United States in this great conflict liberal, disinterested, and righteous.

To our fellow-countrymen, who are following the leadings of conscience into ways where we cannot be their comrades, we give assurance of respect and sympathy in all that they endure. Finally,

For all men, whether they be called our enemies or not, we pray that the sacrificial love of Christ, stirring us to repentance, may reconcile and unite all mankind in the brotherhood of His spirit.

If the religion of the Quakers had become the religion of the world, war would have ceased. But it has not become the religion of the world or even of an appreciable section of the world. Personally I believe it is in its moral idealism nearer the spirit of Jesus than is ecclesiastical orthodoxy, but the question that confronts us is not one of ideals or theories but of actual social attitudes and tendencies. Whatever may be our individual convictions, in the realm of actual conduct we are dealing with organized social groups controlled by socialized passions, convictions, and principles of conduct.

III

The pacifist claims that war is un-Christian and that he is the true representative of Christianity. Because of this belief he refuses to engage in the present war, undertakes to oppose preparation for war, often attempts to induce men to avoid draft, and attacks all forms of military preparation for the purpose of national defense.

Speaking generally, this pacifism, other than Quaker or Mennonite, takes two forms. There is first that of those who do not believe in human progress and who hold tenaciously and sometimes joyously to the belief that the world is growing worse. They reproduce the early Christian expectation of the speedy return of Jesus from heaven and the imminent end of the world, and consistently urge that the true Christian awaits a great cataclysm due to the intervention of supernatural and miraculous persons. Why then fight? Periods of war have always given rise to some form of this belief in supernatural intervention, and at the present time the churches of America are dangerously full of this expectation. To an extent unbelievable by those who are out of touch with the situation religious leaders are going about the country announcing the approaching end of the world and calling upon people to await the millennium and the day of judgment. Prophetic conferences are being held in the

larger cities, and throughout the country districts itinerant evangelists are foretelling the imminent return of Jesus from the heavens. The motives of these evangelists undoubtedly vary. Some are certainly sincere in their naïve centering of Christianity upon the Second Coming of Christ. Others are so hostile to the present policies of the government as to have been subject to investigation on the part of the federal government. But whatever may be the particular type of doctrine, the common element in all such beliefs is that history contains no hope and must come to an end. Fantastic expositions of Scripture find in the Book of Revelation the number of the Kaiser, identify him with the anti-Christ, discover prophecies of tanks in the Prophets and dates when the war will end in Daniel and the Revelation, urge the church to await the miraculous disappearance of saints into heavenly "rapture," foretell a period of misery in which forces of evil are to be for a time triumphant, although in the end they are to be conquered by Christ and the angels.

Evidence is at hand to show that the effect of such teaching is in many cases a refusal on the part of its followers to share in national burdens, either of military service or of financial support of the government, or even in the work of the Red Cross. Its champions, whether intentionally or not, are disloyal, because they sap the springs of national courage and make unintelligible prophesying superior to devotion to national well-being.

The other type of pacifism is of a higher character. It looks to no miraculous end of the world, but rather to the operation of nonresistance not unlike that of the Society of Friends or the Mennonites. Its champions, however, as a rule do not belong to either society. Few of them are orthodox, many of them are radical in their theology. Like Tolstoi, they are dominated by a conception of Christianity gained by neglecting the historical inheritances in our religion and by generalizing certain of the sayings of Jesus, like "resist not evil." The position which these pacifists take is in effect that the refusal on the part of a nation to defend itself against the aggression of a nation would tend to mitigate that other nation's aggressiveness and shame it into peace. They recall Christ's words about turning the other cheek, but overlook the social philosophy involved in his saying that those who take the sword shall perish by the sword. A distinguished representative of this point of view was recently asked as to how it could be harmonized with the treatment accorded by the Germans to Russia after the refusal of the Bolsheviki to engage further in war. Her answer was in effect that if the propaganda of the Bolsheviki had not been checked among the German soldiers, peace would have come.

Far be it from me to question the moral sincerity of these high-minded but unpractical souls. But sincerity is not synonymous with wisdom. Good people frequently lack good sense. The difficulty with these particular good people is twofold: in the first place they overestimate the power of moral ideals to determine the action of a nation that, like Germany, has organized itself for war and has justified itself by an un-Christian philosophy in its pursuance of

war as a means of national development; and in the second place they have an abstract view of morality. To them ideals exist apart from concrete human experience. The actual forces of social evolution are neglected and moral imperatives are judged with no regard to the progress and impulses of men who are subject to the forces of social evolution. And this amounts to a misinterpretation of Christianity itself.

Christianity as a religion is not to be described by making an anthology of the words of Jesus. It is the actual reaction of individuals and groups to these ideals. Christianity is a social movement partly expressed and partly not expressed by the churches. Its center is not to be found in this or that apothegm of Jesus, but in the spiritual sympathies and tendencies of social groups. The moral values which go to make up the ideals of these groups are never absolute but always relative. The present issue is not between nations equally ready to be shown the way to giving justice, but between nations one group of which is following Caesar and the other of which is defending institutions embodying a developing appreciation of the ideals which Jesus set forth.

The fundamental principle of Jesus is love, not the particular application made of this love to the duties of those preaching love. The sayings of Jesus dealing with nonresistance were never brought into the political field. They were intended by him to direct the action of his followers in putting the principle of love into operation. When his disciples went forth to preach the triumph of human brotherhood they would be setting forth ideals which interfered with certain privileges and customs and institutions of the world in which they lived. They would undoubtedly meet with persecution. They were not to undertake to convert men to love by appeal to force, nor were they to seek to revenge themselves upon their persecutors. All this is beyond question the true attitude of the Christian. You cannot make men brotherly by terrorization, neither can you spread the principle of love by hatred and vengeance.

Even in the larger field of national life this is true. The enforced Christianization of heathen tribes, like that of the Saxons of Charlemagne and the Prussians by the Teutonic knights, has not served to develop the moral impulses that have sprung from the work of modern foreign missions. A complete appraisal of German Christianity cannot overlook the effect of the brutality that attended the conversion of the tribes that have united in the German people.

Back of any specific application is the principle of love itself. Love is a way of treating other people. It is not a formula but a concrete morality. In the case of individuals it involves much more than good nature or submission to injustice. We recognize this in civil affairs, and laws are a more or less successful attempt to organize social action in accord with the principle formulated by Kant: "Act so as to use humanity whether in your own person or in the person of another, always as an end, never as a means." Obviously the moral problems set a community that endeavors to put the principle of brotherhood into operation are vastly more complicated than the pacifist chooses to see. The development of civilization

proceeds gradually, by the embodiment of ideals in human institutions. These institutions which guarantee personal liberty, the right of initiative, democracy in the sense of a people's right to control its own affairs, exist as an exceedingly precious heritage for succeeding generations. They must be preserved if humanity is to be preserved. To submit passively to their destruction is a violation of the fundamental principle of brotherhood. Society recognizes this clearly enough in its attempt to protect itself from evil-minded men, like thieves, adulterers, and oppressors of their kind. The decision as to whether a citizen shall undertake such protection is not the question of individual likes and dislikes but of social obligation. The fact that as human society grows more responsive to ideals of justice and fraternity the protection of these institutions of human welfare becomes increasingly conventional and so less in need of reliance upon force serves only to obscure the fundamental necessity of a society's being able to offer protection to its members and successors if institutions born of justice are endangered. A refusal to undertake the duty of guaranteeing such protection, whatever may be its alleged ethical justification, is in reality an antifraternal act. While we must oppose every illegitimate appeal to force, all unintelligent treatment of criminals, the hideousness of mob violence, and the excesses of punitive justice, the basic fact still remains: love must protect institutions which embody and preserve its own progress. When a nation that despises love as effeminacy and honors the "will to power" attacks those institutions there is only one duty before nations who love peace. They must exhaust all efforts to settle international difficulties by arbitration and moral appeal; but if these fail they must protect justice and liberty by force. To do otherwise would be disloyalty to the heritage of justice and liberty.

If we would apply the teaching of Jesus to national action we must hold fast to the principle of good neighborliness. It is not always safe to build hypotheses around a parable, but at least it is as legitimate as are some interpretations to which the parables have been subjected. But let us suppose the Good Samaritan had arrived while the robbers were attacking their victim. What should he have done to merit the approval of Jesus? In the first place, he might have done nothing. His interest might have been highly scientific. He might have watched the technique of the robbers, the way in which they stripped their victim, the way in which they disappeared. If he had been thoroughly modern he might then have made a study of their thumb marks so as to be able to identify the perpetrators of similar robberies in the future. Then after he had taken the necessary notes he might have cared for the wounded. Can anyone hold that this would be an application of the principle of neighborliness? Would scientific interest in robbery justify a refusal to defend the robbed?

Or the Good Samaritan, when he came upon the traveler struggling with the robbers, might have said to himself, "Here is a providential opportunity to recoup myself from various losses in business." And so he might have taken

the traveler's baggage and the robbers' baggage and gone on his way to Jericho. Would Jesus have told the lawyer to go and do likewise?

Or he might have said, "This is a moment to call a conference which shall vote measures that shall so police the road from Jerusalem to Jericho that there shall be no robbers." Would such action, necessary as it might be at other times, have been the true expression of neighborliness?

Or the Good Samaritan might have said, "This is certainly a sad occasion, but my obligation as a Good Samaritan is one of amelioration. I will therefore find a shady place where I may wait until the robbers finish their work, and then I shall be ready to care for the wounded man and perform the other duties which are expected of Good Samaritans." Can any sane man think that Jesus would have advised such conduct? Would not the very principle of love and desire to help a man in sorrow, the very spirit of Calvary itself, have induced this man to help the unfortunate traveler defend himself?

Let us get this principle of sacrificial social-mindedness clear. Once grasped the method in which it is expressed is a matter of intelligence. Love is not to be limited to Red Cross service. Such sacrificial social-mindedness as the Good Samaritan might have exhibited is not militarism. Just how far we should interfere in other people's quarrels, how far we should use our resources to protect the defenseless, how far we should undertake to erect proper social defenses which would make good Samaritans unnecessary, must be left to the wisdom which our trained experts may show us. But no man is a Christian who believes that anything injurious is right. No man has the spirit of Christ who is content to permit wrong to live quietly.

Personal comfort, life itself, is as nothing compared with the giving of justice, for which Jesus himself died. So in the case of a nation that sees the world and itself attacked by another nation bent upon terrorizing its neighbors and the destruction of the most precious institutions of civilization. Pacifism under such circumstances is misguided idealism if not transcendentalized selfishness. The duty which a nation owes to its world as well as to itself and its future compels it to protect its institutions and its very existence against the assault of a national highwayman.

That is the real spirit with which Christians must approach the question of war. War born of a perverted patriotism, war for the sake of national aggrandizement at the expense of other nations, is un-Christian, no matter how much it may be camouflaged under appeals to the God of Gideon and of David. The very essence of a Christian patriotism is the defense, not of national institutions as such, but of institutions which are potentially if not actually Christian. Love, which is the heart of the Christian message, cannot permit a nation or an individual to remain passive while the well being of others is endangered. The highest sacrifice which love demands is a frank recognition of the necessity of abandoning the ideals of peace because peace involves sufferings to others. The true Christian patriot at the present time is in fact

saying to certain ideals, "You must for the moment retire from the scene. I have a desperately nasty mess to clean up. I am not responsible for the situation, but it is a choice between defending institutions which guarantee your existence or permitting those institutions to go down to destruction." And my own conviction is clear that such self-sacrifice in the interest of making permanent the achievement of ideals is the most idealistic service a man or a nation can render the world.

IV

Ideals work when they draw men to themselves. But such approach is registered not in abstract theories, but in social accomplishment. To protect such accomplishment in the interest of the still more complete embodiment of ideals is loyalty, not only to a nation but to one's religion. In such a situation a moral patriotism looks to religion not like a monarch who seeks to exploit God in order to justify his own ambition. Rather does it seek inspiration for a service which gets its value, not merely from loyalty to a nation, but from a loyalty to a nation self-consecrated to humanity. It is this sort of patriotism that we dare call Christian. "We hope," a well-intended body of Christians once said to Mr. Lincoln, "that God is on our side." "I am not much concerned," said Mr. Lincoln, "to know whether God is on our side. What I want to know is whether we are on God's side." With this desire that American patriotism may now face its terrible task, we pray for the victory of our arms, not because we demand that God shall give victory to our country whether we are right or wrong, but because we are convinced that the cause for which we struggle is more precious than a peace bought at the expense of the world's welfare; that the cause for which we fight is God's cause as we know it, revealed both in the life and ideals of Jesus and in the unmistakable tendencies of social evolution.

A religion which will keep its followers from committing themselves to the direction of such patriotism is either too aesthetic for humanity's actual needs, too individualistic to be social, or too disloyal to be tolerated.

GERMAN FREEDOM

D. D. LUCKENBILL, PH.D.
University of Chicago

If the war did nothing more than make us appreciate what liberties are enjoyed by democracies, it would not have been in vain. We have been taught to believe that Germany was the only place in which real freedom of speech and thought was permitted. We now know at what point such freedom is stopped and the point where public opinion and public action are effective. Beyond such a point men must think and speak as they may chance to be permitted. Dr. Luckenbill's article, drawn to so large an extent from his own experience, ought to help its readers see that real freedom of thought lies between speculation unverifiable by facts, and state control.

Even those whose acquaintance with German literature is by no means intimate will have little difficulty in recalling numerous passages giving glowing descriptions of or apostrophizing *die deutsche Freiheit*. On the other hand, to the average American tourist Germany is a land flowing with *Verboten!* and *Strengst verboten!* signs. Obviously, thinks he whose knowledge of Germany and the Germans has come through both of these channels—literature and travel—freedom is an ideal toward which the German people are pushing, not something which they are now enjoying. I thought so, and when a student in Germany I thought so "out loud." The result was surprising and somewhat disconcerting, for I discovered that it is in the United States and not in Germany that freedom's wings are clipped. If *Verboten* and Germany are synonymous terms to the American, it is equally true that the two compounds "skyscraper" (*Wolkenkratzer*) and "blue laws" characterize the United States in the eyes of most Germans. Our dry legislation, Sunday closing laws, and other "puritanical" attempts at violating the sanctity of "personal liberty" hold as prominent a place in German as in German-American discussion. "A free country! Ha! Ha! in which one is told what he may and may not drink!" Insist, as I did, that America is really a "land of liberty" and the educated German will give you a lecture on trusts and the lynching evil. Indeed this sort of talk has long since become stereotyped. Those who took time to read any of the pro-German pamphlets which were circulated in our country prior to our entrance into the great world-struggle may remember that the German virtues and German freedom were often set into bolder relief by contrasting them with some of the faults inherent in democracy, faults which we were urged not to overlook.

But if Germany and the Germans at peace were an enigma to us Americans, at war they have become the riddle of the ages. How can intelligent humans stand for the Kaiser, militarism, and the things to which these have led? The answers to this question are legion.

However, it seems to me that none is so wide of the mark as that which makes "higher criticism" the spring of our modern woes unnumbered. That terrible monster, we are to believe, has undermined faith in the Bible in Germany. Further search for the cause of the collapse of German morality and ethics is unnecessary. We may safely assume that those who have put forth this explanation are unacquainted with the church situation in Germany as well as with the obstacles encountered there by those who have attempted to disseminate the results of a scientific study of the Bible. The Kaiser's almost daily assurances to his people that God is marching at the side of the German armies do not point to an undermined faith in God and the Bible. The most orthodox, some of us would prefer to say reactionary, churches in America are the German bodies. The most vigorous arraignment of the higher critics that I have ever listened to was delivered from a German pulpit in this country. However, the history of biblical criticism and its struggle for a hearing in Germany have recently been discussed by Mr. Wallis in the *Biblical World* (July, pp. 41 f.), which means that my task has been considerably lightened. And that task as I have set it for myself is to point out the one great barrier in the way of liberal thinking, of freedom, in Germany, whether in religion, in education, or in politics. Since so much of what I shall have to say consists of things I saw and heard during a brief summer's residence as a student at the University of Berlin, a few "personal" remarks may not be out of place.

My paternal ancestors left the Rhineland and settled in America some fifty years before the Revolution. It may, therefore, be taken for granted that my visit to a German university was not due to any lingering loyalty to the Fatherland. I went to Germany, not from any sentimental reasons, but merely because it was the proper thing to do in preparation for a teaching career. As the result of a somewhat exceptional early training, I took with me a more intimate acquaintance with the German language and literature than most students bring back with them even after several years of residence abroad. "Mixing" with the Germans was a comparatively easy matter for me. My relations with the professors and students at the University of Berlin were far more pleasant than I had anticipated, far more pleasant, indeed, than I deserved in view of my frank criticisms of almost everything German. To say that I was not benefited by contact with some of the world's foremost authorities in biblical science, ancient languages, and history, would not only be ungrateful but untrue. But the German people, their schools and churches, in particular their politics, soon became my absorbing interest.

That the civil and university authorities should insist on knowing whether I was a Catholic, an Evangelical, or a Jew did not surprise me—they had asked so many other questions before they came to this. But that this should be about the first bit of personal information desired of me when I tried to open up an acquaintanceship with a German did puzzle me. Later I found out that politics and religion were very closely

related and that it was not an easy matter to be on intimate terms with a man until you had him classified as to these.

My landlady's husband was an interior decorator, a widely read and a most intelligent man: also a Social Democrat. I got to know this man rather intimately. With him I attended Catholic, Evangelical, and Jewish services. But politics and political meetings were his specialty. Through my acquaintance with this man and our perambulations I got more first-hand information as to the working of the German mind, the official mind in particular, than I could have gained from a dozen volumes. This man, like the large majority of Social Democrats, was quite sure that the church, more particularly the Prussian state church, was the instrument used by the aristocracy to keep the common herd in ignorance and subjection. I had previously found out that the payment of the taxes levied for the support of the state church was entirely voluntary, so I told my friend that I assumed that he made no free-will offerings to the church. "Yes, indeed, I do; it's advisable." I learned as time went on that the Germans do a great many things "voluntarily." Again a number of remarks I have read in the pro-German propaganda come to mind, but I pass these by in favor of an extract from a memorial presented to the State Department in Washington on January 20, 1917. The document is an answer to the protests which reached Berlin in the matter of the deportation of the Belgians. After pointing out that the British blockade is the cause of all of the suffering in Belgium, the paper goes on to say that "before they [the ordinances of deportation] are applied the unemployed are given opportunity to enter of their own will into remunerative labor contracts, and coercive measures are resorted to only in cases of obstinate refusal." No doubt this sounds all right to the official German mind. To us it would be humorous if it were not so pathetic.

At first I was surprised at the freedom with which I could discuss matters of religion and politics with the Germans. Not even the subject of the Kaiser and his antics seemed taboo. Only after I had heard the story of *das Brandenburger Thor* and *der Brandenburger Thor* and a few others like it a dozen times from as many people did I discover that certain anecdotes, whose telling I was sure would bring the charge of lèse majesté, were quite *en règle*. Like the Ford stories in this country, they were apparently gracefully accepted as a tribute to an object whose sterling qualities are universally recognized. But when I tried to come to close quarters, to have an honest opinion expressed, invariably there came furtive glances and words to the effect that it was not advisable to continue the discussion. Two words, *die Obrigkeit* and *das Militär*, I heard pronounced with "bated breath" so many times that I cannot see or hear them now without having a "creepy" feeling. One goes so far and no farther in the discussion of the German government. Let me give an illustration.

My socialist friend took me to a political meeting. It was held under the auspices of the anti-Semitic party. As its name indicates, this party stands for the suppression of the Jews. The

speaker of the evening was Graf Pückler. The audience was seated in German fashion around tables where beer was served. Back of the speaker's table were three chairs, one for the orator, the others for the chairman and secretary of the meeting. But there was also a chair at each end of the table. My friend told me to watch the occupants of these chairs. They were policemen. The one to the speaker's left took notes which went to headquarters; the one to the right merely looked important. I was informed that he was a kind of umpire; that the meeting could not open until his helmet was removed and placed on the table, and that the meeting was over the moment that helmet was placed on his head. "Keep an eye on his hand," whispered my friend.

The address took away my breath. The picturesque language I had heard from the lips of Pennsylvania German farm hands and Berlin "cabbies" was mild in comparison with the speaker's. One sentence, on which my friend said the Graf had probably practiced some twenty or more years, contained more vulgar epithets than I imagined all of the German dialects could boast of. "Surely," thought I, when the first dozen of milder terms of opprobrium were followed by some of brighter hue, "the hand of the policeman will move toward the helmet." But nothing happened. Even if I remembered the whole of that long sentence, propriety and the postal laws would forbid its repetition here. It opened with *der kleine Yakob*, and ended with *Wanzen* (bed bugs). At the end the helmet still rested on the table. I strongly suspected that the umpire would have joined in the applause had not his official position stood in the way.

The story that brought down the house, and also brought the hand down on the helmet, ran as follows: Some Jews over in Russia were having a picnic. In the evening they hired boats and were enjoying themselves on the river. They fell in with a boatload of drunken army officers who opened fire on them with their pistols. In the scramble some of the boats were upset and the occupants carried helpless downstream. A few managed to lay hold on the boat in which the officers were. But these took the oars "and cracked their skulls like nuts."

The last sentence was repeated over and over again by the speaker as a sort of refrain to the other episodes which were related. The speaker now left the Russian Jews and began talking about those in Germany. As he warmed up, I noticed the fingers of the umpire drumming on the table alongside the helmet. But the chairman of the meeting saw it before I did, and immediately laid hold of the right coat-tail of the speaker, who broke off his sentence in the middle and started on another tack. But he was soon on thin ice again (I hope I am not getting my figures mixed), and this time the aid of the secretary was called for. Vigorous attacks on both coat-tails were needed to bring the speaker to his senses; and the hand had almost reached the helmet. What finally brought the hand to the helmet and the helmet to the head were words to this effect: "Why do we continue to suffer at the hands of these miserable money-lenders? Is it not because our princes need money and are willing

to . . . ." But the sentence was not finished.

Not all German meetings and addresses are as exciting as this one was. What changes the war may have brought about I do not know, but Germany before the war was full of parties. Witness the anti-Semitic party whose one-plank platform called for the abolition of "little Jacob." Meetings were being held all the time. New York's east side soap-box oratory could not hold a candle to many of the speeches delivered at these meetings. Free speech in Germany? So I have been informed by pro-German propagandists in America, but my Social Democrat friend was not deceived. He told me it was perfectly safe to talk until you were blue in the face, that you might use all the words in your vocabulary; if you were an Evangelical you were free to wipe up the earth (figuratively) with the Jews and Catholics, and vice versa, but —*aber!*— when you got around to criticizing the Kaiser and the government the helmet adjourned the meeting. The Centrists (Catholics), said my friend, control just about half of the votes in the Reichstag and these are always cast *en bloc*. Over against this solid front stands a hopelessly divided opposition. I haven't time to discuss this point, but I became convinced by what I then saw and have been able to learn since that the Kaiser, like the Austrian emperor, divides and rules.

Most of us Americans have known only the quietly plodding, unexcitable German who has made his home in our country. Few of us, before the war, could have imagined a German getting excited over anything. And yet Germany has been stirred from end to end for a year or two at a time by things which would never get on the front page of our newspapers. Take, for example, the "Babel-Bibel" controversy.

On January 13, 1902, Professor Friedrich Delitzsch, the eminent Assyriologist of the University of Berlin, delivered a lecture before the members of the German Oriental Society in the presence of the Kaiser and members of the court. At the Kaiser's request the lecture was repeated on February 1, following, in the royal palace. The lecture set forth the close relationship between the results of cuneiform research and the Bible, and was fittingly called "Babel und Bibel," that is "Babel (Babylonia), the interpreter and illustrator of the Bible." No doubt Delitzsch overstated the Babylonian side of the case, but the discussion would have remained an academic contest had not a second lecture followed about a year after the first. The Kaiser was again present. With this lecture the real storm broke forth.

Professor Delitzsch told his audience that he avoided using the word "corroboration," for "the Old Testament would be badly served as a source of ancient history if it needed corroboration at every turn by the cuneiform monuments." In speaking of the difficulties which Assyriology has with many newly discovered texts "full of rare words and modes of speech," he said: "One perceives in this how fatal a mistake it has been for modern exegesis to quibble about such rare words and difficult passages [in the Old Testament], to 'emend' them and only too often to substitute platitude." Orthodoxy

would have showered blessings upon the professor's head but for the following:

> Revelation indeed! A greater mistake on the part of the human mind can hardly be conceived than this, that for long centuries the priceless remains of the old Hebrew literature collected in the Old Testament were regarded collectively as a religious canon, a revealed book of religion, in spite of the fact that it includes such literature as the Book of Job, which with words that in places border on blasphemy casts doubt on the very existence of a just God, together with absolutely secular productions such as wedding songs (the so-called Song of Solomon). . . . . To be quite frank, beyond the revelation of God that we, each one of us, carry in our own conscience, we have certainly not deserved a further personal divine revelation.

In a little over a year a hundred thousand copies of these lectures were spread over Germany, while more than eighty pamphlets of considerable size had appeared, together with countless magazine and newspaper articles. "Babel-Bibel" was on the tongue of everybody. The church became alarmed and preachers answered Delitzsch from the pulpit or in the church papers. In the summer of 1905 my Social Democrat friend was still reading this literature, while at the "pension" Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* had to be content with running a close second as the dinner-table topic of conversation. One of the comic newspapers protested at the advertising Berlin was receiving through "Babel-Bibel-Bebel."

The Kaiser thought it necessary to take part in the discussion. He wrote a letter to the president of the Oriental Society—a letter intended for publication, as the postscript showed. "You may make the utmost use of these lines. Let all who are interested read." A few quotations may be of interest.

> He approached the subject of revelation in a polemical tone, more or less denying it or reducing it to a matter of purely human development. That was a grave error, for thereby he touched on the innermost, holiest possession of many of his hearers.

The Kaiser then goes on to distinguish between two different kinds of revelation—

> one progressive, and, as it were, historical; the other purely religious, as preparing the way for the future Messiah. . . . . In order to lead the race forward and develop it, God reveals himself in this or that great sage, whether priest or king, whether among the heathen, the Jews, or the Christians. Hammurabi was one. So were Moses, Abraham, Homer, Charlemagne, Luther, Shakespeare, Goethe, Kant, and Kaiser Wilhelm der Grosse. . . . . The second form of revelation is that in Israel, leading up to Christ.

Professor Harnack, a colleague of Professor Delitzsch and a close personal friend of the Kaiser, felt called upon to pour oil on the troubled waters. He says the Kaiser was really compelled to call attention to the fact that he and Professor Delitzsch were not of the same opinion on points theological. From the point of view of scholars there was indeed no controversy. It had long been recognized by these that a portion of the myths and legends of the Old Testament as well as some important elements of the Israelite civilization had their origin in Babylonia. It was equally beyond question that this fact is fatal to the current notion of inspiration. But the knowledge had not

become common property. The theologians were not to blame for this. "But church and school have been in league to suppress this knowledge by excluding it from their domain." But Professor Delitzsch was hardly discreet in his choice of terms. As a result "today it is the talk of the streets that the Old Testament does not amount to much."

For the benefit of those who think the higher criticism is rampant in Germany, let me give an extract from a series of "Babel-Bibel" sermons preached by a pastor to his flock and published "by request." I give a free translation.

Since God created man after he had created everything else, the account of the creation could come only from God himself. He might have revealed this to man at some later time, but this is unlikely. Undoubtedly Adam asked God whence he came—even little children ask such questions [according to the catechism], and God then instructed Adam as far as was necessary. As to the preservation of the record: The Flood occurred about one thousand five hundred years after the creation. Now Adam lived to be almost a thousand years old and Noah was born six hundred years before the flood. Although Holy Writ does not mention the fact, undoubtedly Noah knew Adam and had ample opportunity to become acquainted with the facts of the creation.

Then follows a plea for a more childlike faith.

The results of the scientific study of the Bible have been made accessible to the average reader in Germany through numerous popular volumes. But these results are not incorporated into the religious instruction which is part of the common-school education of Germany. German school children, whether they are Catholics, Evangelicals, or Jews, receive religious instruction daily, but this instruction is as orthodox in the Evangelical as in the Catholic and Jewish classes. Besides, for every "radical" professor on the faculty of a German university there is a conservative. This is a well-known fact. And, again, you may go to hear a university professor of the radical type preach at some big city church and you would never suspect from the sermon that a radical thought had ever passed through his mind. To quote Harnack's words: "Church and school have been in league to suppress this [kind of] knowledge by excluding it from their domain." But how can a radical like Harnack continue to bask in the sunshine of the Kaiser's favor? Perhaps the Jatho and Traub cases will answer this question—and a few others.

In 1909 the new Prussian heresy law was passed (see Gates in the *American Journal of Theology*, XVI [1912], 241 f., and XVII [1913], 80 f.). Through these enactments, according to Professor Harnack, "the church of Prussia has broken with the custom of treating doctrinal error as deserving of punishment." The heretic was no longer to be treated as a criminal, but was to be removed from his position with or without a pension.

The removal of the popular pastor Jatho under this law led to a violent discussion in Germany. Protests were made on all sides. One was drawn up by three professors and signed by the laity of the church. Part of the protest

runs as follows (I quote from Dr. Gates's translation):

> Concerning the theology of Pastor Jatho we pass no judgment. What concerns us as German Protestants is the question whether the new law of doctrinal discipline shall find application or not. We hold this doctrinal discipline in the Protestant church of the present as impossible, and every attempt at its application a shock to the ecclesiastical organization of Protestantism.

Note Professor Harnack's defense of the law:

> Since the Prussian church is not fundamentally a national church, and does not include all citizens, but only those who confess a certain creed; therefore, its existence depends upon the maintenance of a creed. It owes itself the duty of protecting its creed. This task has been assigned to the Judicial Council. "But because a thing completely unprotected and at variance is worthless, therefore the protest against the Judicial Council is a mistake. To defend freedom and endanger existence is not good policy."

Germans need freedom, but it must not come at the risk of endangering the existence of the "machine."

Fuel was added to the flames when the Council took up proceedings against Pastor Traub, a friend of Jatho and his attorney before the Council. Traub's misdemeanors are summed up in a long list of attacks upon Consistories, Synods, Supreme Consistories, Royal Consistories, etc. He was dismissed without pension. Harnack again backed up the "machine." He believed that Traub was too severely punished, but "he was guilty of a serious breach of discipline and had continually overstepped the conceded rights of serious and candid criticism." Harnack is not a conservative. He goes on to say:

> Dare we treat any ancient confession of faith, with its numberless and untenable hypotheses as the Catholic church treats its "tradition"? Are we not the moment we do this already Catholic? Are we not doing it now? This is the ecclesiastical crisis of the present.

Harnack straddles the fence. Of the liberal party he says:

> We sympathize strongly and warmly with them and for them, and we sympathize most deeply with Traub, and feel ourselves smitten with him.

But

> for the exceedingly difficult position of the highest ecclesiastical authorities I have a strong and warm sympathy and feel it my duty to support them to the extent of my powers in the administration of the ecclesiastical ordinances.

Here lies the great difficulty. Men like Harnack, most educated Germans, in fact, know that more freedom in religion and politics is needed in Germany, but it never seems to have occurred to them that the way to get this freedom is by breaking down the governmental machine which stands in the way. Of course, we must remember that that machine has made modern Germany. That machine has united a host of petty states into an empire. But it rules the empire largely through keeping it divided. Only the lines of division have been drawn in different places. Germany has its higher critics, but they hold their university positions *because they support the machine.* The results of scientific study of the Bible are popularized in Germany, but religious

instruction in the public schools and the preaching from the pulpits is orthodox. If it is not, there are the new heresy laws. Germans discuss politics freely, loudly, and continuously, but they know when to stop. If they forget themselves, there is the helmet.

The Kaiser has promised Germany the world. But we ask what would this profit Germany, seeing that she has lost her soul. The Kaiser has told the Germans that they are the salt of the earth, and the Germans have been ready to believe it. But what if the salt have lost its savor? Millions of Germans know that they are not free, but they have not had the stamina to draw up their Magna Charta. Millions of Germans have known that militarism was bringing them to the verge of bankruptcy, but they have been hoping that some day it would pay its own bills. Indemnity talk is still the chief ingredient of the soothing syrups administered to a restlessly interrogative Germany. I fear Germany is going to have a headache when she wakes up. And, finally, I wonder whether the professors who did not think it good policy to gain freedom at the expense of existence will ever come to understand our inability to understand their attitude.

GOD AND THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT

REV. ROBERT A. ASHWORTH
First Baptist Church, Milwaukee, Wisconsin

While we may be too near the event intelligently to estimate the significance of the revolt of the Russian people it is apparent that, whatever reactions or checks it may suffer, the course of history in Russia has been turned into new channels. Nothing comparable to it has appeared in the world since the French Revolution of the closing years of the eighteenth century. Indeed this is more radical still, for while the French Revolution was an uprising of the bourgeoisie, the Russian revolution tapped a lower stratum and is an outbreak of the proletariat.

Yet the social ferment in Russia is only the most aggravated symptom of an infection that extends throughout the world. Just as, if modern medicine is correct in its conception of the possibility of the transmutation of bacilli, various disorders, bearing different names and of a quite dissimilar behavior, may be forms of the same infection, so the various expressions of social unrest and discontent which we see among every European people spring from the same cause. No land is immune. Austria is on the verge of revolt. Even the German people, disciplined as they are from childhood in the repression of popular feeling and almost devoid of all spontaneity and power of initiative, are showing signs, not forever to be restrained, of approaching

social upheaval. Even liberal England, France, and America herself are showing symptoms of a milder, less virulent form of infection, a sort of social varioloid, modified by a previous and preventive inoculation with the social virus. No thinking man can seriously question that we are in the midst of a social movement today more significant, more widespread, and more rapid than any other which history has recorded. Nor can anyone doubt the direction of that movement: it is toward democracy. The questionings and disquiet, even the violence, much of it, that accompany that movement are signs, not of social disease, but of new social health. Beneath the dark clouds of war there is a glow on the horizon that promises the dawn of a new day for humanity.

Under the leadership of our great President we have come to see that the causes that produced the war are not those which account for its continuance. Gradually the character of the conflict has been changing, until it has become a war of ideas. Autocracy is making its last stand against the advancing tide of democracy. In a phrase that has caught the imagination and has been adopted by the judgment of all the allied nations the President of the United States has defined the issue: we fight "to make the world safe for democracy." As Lincoln once questioned whether any nation could endure, "half slave and half free," so the free peoples of the world have come to question, in these later days, whether democratic ideals have any chance to endure in the face of the constant menace of an aggressive and conscienceless autocracy. We are fighting once more, and now, we hope, for the last time, to retain the priceless treasure of our liberties.

As Christian men we are bound to endeavor to interpret this great democratic movement, into which we have been caught up, and by which we are being carried forward, in Christian terms. What does it mean in its relation to the supremely formative conception of the Kingdom of God? The Pharisees of our Lord's day were incapacitated for leadership because unable to discern the signs of their times. "You hypocrites, you know how to decipher the look of earth and sky; how is it you cannot decipher the meaning of this era?" It is the function of a prophetic ministry today, as in Israel's great prophetic age, to interpret history in terms of God. What has God to do with the democratic movement?

If we are to talk intelligently we can hardly escape the necessity of definition. What are these contrary principles, democracy and autocracy, that now face each other across the trenches in Flanders? What, first, is democracy? Is it a form of government by numerical majorities? Does its essence consist in machinery or parchment constitutions, or is it a certain political, moral, social, and even spiritual ideal, a state of society dominated by principles of self-evidencing and perpetual validity? And if the latter, what are those principles? Shall we adopt the formula of Bentham and say that it is a state of society in which "everybody is to count for one and nobody for more than one?" Or shall we say with Mazzini that democracy is "the progress of all through all, under the leadership of the best and the wisest?"

Democracy is more than a form of government. As Lincoln defined it, it is "government of the people, by the people, and *for* the people." It is a state of society in which government is dedicated to the service of human need and has for its supreme aim the furtherance of human progress. Its purpose is well defined in an address by W. J. Fox when he said:

> I have gone into politics with this question constantly in my mind—What will your theories, your forms, your propositions, do for human nature? Will they make men more manly? Will they raise men and women in the scale of creation? Will they lift them above the brutes? Will they call forth their thoughts, their feelings, their actions? Will they make them moral beings? Will they be worthy to tread the earth as children of the common Parent, and to look forward, not only for His blessing here, but for His benignant bestowal of happiness hereafter? If institutions do this, I applaud them; if they have lower aims, I despise them; and if they have antagonistic aims, I counteract them with all my might and strength.

In a democracy government is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and that end the winning of his full heritage for every man who may be served by it.

Autocracy, on the other hand, what is its genius? It is not merely a denial of popular sovereignty. It scornfully rejects the principle that "governments derive their just rights from the consent of the governed," but not only so; it defiantly asserts that the state is an end in itself, to which every most sacred interest of the individual must be subordinated, and, in the words of von Bethmann-Hollweg, affirms "the personal irresponsibility of the king, the self-sufficiency, original, autocratic, of the monarchical power." "These," said the Chancellor, four years before the war, "are the fundamental ideas of the life of the Prussian state, which have remained vital, even through the constitutional period of its historic evolution." It is evident that there exists between the opposing ideals of autocracy and democracy an opposition so fundamental that no compromise is possible between them. The one affirms all that the other denies and denies all that the other affirms. Autocracy declares that man was made for the state, not the state for man: democracy proclaims that the state was made for man and not man for the state. When we declare that "the world must be made safe for democracy" we mean that, the world over, human interests must be held to be supreme, as contrasted with the interests of any single class or group or nation.

These are the two principles, then, that war for world-supremacy. It is our conviction that democracy is founded in the nature of man and is therefore the divine order for human society. On that conviction is based our confidence in its ultimate triumph. It is obvious that autocracy has certain advantages, at the outset, in such a struggle. It can more readily secure the immediate, unquestioning obedience which it claims, while the democratic, independent spirit needs to be assured, convinced, and persuaded. Blind obedience is contrary to its genius. "The chief pillars of the army," Kaiser Wilhelm is fond of reiterating, "are courage, honor, and unconditional blind obedience." "The soldier has not to have a will of his own; you must indeed all have one will, and

that is my will; there is only one law, and that is my law."

Professor Frederick D. Bramhall says:

> Americans will like to contrast with these the words of Abraham Lincoln when he addressed a regiment on its way to the front in 1864: "I always feel inclined when I talk to soldiers to try to impress upon them the importance of success in this contest. . . . . I happen temporarily to occupy this White House. I am a living witness that any one of your children may look to come here as my father's child has. It is in order that each one of you may have an open field and a fair chance for your industry, enterprise, and intelligence; that you may all have equal privileges in the race of life with all its desirable human aspirations—it is for this that the struggle should be maintained, not for one year only, but for two or three." We may congratulate ourselves upon being the inheritors of the tradition of Abraham Lincoln rather than that of the Hohenzollerns.

True, yet that must not blind us to the fact that the autocratic tradition is fitted to create a more immediately effective instrument of war than is the democratic.

The question at issue at the present moment is whether democratic peoples are willing to subordinate their individuality, which is their chief glory in times of peace, to the necessities of the stupendous task imposed upon them by this war, whether they can meet and master autocracy upon its own chosen field by the enthusiasm of a great ideal that will lift them up to the plane of a voluntary co-operation superior to any which blind obedience can achieve. We believe that they are willing and that democracy will triumph.

Our faith in democracy rests, I have said, upon the conviction that it is based upon the nature of man and is therefore the divine order for human society. But such a faith will not pass uncontested. How does it come that there has grown up in Central Europe within the past half-century this ultimate expression of the autocratic state with which we are now in conflict? It will be worth our while to endeavor to answer that question that we may clarify our own ideals of the democracy which we believe is to dominate that reconstruction of the world that is to come when the present war is over.

In *Democracy and Reaction*, a searching inquiry into that retrograde movement away from democratic ideals which he believes to have characterized many nations, even the most liberal, during the past generation, Mr. L. T. Hobhouse has made many illuminating suggestions which throw light upon this question. Written ten years before the outbreak of the war, the events that have subsequently transpired only serve to justify his argument. It is particularly suggestive when applied to the most characteristic ideas that govern the thinking and the conduct of the German state as we have learned to recognize them. Mr. Hobhouse names three outstanding causes, of an intellectual character, of reaction from the democratic ideal. The first is "decay in vivid and profound religious beliefs." He says:

> This decay was in progress a generation ago, but its effects at that time were offset by the rise of a humanitarian feeling which, partly in alliance with the recognized churches, and partly outside of them, took in a measure the place of the old convictions, supplying a stimulus and a guidance to effort and yielding a basis for a serious and rational

public life. But the promises of that time have not been fulfilled. Humanitarianism . . . . has lost its hold, and the resulting temper is a good natured scepticism, not only about the other world, but also about the deeper problems and higher interests of this world.

I shall reserve consideration of this cause, though it is mentioned first by our author, to the conclusion of this paper.

The second cause which Mr. Hobhouse mentions is "German idealism." By "idealism" is obviously not meant what we usually so term, pursuit of the ideal, with its suggestion of impracticality and aversion to compromise—which could hardly be called German. He means an idealistic philosophy which is "one expression of the general reaction against the plain, human, rationalistic way of looking at life and its problems. Every institution and every belief is for it alike a manifestation of a spiritual principle, and thus for everything there is an inner and more spiritual interpretation." We can see how such a philosophy may prove inimical to democracy and freedom when we see how it has been applied to the idea of the state. For the German the state is not merely a composite of the citizens who constitute it, but a "manifestation of a spiritual principle," with an existence of its own, and with rights and a destiny of its own and interests of its own that may be quite contrary to the interests of its citizens. This philosophy Hegel helped to formulate and Bismarck put into effect. Mr. Hobhouse writes:

> In place of the rights of the individual Hegel set the State—and for him the State was not to serve humanity, but was an end in itself. It was not to serve the Church, nor even to be separate from the Church; on the contrary, the modern State was to be the fountain of religious as well as secular authority. It summed up in itself both the temporal and the spiritual order. Clearly, then, there were no limits to its authority, nor was there any necessary responsibility on the part of its government. . . . . Bismarck's career was a concrete exemplification of the Hegelian State, crushing out popular resistance, and in relation to other States a law to itself. Bismarck first showed the modern world what could be done in the political sphere by the thoroughgoing use of force and fraud.

Since these words were written we have seen what ends this doctrine of the state can be made to serve. Because the necessity of the state knows no law, Germany invaded Belgium. Because the state is above and beyond morality, the vilest and most frightful crimes, the most outrageous brutalities perpetrated in the name of the state are honored with the Iron Cross! This doctrine of the state sank the "Lusitania," executed Edith Cavell and Captain Fryatt, and daily shoots down stretcher-bearers with machine guns and drops bombs on hospitals.

The third cause, and by far the most potent one, of the reaction against democracy which he describes, Mr. Hobhouse declares to be "the belief that physical science had given its verdict in favor . . . . of violence and against social justice." We are familiar with this argument also. It has been reiterated and illustrated in many forms and from many sources during the last ten years. Slavery, to our grandfathers, says our author, seemed "a denial of the fundamental rights of humanity. But

the question is raised by the current interpretation of biological science whether humanity has any fundamental rights at all." "Far from seeing any immorality in this arrangement [i.e., slavery], the prevalent theory is that it is by adding strength to the strong, by giving to them that have, and taking from them that have not, that the fittest survives and the race improves." According to Bernhardi and the caste that has long given its political and social ideals to Germany, "war is a biological necessity." The study of the evolutionary theory seems to have yielded to the German mind only this conclusion,

> that the time-honored doctrine "might is right," has a scientific foundation in the laws of biology. Progress comes about through a conflict in which the fittest survives. It must, therefore, be unwise in the long run—however urgent it seems for the sake of the present generation—to interfere with the struggle. We must not sympathize with the beaten and the weak, lest we be tempted to preserve them. The best thing that can happen is that they should be utterly cut off, for they are the inferior stock, and their blood must not mix with ours. The justice, the mercy, the chivalry, which would induce the conqueror to forbear from enjoying the full fruits of his victory must be looked on with suspicion. It is better to smite the Amalekites hip and thigh and let the conquering race replenish the earth.

A clearer definition of the spirit of Germany in the present war and the philosophy that lies back of it could hardly be penned.

To those who are possessed by such a biological theory it would appear that there is only one reply—to meet them upon their own ground and apply to them their own argument, and by administering a sound defeat with their own weapons convince them that it is not they, at least, that are fittest to survive. Arguments addressed to the intellect would not be hard to find which might prove to the open mind that this appeal to brute force is a false interpretation even of the authorities to whom these appeal. As Mr. Hobhouse remarks, "those who have applied Darwin's theories to the science of society have not as a rule troubled themselves to understand Darwin any more than the science of society. Darwin himself was conscious of the limitations of his own hypothesis, and was aware that the development of the moral consciousness in man involves from the first a suspension of the blind struggle for existence." Man is more than an animal, and the attempt to explain his development solely in terms of the laws that prevail in the animal world is pure materialism. Materialism is the explanation of the higher in terms of the lower, the animate in terms of the inanimate, growth in terms of mechanics, the life of the spirit in terms of biology. With the emergence of the human mind in the long succession of unfolding life other laws of development replace the purely biological. Fitness to survive is no longer the criterion of worth, and cooperation and not competition becomes the controlling element in social progress. To quote Mr. Hobhouse once again: "The evolution which has created man, which has engendered human society and developed civilization out of barbarism, is, he [the sociologist] finds, not based upon the struggle for existence, but upon an opposed principle by which the struggle for existence is gradually subdued, a principle of peace rather than

war, of co-operation rather than compulsion, of love rather than hate." All this might be said in reply to the German justification of force and frightfulness on biological grounds. But the Germans are not open to such arguments. They are not what they have proved themselves to be by their conduct in this war because they have been persuaded that "right is might" through the study of biology. They have gone to biology to seek plausible justification for a theory to which they were already committed for other and less admirable reasons. The fact is that Bismarck, with his policy of cunning, lies, and "blood and iron," succeeded. The deliberate aggressions of 1864, 1866, and 1870 succeeded. War has always been Germany's "most profitable industry." Autocracy and force have produced more territory, more money, and more power. Having proved them to be profitable, Germany formally adopted them. It was only then that her scholars were called upon to furnish passably respectable reasons to justify conduct which she had already determined and threw about it the cloak of biological science. Until Germany is persuaded by incontrovertible physical arguments that autocracy, force and frightfulness, deceit, treachery, brutality, and lies do not succeed she will continue to practice them.

Democracy finds its sanction in the nature of man. We do not need to fear that any argument drawn from the laws that govern the life of the beast can refute the argument written in man's constitution as self-conscious personality. Man was meant to be free. His development depends upon the degree of liberty that is accorded him.

But such a conception of man and his place in nature is dependent upon the recognition of man's worth as man, and this, in turn, is a product of religion—which brings us back to a consideration, in conclusion, of the first of the causes assigned by our author for social retrogression, namely, a "decay in vivid and profound religious beliefs." Here and not in any contrary tendency innate in the constitution of society lurks the real enemy of democracy, for the fate of the democratic movement rests ultimately upon religion. Religion is essential to democracy, and is, indeed, its foundation. It is based upon the New Testament principle of the equal value of every soul in the sight of the Divine Father. Autocracy can get along without religion; Ambassador von Bernstorff, champion of autocracy, faithful agent of frightfulness and faithless guest of America, confessed, on his departure from our shores, that he had no religion. Or autocracy can be satisfied with an Old Testament religion. It is no accident that Kaiser Wilhelm, with all his fervid and dramatic and, at times, ridiculous appeals to Almighty God, and his sacrilegious assumption of a place in a divine partnership, should make little or no reference to Christ. The God of the Kaiser is an oriental despot, a tribal divinity, the God of the Exodus and the Book of Judges, not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. But no man can be a true democrat who is devoid of the New Testament spirit. With a "decay of vivid and profound religious beliefs" goes a decay of democracy.

This provides and determines the task of the church in the midst of the accelerated democratic movement of our times.

The church must foster a faith that can be expressed in terms intelligible to democracy, and which can therefore minister to the new age that is upon us.

Democracy began in the first Christian church. But passing out from Judea to Rome it emerged from a world at least partially democratic into an environment wholly autocratic. Through the influence of that environment the institutions and theology of the church were gradually transformed until it became the friend of privilege and the tool of autocracy. Jefferson found the rudiments of the Constitution in the church, and a democratic and independent church has always been the most loyal supporter of free institutions and the champion of the rights of man. But the main stream of the life of the church has taken its color too largely from the social institutions that have surrounded it. The successive theologies that have dominated the thinking of the church are cast in the molds furnished by the political and social conditions of the days in which they originated. In a suggestive article on "Theology and the Social Mind" Professor Shailer Mathews has outlined the influence which history has brought to bear upon the central doctrine of the atonement. Feudalism gave Anselm his theory of satisfaction-atonement. When the state took the place of feudalism and legality was substituted for notions of honor, the death of Jesus was conceived as necessary to vindicate God's respect for his own law. With the rise of monarchical absolutism came reemphasis upon the sovereignty of God in the Calvinistic theology—God an arbitrary ruler, condemning or redeeming whom he would. With the advent of the bourgeois spirit and capitalism came the application of commercial theories to religion and the vogue of a theory of substitutionary atonement, by which "Jesus paid it all."

But the theology formulated in an autocratic or capitalistic era will not satisfy this socially minded age. Christian thinking must be cast in new forms if it is to guide men in the new day. Democracy has come late into the political field. It has not yet come to its own in the realms of government or industry: it is not remarkable that it has hardly affected religion and theology. But the spirit of democracy must have its way in religion as in politics and industry or the church will be compelled to relinquish its leadership. Religion can no longer be imposed upon men by authority from without. It is of the essence of democracy that it is ruled from within, and only those institutions and doctrines which commend themselves to the spiritual consciousness, and which are found actually to satisfy the spiritual cravings and serve the spiritual needs of man, can command him. Men are asking of theology and the church what they asked of political institutions—Do they serve human needs? Do they minister to the enrichment of life? Democracy says, "Religion was made for man, not man for religion," as it says, "The state was made for man, not man for the state."

Finally, Christianity for a democracy must attempt a new definition of God, not as an arbitrary and autocratic sovereign concerned with considerations of his own "glory" and jealous of his prerogatives, but as the leader, inspirer, and companion of men in a great spiritual enterprise. The new conception of the

worth of man upon which democracy is built has destroyed the religion of fear. The modern man no longer thinks of himself, with Isaac Watts, as a "guilty worm." He is not willing to "be damned for the glory of God," and does not believe that God requires it. Having conceived the function of human government to be the welfare of the governed he cannot think of the government of God in lower terms. The law of God for him is written in his nature and God requires obedience for man's "good always, that he may preserve him alive." He thinks of punishment as a means of reformation, not in terms of vindictive justice or retribution. The monarchical ages of the past have talked and thought of God as king, and theologies formed in the atmosphere of autocracy have emphasized his sovereignty as an arbitrary exercise of power. But times are changing. Just before the Civil War a minister in old Virginia was discoursing upon the doctrine of "election." In the midst of the sermon up rose an old Jeffersonian Democrat. "Preacher," said he, "do you mean to say that God saves whom he will and condemns whom he will just as he chooses, without reference to their desert?" "Yes," said the preacher, "that is the doctrine of election." "Then," said the old man, "I want you to understand, Sir, that the people never will stand for it!"

The day is about to dawn when autocrat and king will have disappeared, so that we shall have to explain the meaning of the terms to our children and refer them to history and to museums for the material out of which to reconstruct them in their imaginations. When the word "king" becomes obsolescent, what shall we call God? We must reconstruct our theology so as to provide a conception of God which our children's children will understand. Jesus called God "Lord," that is, Master, and "Father." These are terms that will satisfy democracy. God is our Master, our Leader, our Captain. He is the Father and mankind of his children. He has a purpose to fulfil in the world, something to accomplish, and toward it he strives. And he will join him, not under compulsion, but willingly, joyously, and fight by his side. God is not merely seeking to do something for us, but to do something with us, and he makes his appeal to us as free personalities to follow him. He rules, not by the compulsion of force, but by the constraining influence of love. "Our wills are ours, we know not how. . . . . Our wills are ours to make them thine." In his triumph, we triumph.

THE SERVANT OF ISAIAH AND THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST: A PARALLEL

A. HAIRE FORSTER
Professor in Trinity College, Toronto, Canada

It is generally agreed that the Servant of Isa., chaps. 41–66, must be interpreted as the nation of Israel, though of Israel in its peculiar function, that is as God's prophet and witness in the world. Then, since the whole nation did not fulfil this function, the Servant is, more strictly, that part of the nation which remained loyal to God, the "Israel within Israel." This interpretation seems unavoidable in view of such passages as Isa. 41:8, "But thou Israel my servant," and 43:10, "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen."

The Servant then is a community personified. Now these "servant" passages have been applied to Christ by Christ Himself, as in Luke 22:37; by the evangelists, as in Matt. 8:17; in Acts, as in 3:26; in the Epistles, as in I Pet. 2:23, and even rabbinical Jews have applied them to the Messiah. Here therefore we have prophecies spoken of a community applied to an individual.

May we not reverse this process in interpreting the Second Coming of Christ?

The Servant was first a community, then an individual. The Son of Man, too, may be first Christ and then a community controlled by Christ's spirit. The Son of Man of Dan. 7:13 seems to be a symbol of "the people of the Saints of the Most High," according to vs. 27 of the same chapter, and, though Christ says that the Son of Man will come, He is never represented in the Gospel as saying, "I will come again," except in John, chap. 14, where He is speaking of the coming of the spirit. Even if Christ's sayings about the return of the Son of Man were taken at first by those who heard them to refer to a literal reincarnation, may *we* not apply them to His return in His body, the Christian community? Parousia, after all, means presence as well as coming, and what further coming is required of one who said "I am with you always"? An advance toward this idea may be traced in the New Testament itself, as may be seen by comparing Mark with John or I Thessalonians with Colossians. Why should not we go on from where the New Testament writers left off, instead of remaining where they began? Why should we be mere "half-Jews," as Jerome called the pre-millenarians? The thought of the members of the early church was "fluid" on this question, as their acceptance of the Fourth Gospel shows,[1] and so, just as God's witnesses are identified with the Servant in Isa. 43:10, Christ's witnesses in all ages may be

[1] Prideaux, *The Second Coming of Christ*, p. 79.

identified with the evercoming Son of Man.

Even in the Apocalypse, the textbook of the pre-millenarians, comings of Christ are mentioned which cannot be taken as literal reincarnations: for example in 3:20, "If any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in to him and sup with him and he with me." Finally is it not necessary for Christ to come in a community in order to come completely? This seems to be suggested in Eph. 1:23, where His body, the church, is called "the fulness of him that filleth all in all," or, as the words might mean, "the fulness of him that all in all is being fulfilled."

A PLEA FOR A SCIENTIFIC THEOLOGY

H. C. ACKERMAN, D.B.
Professor of Old Testament in Nashotah House
Nashotah, Wisconsin

Theological opinion is different from ecclesiastical dogma. It is always in the process of becoming something other than it is. The human mind is restless until it finds its religious and scientific knowledge at peace one with the other. The real difficulties in our theology are not so much in the field of experience as in the use of standarized scientific concepts to describe and legitimize that experience intellectually. That is to say, it is a means by which our religious experiences are thought into harmony with the mass of reality which is given us outside of reality. It goes without saying that it must change. To this end, whatever may be our personal reaction toward the suggestions of Professor Ackerman, we welcome his exposition of a new method in theological procedure.

As the dominant interest of philosophers of the present day is to develop a scientific philosophy and the point of departure toward this end is the abandonment of metaphysics, so it should be the main ambition of theologians to develop a scientific theology, and the *terminus a quo* toward this goal will be the abandonment of mysticism, the metaphysics of religion. Mysticism is practically equivalent to metaphor, and to achieve a release from the picturesque means searching more profoundly for the reality that underlies the religious imagination. To surrender the metaphor will not necessitate the denial or loss of any part of the reality of religious experience, but it will mean the substitution of more exact and concrete definitions for the abstractions and personifications that have so long prevailed in the field of doctrine at the expense of intellectual conscientiousness. Most of our religious reals are symbolically conceived, and the picture obscures the truth about the fact. Religious concepts, especially in

the realm of spirituality, must be reduced to a more concrete form, intelligible to the scientific mind.

What is needed is an intellectual rebirth, a rational conversion, a mental penance of extra-hard thinking that will reform the naïve idealities of religious thought into plain matter-of-fact statements acceptable in the realm of material science; for unless a man is born again intellectually he cannot see the Kingdom of God. We must become children again in intelligence, taking up once more the simpler idea, the concrete form, the tangible reality, and proceeding from that to the new construction of a realistic and materialistic theology. When Phillip asked our Lord to show him the Father he sought to approach God in some extraordinary and supernatural way. This amounted to asking for a definition of God in mystical or metaphysical concepts. Christ told him it could not be done. He had no revelation of God to give that was not natural and tangible and material. One might perceive God only as man perceived any other kind of reality. He had no other revelation to give of the Father save that which was manifestly visible in himself, in flesh and blood, in tangible forms of reality common to all human experience. When John dealt with the nature of God under the concept of the *logos*, borrowed from Greek philosophy through Philo, he makes it clear that this *logos* is not a metaphysical reality but the actual person of Christ which their hands have touched and handled. The whole point of his gospel is directed against the Alexandrian metaphysics and seeks to interpret the *logos* in terms of the human nature of Christ, who walked and talked upon the earth as man in material form.

As spiritual growth necessitates moral changes in the will, so the life of the mind requires intellectual changes in keeping with mental development and the clarification of consciousness. Intellectuality is as susceptible to sterility of thought as will is to the inertia of habit and custom. The spirit of truth needs the constant refreshment of clearer understanding and deeper insight into the nature of all reals of religious value. Consequently to achieve this end the inherited doctrinal generalizations of dead generations must be dissolved over again into their primary constituents so that they may be resolidified into a brighter crystal—or, better, kept liquefied in order to prevent their hardening into intractable forms.

It is with a generous criticism that one should approach the truth systems of authoritative religion, recognizing them not as simply antique and outworn, but as gauging their real potentiality for reinterpretation and reconstruction. Theology has its hopeful as well as its hopeless side to the sympathetic critic, and there is bound to be a messianic age in store for the queen of the sciences, but only through a rational conversion. The Christian mind calls for prophets who will show the way toward intellectual repentance and for evangelists who will preach a gospel of intelligence; the prophets must be philosophers with a pragmatic spirit (like the Hebrew authors of the Wisdom literature), and the new evangelists must be theologians with a scientific interest whom the world still awaits.

We are in want of both today. The reborn religious intelligence requires, not rational repentance alone, but a gospel of practical truth and applied theology. Consequently it is not mere restatement of the old truths that is called for, but a specific kind of restatement, namely, a reinterpretation in practical terms. To realize this desideratum, this vital objective, some recent efforts have been made by "going back to Christ." Some have thought that the church has sadly misunderstood the master and has passed beyond the bounds of the primitive faith. Safety lay in a fresh start. These endeavors, courageously undertaken, have nevertheless had no real success, and the failure has been due, not to the reluctance of the world to follow back if need be, but to the actual impossibility of so doing.

Christ, the author of our salvation, is not resident in the past. Others, therefore, having taken a step into the future, have responded antiphonally to the cry, "Back to Christ," with another theme, "On to Christ," which makes a pretty harmony, no doubt, but is not a summary of the truth. For Christ is not to be found in the future any more than in the past. The futurists have contended that we have failed to understand the Christian message because the Lord was too far ahead of humanity. The poor idealists! They have been more misguided than those who advocated a return to the primitive faith. These pioneers of a new religion have been by far the poorer shepherds of the two. It is not a new religion that is wanted. The truth of the matter is that Christ is not a God of the past nor a God of the future, but a God of the present, and the present is "the fulness of time." Here is the essence of the Christian religion: God with us now, the kingdom in our midst. This is the reason we feel a real pity for those who would urge us to retrace our steps and no little distrust of those who prophesy a new and different religion. It is the church of God in the world today that must explain herself to this generation. The eternal truth must be seen with the eyes of the modern age. And to be seen correctly or more correctly understood her doctrines must be translated into the vital terms of the day. And this day is undoubtedly materialistic. Consequently the translation of doctrine must be in materialistic terms. Why? To quicken a fresh interest in the old truth. We do not wish to surrender a fragment of the ancient creed nor generate an unwholesome skepticism of the eternal truth of the incarnation, but we do wish to realize more perfectly the value of this catholic trust as it affects our life here and now. The meaning of religion in material modes of thought —that is the main desideratum.

Such an applied Christianity must first become scientific in expression. The theologian must learn how to think and express himself in materialistic terms. This is the new baptism. The efficiency of the doctrine must be thought of in its formulation, the doctrine operative. In the great Wisdom psalm (Ps. 119) the true religious philosopher says, not "I have more understanding (*theoretical*) than my teachers," but "I have more *practical* understanding . . . . for thy testimonies have been my study." A faith

of practical testimony must pass through a reduction to pragmatic terms.

I would suggest toward this end the scientific study of religious truth. We are bound to make mistakes at first, errors of over-simplification, but they will become profitable errors in the end. Understanding submitted to practical tests restores the mind to confidence and generates a fresh inspiration (interest). Thus only, I believe, can faith win modern scholastic approval and a university following. And an intellectual revival in theological interests is one of the most striking needs of the time. If the demand is strong enough it is bound to awaken a hearty response. But it is in the practical potentiality of religious thought that hope lies.

The following suggestions toward the beginning of a scientific dictionary of theology are tentatively made with the hope that they may lead to similar attempts on the part of others or at least stimulate a sympathetic criticism. The definitions are reduced to the briefest possible form in order to present the essential idea in the most unqualified way. They should be valued in the light of this deliberate simplicity.

Soul: the living organism.

Spirit: energy or force in operation.

Good: integration of energy.

Evil: disintegration of energy.

Sin: dissipation of energy.

Morality: conservation of energy.

Right: the intellectual criterion of good.

Conscience: moral inertia, i.e., the tendency of the will to persist either in a state of rest or motion in accord with the idea of right.

Repentance: emotional revolution of energy in accord with a reassertion of the idea of right.

Conversion: the recontrol and readjustment of dissipating energies.

Character: uniformity of energy.

Law: generalization of energy.

Holiness: unified energy.

Grace: the fulness of energy in human nature.

Church: the community or social organism constituted by virtue of individual union with a common center of the fulness of energy.

Religion: the interaction of energy in consciousness toward holiness.

Atonement: potential energies liberated.

Salvation: potentialities becoming actualities. (Cf. St. Paul's phrase, "the process of being saved.")

God: the primary force in its highest and widest connotation.

Trinity: force, energy, and power.

Immanence: energy qualified by phenomena.

Transcendence: energy unqualified by phenomena.

Infinite: immeasurable.

Finite: measurable.

Absolute: energy independent of any necessary relations outside a predetermined field.

Supernatural and miracle: inexact and meaningless terms in the field of pure energy. For example, it is *natural* for God to do miracles.

Inspiration: (energetic) interest.

Vision: truth-seeing.

Mercy: benevolent energy.

Charity: the energy of love.

Faith: a form of intellectual energy which accepts anything as true in so

practical a manner as to compel trust and to generate loyalty.

Prayer: petition for energy.

Praise: thanksgiving for energy received.

Worship: reverence for energy.

Sacrifice: contribution of energy.

It is not the place here to attempt an apologetic for the position taken, but the briefest suggestions toward such a course may be made. It may be helpful to suggest that the term "energy" as used in the New Testament is always employed with reference to that which is superior to the human; that the word for God in the Old Testament (*El*) in its primary significance denotes essential force; that the identity of spirit with force operative is the fundamental idea of Paul in this regard (cf. Col. 1:29; 2:12 and Eph. 1:19 in the Greek); that the person of the Holy Spirit is interpreted by Luke in terms of power (cf. Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8 in the Greek). Thus one may reason back from power through energy to force in line with the Trinity. The idea of holiness as unified energy, emphasizing the oneness or wholeness of spirit, results in a synthesis of spiritual efficiency by virtue of the inherent power resident in a thing. Also the transition of moral life in terms of energy easily suggests an apologetic consistent with the main tenets of both Christian morality and scientific ethics. Finally it may not be irrelevant to state that the notion of force need not subtract from the nature of personality, nor need the idea of energy undermine the fulness of the personality of God.

CURRENT OPINION

Philosophy as the Servant of Man

During the last few years the members of the Pragmatic School of Philosophers have been insisting that the task of philosophy is scientific control and direction of the progress of human life. This note is struck again by Professor A. W. Moore in the March number of the *Philosophic Review*. He calls philosophy to the high duty of creating, organizing, and harmonizing human values and purposes. The present tragedy in Europe is sufficient evidence that the time has come for the application of science as the method of values. This does not mean that science is to be called to the defense of values born of instinct, custom, and myth. It means that scientific intelligence must be operative in the formation of the values and purposes of our social life. It must be the method not only of maintaining but of obtaining them. It means not the abolition of instinct and custom but the use of these as the material for new values.

This is the issue:

> Are we ready to take toward our social, political, and religious values the same experimental attitude, subjecting them to the same tests of international scrutiny and criticism which we demand in our scientific procedure? It is the issue of the democratization of values. And it is neither sentimentalism nor demagoguery to say that it is at bottom the issue of the world-war. The world can never be made "safe for democracy" so long as tribal survivals can avail themselves of a theory which places values above or below, at any rate beyond, scientific treatment on the ground that they are either "unique" or "universal." What Lincoln said of the nation is now true of the world. That it cannot exist half slave and half free means at bottom that it cannot go on with an alleged free science and a tribal morality. If either is not free neither is free.

This it is that makes the present problem and present opportunity of philosophy. It will be a great and splendid work if philosophy shall be able to abolish the esoteric attitude, the attitude of the tribal medicine men toward our social values and purposes. This is the field for the service of the highest intelligence. If the philosopher will teach and preach the necessity of this change of attitude toward personality and values and toward science he will "not only be doing his bit in the present world-crisis but much more in preventing the recurrence of such crises in the future which indeed is the issue of the present crisis." Surely there is inspiration in the hope of being able to substitute reason for shrapnel as the method of dealing with problems involved in the formation and in the conflicts of our human values and purposes.

A Finite God

During the last year there has appeared from the pen of Dr. Ray H. Dotterer in the *Reformed Church Quarterly* a series of articles presenting an argument for a finitist theology. He brings the fruit of this extensive study into brief compass in a criticism of the ideas of God presented by H. G. Wells and Reeman. The article is in the *Hibbert Journal* for April and is entitled, "The Doctrine of a Finite God in War-Time Thought." The idea of a finite God is not a war product, though the war has given acceleration to a movement long under way. The problem of evil has always been an anxious one. Theology was able, however, to keep man quiescent and humble. Mill made a protest in the interest of the goodness of God. In this generation there have been many voices raised. James insisted that the only God worthy of the name must be finite. H. Rashdall argued for a limited God. G. B. Shaw wanted an experimenting God. Bergson's system demands dualism. While in the past theology has not been

greatly influenced in the long run by passing fashions in philosophy, and while the traditional idea of God as infinite, eternal, immutable, omniscient, and omnipotent has survived other wars, it is probable that in our age there will be a radical change in the conception of God; for "never before in Christian lands has there been so numerous a public emancipated wholly or in part from the authority of the church and scripture and ready to welcome unconventional winds of doctrine."

Both Wells and Reeman argue the general thesis that the apparent dualism of good and evil is not merely apparent; that the world-struggle is a struggle in which every good-will and therefore God himself must be thought to have a genuine part. Reeman's argument may be briefly stated. The present known facts of the world force us to one of four conclusions: either God is good but not omnipotent, that is, he loves the good and wants to further it, but is just about as helpless to sweep evil away at one stroke as we ourselves are; or that God is omnipotent but not good, that is, has the power to destroy evil but not the will; or what we call good is not the real good as God sees it (which would mean of course that we do not know what good is); or that God has no concern with mankind and no interest in what happens to us. From these it seems best to believe that God is now doing the best he can and that if God could end such things as the horrors of war and destroy the world's evil tomorrow he would. Hence he must be finite. Dotterer points out that the old theologians were never foolish enough to argue that omnipotence in God meant "ability to do anything that might be mentioned." Omnipotence must be defined. Aquinas recognizes a logical limitation in that God cannot actualize a contradiction. There is also an ethical limitation, for good and evil are not arbitrary conceptions; they do not depend upon the will of the omnipotent one. We must also recognize a temporal limitation, since God will have to be limited by the law of time; his purposes cannot be accomplished in an instant. This last limitation of omnipotence is not a self-limitation either, unless we are ready to hold that for God the world-order is only a gigantic game.

Traditional theology emphasized the logical limitation and added that the evils of the world were the condition of the highest good. Modern theology tries to explain evil as the necessary means of producing such virtues as courage, patience, industry, fidelity, etc. None of these defenses can stand. There seems to be pure evil. How can insanity be rationalized? Dotterer states his own views as follows:

> I submit that the hypothesis of a god of limited power, considered merely as an hypothesis put forth to explain the facts of experience is more satisfying than its rival. It conflicts with none of the facts: it harmonizes with all: while at best, its rival accounts for only some of them. It makes our struggle with evil a real struggle, not a mere fictitious thing. If we say that God enters genuinely into the experience of struggle, then the difference between the kind of goodness ascribed to God and that ascribed to man disappears and all men of good-will will have a powerful motive for action in the thought that, in engaging in the struggle, they are co-operating with, and imitating, God himself.

There is one great objection to the doctrine of a finite God and that is that such a God gives no assurance of victory. Dotterer answers this difficulty by saying: (1) that if the omnipotence theory gives us the assurance of victory it at the same time takes away all meaning from the idea of victory; if evil is necessary, eventual overcoming of evil is illusion; (2) that it is at least as easy to believe in the exitsence of a good-will, which, though not infinite in power, still possesses sufficient power to assure the ultimate salvation of the world, as it is to believe in a good-will that is omnipotent.

The Problem of Evil

Professor Dickenson S. Miller is to contribute his quota to the new "philosophy of God and God's dealings with mankind." Under the foregoing title he outlines the argument of his series of articles which are to follow in the new and excellent *Anglican Theological Review*. The first number appeared in May. The problem of evil is a good starting-point for a new doctrine of God because it is as momentous as any with which theology deals, and its attempted solution has held a peculiar snare for Christian thinkers. The solutions have explained too much. They have attempted to justify God by explaining evil away. Every "solution" argues that God permits evil because it is better to have it than not. But the religion of Christ arises in the conflict with evil. Men are to be redeemed from evil. It is a formidable enemy. Our fight with it is a fight to death. But when theology is formulated God is thought to be so good and supreme that there is the tendency to explain away the very evil which Christianity arose to conquer. We must not purchase a dubious satisfaction for theology by cutting the ground from under religion. In brief summary Professor Miller argues that evil is not a good in disguise; that the Christian duty is to subdue evil, and this is more important than to explain it; we subdue it by God's help, for it is his will to vanquish it; the faith which gives conquest is that God is good, that he is our Captain in the conflict, and that he is supreme. He is, moreover, the underlying foundation that the conflict presupposes, for the moral law and our standard of goodness must be rooted in the nature of things; we are not to deny that this is a bad world; we are not to deny that God is supreme. These are vital parts of the Christian religion. "To solve the problem of evil is to destroy Christianity." Yet the relation of God's power to the state of this world is something which the logical understanding is not yet in a position to formulate because it has not yet a sufficient grasp of God's nature and power. Christian dogma has refused to simplify at the risk of sacrificing ultimate truth, even though to cling to dogma meant to believe a mystery. In this it has been wise. Solutions of the problem of evil have tended to confuse the moral sense. They have tried to prove that pain and creature ills are not of necessity evil; but they are evil for the religion of Christ. God does not and man may not permit evil. God would wield man as a deadly instrument for its destruction. To face it religiously is to conquer it if we can. The Providence of God is the source only of the good. Being the source of good, God would have us be the sources of good also. The supreme need in religion is a synthesis; that is, spiritual aspiration must be logically and perfectly united with the care for humanity and all its concrete needs.

The War within the War

In the *Dial* for June 20 Will Durant displays a danger signal to the optimists who expect that the sufferings of the war are to give way inevitably to a new social order of surpassing splendor. Governments of democratic nations are being compelled to become more aristocratic with every passing month. The needs of finance and personnel have driven governments more and more into the hands of "successful" and hence conservative men. While we idly hope for a beautiful new world, men who desire the continuation of that system under which they seized supremacy are now setting in motion forces of obstruction, actively moving to secure control of state and federal governments and enlarging their power over the media of public information. It is possible for this war to end with reaction enthroned unless the lovers of a more decent world bend seriously to their great task.

The power of financial monopolies has now become internationalized. Finance in this form may control newspapers and films

and shape public opinion. It would be easy to drown democracy in a sea of poisoned ink. "The gods of the *status quo* can threaten an over-liberal government with almost irresistible assault." They could practically control elections.

What kind of thinking does reconstruction need? Thought is not an instrument for understanding only; it is an organ for resynthesis of analyzed experience into effective response to a new and fluent situation. Thought has been too much concerned with analysis, too little related to action. The function of intelligence is to remake the world as well as to understand it. Yet only the selfish capitalist has put the creed into practice.

Another unhappy element in the situation is that most men of the active type are conservative, while thoughtful men are liberal. One thing is clear: the haters of the new are so intrenched that they can be successfully attacked only after the abandonment of generalities for a study of details. The establishment of an unfettered institute for political research which has been accomplished is a sign of promise. Why may we not hope for nation-wide research into all the vital phases of the social problem and for a means of distributing results? "Only a fund of facts and a power to think can preserve the voter from the avalanche of paid suggestion that will fall upon him from platform and periodical. Without these safeguards votes follow the line of greatest gold and triumphant plutocracy smiles Mephistopheleanly." The enemy of the new social order is active now, and only superior knowledge and decision put to work at once, while the war is on, can secure our safety.

The Meaning of Democracy

That the war is making a profound change in our manner of living and in our ideals is evident to everyone. It is also becoming clear that we of America are fighting, not merely that we may live, but that we may live in a specific way and that a certain specific form of life may through us retain a place in the world. We desire to be democratic. But what do we mean? Professor R. B. Perry undertakes a definition of the term in the July number of the *International Journal of Ethics*. There are three great ideas associated with the democratic tradition: equality, liberty, and popular government. The two last define what we mean by political democracy. The idea of equality defines what we mean by "social democracy."

Why is it that the word "equality" so stirs the hearts of men? The answer is that it appeals to five of our strongest motives. The first of these is compassion, which prompts men to relieve the distress of their fellows. It is, however, remedial rather than constructive. It halts the vanguard of civilization that the stragglers may be brought up. It is less interested in the perfection of the extraordinary few than in the normal man. It is stronger in women than in men. It is the link between democracy and humanity. From this viewpoint the idea of equality means the community and mutuality of life in which all men shall achieve happiness and perfection together at a pace which requires neither the abandonment nor the exploitation of the unfortunate. Secondly, equality appeals to the motive of emulation. It prompts a man to surpass his fellows. But this implies a fair chance and equal opportunity. There must be also "effective personal freedom" or freedom that can actually be used to advantage. Equal opportunity often has to be created by actually intervening against established injustice. Men must be given a fair chance, not an off chance. A third motive to equality is self respect or the resentment of arrogance. It is dislike of conscious superiority, because this aggravates accidental advantages or ignores merit or because it implies an attitude of disparagement toward one's self and forces one to self defense.

Humiliation in this respect may produce violent hatred, as the French Revolution amply demonstrated. A man cannot be given opportunity without acknowledgment of dignity. A fourth motive to equality is in the sentiment of fraternity. This need not imply intimacy or friendship but only courtesy, fair-mindedness, and admission of one's limitations. It leaves room for hero-worship, but a great man is always on trial. Moreover his success does not lift him above the level of his fellows as a man. "Only those will be happy in a democracy who prefer to be greeted neither with the upward slant of obsequiousness nor by the downward slant of condescension, but by the horizontal glance of fraternal self-respect." Finally must be recognized the motive of envy. This motive is doubly vicious; it makes men dislike, not the consciousness of superiority, but the substance of superiority. It is negative and destructive. It seeks equality by impeding the leaders. Envy gives rise to a cult of vulgarity; discourages every sort of eminence and so robs society of the services of the expert and leader. This is a great danger, for the best things have to be worked for, and without patience and slow cumulative effort the great things are not attainable. To disparage and despise the best things and the great things is an offense to mankind.

What is the use of opportunity if there is nothing worth gaining? We must believe that nothing is too good for a democracy. Science, philosophy, art, virtue, and saintliness must be as reverently regarded, as earnestly sought and cultivated as formerly. Otherwise the much-prized opportunity which a democracy affords is an equal opportunity for nothing. . . . . In so far as social democracy means a compassionate regard for all human beings as having feelings, powers, and capacities of the same generic type; in so far as it means the equalizing of opportunity and a mutual respect it rests upon sound and incontrovertible ethical grounds. But in so far as it exalts failure, inverts standards, and acts as a drag upon the forward movement of life it is reactionary and abhorrent.

Will America have the courage to see democracy through? It will require courage to make the necessary internal readjustments. Social democracy will have to be paid for. It will mean the surrendering and curtailing of personal advantages for the sake of those who lag behind in the struggle for life. It will also require courage behind democratic convictions to carry the war through to a victory that other peoples may be permitted to proceed with democracy. "If we are democrats, then Germany as at present governed, motivated, and inspired is our irreconcilable enemy."

Personal Problems of the Soldier

Professor W. E. Hocking presents an estimate of the probable influence of the war upon the moral life of the American soldier in the *Yale Review* for July. He points out that it is inevitable that the old rigidities will be loosened in such a completely new life. The interest of the soldier in woman is deepened both by the fact that he feels himself in some manner the protector of the weak and by his segregated life. He feels the need of companionship and prefers the care-free informality of chance meetings to the correctness of formal entertainment. He is eager for brightness and vivacity after the strain and monotony of the trenches. The British colonial soldier has proven himself able to stand the test, and both British and French have shown a higher standard of sex honor than the German. The German method of countenancing vice by providing for the physical safety of the troops in that regard tends to coarsen the soldier. The American has a high standard, for democracy cannot endure the suppression of one sex nor the refusal of either sex to assume the responsibility for elevating and ennobling the moral life of the other. Professor Hocking believes that a large percentage of the American troops will remain straight under any circumstances. They are deterred from the easier course, not by fear

of physical results, nor by regulations, nor by any other overt reasons, but simply by an ingrained soundness of feeling or by a sense of right lying deeper than the human level. Some will lose their bearings, but will soon realize it and recover themselves. Some will be swept away, but these will be the men whose standards have only a conventional and superficial footing or none at all, and in them our western civilization has already failed. But if our boys are to come back better from their experience, as most of them will, we must do our part. And our part is to get a better grasp of our own convictions and weed out what is merely traditional and inert. It will be as fatal for us to condemn what is harmless as to approve what is wrong. "Hospitality of mind together with firmness of character will alone fit us for meeting the strains of the moment and save the day for the America of tomorrow."

The Faith of the Man in the Ranks

This is a protest by Lieutenant Harold Hersey against the superficial studies of the American soldier which have appeared in the press. He writes in the August number of *Scribner's*. These accounts fail because the soldier does not reveal his mind to chance visitors and inquisitors.

> To read some of the articles one would think the writers were treating inanimate objects, pure automatons, when in fact there is no one quite so fine, so human, as our soldier. He is a refinement of American manhood, a concrete example of what the practical application of an ideal can accomplish. . . . . He will come out of this bloody conflict sure of the things which are now moving him to action, the inner aspirations which must pass the acid test of fire and privation.

We should stop talking of our troops as if they were incomprehensible strangers. They have not changed. People seem to think that the religion of the soldier has undergone a mysterious transformation, but the same faiths are in the army that are in civilian life. The men bring their faith with them. It is doubtful whether even immortality is stressed more than usual. One might say that the soldier has his old faith but wrapped up in patriotism and that he is eager to share the effort to crush autocracy as a religious duty.

But what are the elements of the faith of the soldier? "He believes sternly and irrevocably in a higher being. I have not yet met a man who did not believe this." The faith of the men is concrete. They will consult a chaplain of any denomination if he be a real man. Sympathy and comradeship are higher in their esteem than beliefs. Distinctions of faith have largely disappeared among the Protestants, their common faith resting on the fundamental solidities of human nature, honor, courage, and truth. Soldiers demand vital, concrete sermons devoid of platitudes. Their religion is a simple thing, and they are too busy and too serious to have any patience with nebulous fancies or far-away theories.

The insistence of the army upon absolute cleanliness is developing the individual soldier into a personality of clean motives and higher desires. His faith is clean and straightforward. "There can be no doubt that we are producing better men all round —higher types, physically, mentally, and spiritually. The faith of these higher men is based on the same things that held our forefathers to the work of settling the Civil War and it cannot help produce that ideal that gave us in the past the material of our great leaders."

The Conditions of Tolerance

An attempt to clear up the meaning of the idea of tolerance is made in the *Unpopular Review* for July-September. Tolerance is defined as willingness to sanction the existence of views at variance with our own. But there is an inherent contradiction involved. We are willing to have an opposite

view exist only when we are not entirely convinced that our own view is true. "The real belief in absolute truth is a missionary state of mind and carries with it the faith that truth is the one thing worth having." Today we have learned caution. We are modest enough to be willing to admit a view differing from our own because we realize that both may be right. The real tests of tolerance are the commoner cases in which if I am right, you are wrong. "When we say, 'Oh, yes, we both believe in God: to me he is Life Force, to you, Jehovah,' we know in our hearts that we are simply conniving at the draining of all definite meaning from the word in order to confuse the issue and to keep the peace." Even in such cases there are three conditions which make tolerance tenable. The first is that we do not really care about the issue. We are tolerant with the ease of indifference. Modern Christianity and modern paganism are tolerant of each other in this way. If these two ideals dared to stand forth and contest the field, there would be an end of tolerance—a holy war and clearing of the atmosphere. The second condition of tolerance is that we shall be so mentally sophisticated as to be too cautious to be certain of final truth. And so our faith is paralyzed. Only bigots and fanatics set fire to the world without scruple. The third form of imperfect conviction on which tolerance is based is the view of truth as purely personal and relative. The man who holds to such subjectivism tries to put himself at the center of indifference, and his one conviction is that all standards are relative. Challenge this conviction and he is intolerant enough.

So, after all, it is incomplete conviction that makes tolerance plausible. Of course it is possible to abandon the claim to absolute truth. Real tolerance can have meaning only as applied to a conflict of present issues.

By assuming tolerance as a possession or as a goal we have lost the driving power of conviction which more primitive, less imaginative forms of belief still hold. Perfect tolerance would be an anaesthetic influence; it would militate against that clash of open conflict in which alone are ideas tested. If tolerance is to be achieved only by proportionate weakening of conviction the prevailing acceptance of such an ideal may not merely be a crying for the moon but for a burning toy balloon which would be of no value to us if we had it.

Treaties of Peace

Interest is more and more centered on the peace that is to reconstitute the world after the war. Lenetta M. Cooper presents a study of the defects of peace treaties in the *Public* for July 20. She feels that there has never been such a tremendous opportunity for rebuilding the whole social and economic structure of society. The British Labor Party is demanding that there be no patched-up settlement but a new social order built from the ground up. The demand is insistent that this war shall end war. But may we have any well-founded confidence that the peace treaties will mean the end of struggle for this generation at least? The story of the past is not encouraging. Quoting from statisticians she states that "from the year 1496 B.C. to 1861 A.D. in 3,358 years there were 227 years of peace and 3,130 years of war, that is, thirteen years of war for every year of peace. Within the last three centuries there have been 286 wars in Europe. From the year 1500 B.C. to 1860 A.D. more than 8,000 treaties of peace were concluded. The average time they remained in force was two years."

A study of the peace conferences of the nineteenth century reveals certain significant features: (1) They were conducted in secret. After they were finally concluded they were ratified by the governments without consulting the people. Not infrequently there have been certain secret articles of which the people knew nothing. (2) The negotiators of the treaties were always representatives of the propertied classes and never of the

men called upon to do the fighting. (3) The victors reserved for themselves such portions of disputed territory as contained valuable natural resources, thereby cutting off access to raw material which all needed; they took possession or kept control of strategic points in the world's highways on land and sea and so restricted free trade of the world's commerce; they reserved certain territory for colonization and so restricted free markets. The people in such territories were never consulted.

It is obvious that a new sort of conference must close this war and that the delegates must be democratically chosen to represent the people. Militarism must never again be trusted to keep the peace of the world. Mutual good-will and not mutual distrust must be the basis of the new social structure. There must be determination on the part of the people to see that these things shall be. Men have pleaded for it a century ago. Mere longings for permanent peace will not do. "The remedy lies in actual knowledge of the conditions which bring about wars and a firm determination on the part of the people to change those conditions."

The Issue of Slavic Freedom

The editorial opinion of the *New Republic* is that "Slavic liberty is an issue of such vast importance as to dwarf all other gains to be derived from the overthrow of German power. At the same time Slavic liberty will be a guaranty that other gains will be permanent." The case is argued in the number of July 6. Two-fifths of the entire population of Europe are Slavs. They comprise Russia, the White Russians, Ukraine, Poland, Czecho-Slovaks, Jugo-Slavs, Bulgars, and Roumanians, a whole galaxy of nations every one of which has the territory, the population, and the national self consciousness prerequisite to a fruitful political development. And of all of this vast Slavic land only Serbia and Montenegro have been both independent and free. It is easy to raise doubts as to the ability of these nations to maintain their freedom, but these adverse opinions rise from a failure to understand the dead weight of dynastic ambition and intrigue under which they have labored in the past.

We know that the Slavic races are capable of generating great political leaders and that they are capable of following these leaders with unswerving loyalty. Serbia's gallant record is no more disfigured by renegades than is that of Belgium. The Czecho-Slovaks are fighting for their national rights with a tenacity that would be impossible without skillful leadership and loyal following. The difficulties of Germany in Ukraine argue a people of independent spirit and the Soviet republic in Russia is displaying a remarkable survival power in the face of German aggression and allied suspicion, famine, and industrial disorder and domestic political intrigue.

Give the Slavic peoples time and the elements of solidarity and mutual helpfulness will make of them strong nations. They stand to win most by the defeat of Germany. But they will equally benefit the world. They will solve the German problem forming barriers in every direction to German aggression.

We must have an organized League of Nations if civilization is not to perish by war. But the members of such a league must be real free nations, not conglomerate empires, like Austria-Hungary, Old Russia, and Germany, held together by force and militarism. And the first prerequisite to the formation of a permanent system of internationalism is the liberation of the Slavic nations. This was not foreseen as an issue of the war in 1914, but now Slavic liberation has become the fundamental issue. "A peace which should leave Germany in control of Poland and Ukraine, which should leave the Czecho-Slovaks and Jugo-Slavs under the yoke of the Dual Empire, would be a German peace no matter what territorial concessions the Central Empires might make to Italy or France."

Social Darwinism

A challenge to the doctrine of social Darwinism developed in Germany during the last half-century comes from the pen of David Starr Jordan. It appears in the *Public* of March 30. The dogma of social Darwinism is stated in two items: (1) There is a constant struggle among races and nations whereby the largest, strongest, and fiercest survive and the others go to the wall. (2) It is incumbent on the strong nations—those most populous and enjoying the most complete discipline—to subdue or exterminate the others. This is of course the justification for international war and racial oppression, and the doctrine of frightfulness is a logical corollary.

The biological argument for war, however, has no scientific validity and no legitimate relation to the teachings of Darwin. It has been developed to meet the needs of existing dynastic ambition. War is to be the test of *kultur;* the strong nation vindicates its right by ruthless destruction. All mercy and soft-heartedness are banished. But the whole dogma overlooks four vital truths: (1) The struggle for existence is primarily not a matter of rivalry, but the condition of persistence even in the face of adverse conditions. (2) The competition involved is one of the necessity of life, not a demand for collective and national destruction. (3) It entirely ignores the law of mutual aid and the established fact that altruism is one of the most potent factors in natural selection. (4) The qualities of permanence and progress are not those of the forceful and merciless, for against these the greater power of the altruistic and co-operative races are sure to combine.

Altruism, in the form of mutual aid, is an undisputed fact reaching back into the animal and plant kingdom. "It is as old as selfishness and as hard to eradicate. It asks no external sanction, for individuals deficient in altruism pass away leaving no descendants. There is bounty on their heads, whether they be wolves or hawks or predatory men." Art, literature, music, and religion arise and are developed through mutual help. Altruism begins with the union of primitive cells, which results in a change to both. It appears later as an aggregate of cells in a complex organism, which gives specialization, differentiation, organization, sensation, and will in the higher forms. Men unite to form societies as individual cells unite to form the human body. The growth of society abridges individual freedom by making freedom valuable. Mutual aid involves mutual dependence. It gives a security and strength forever impossible under purely individualistic conditions. "This world is not the abode of the strong alone; it is also the home of the loving."

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD

MISSIONS

Winning the Soul of Latin America

The only way to win the soul of Latin America or of any other country is to approach that country from the common level of mutual respect, instead of attempting to descend upon it from the superior heights of condescension. This is a much-needed lesson which Clayton Sedgwick Cooper tries to impress upon the North American public in the July number of the *Homiletic Review*.

The only road to mutual respect is through a knowledge which goes deeper than the superficialities which strike the senses. No one can understand South America who does not understand something of the thought and purposes of Spain and Portugal, from which these people inherited their civilization. "Spain for its part is a great detached fragment of Africa, and the Spaniard is the firstborn child of the ancient white North African, now widely regarded as the parent of the largest element in the population of Europe." One is therefore struck at once with the orientalism of the South Americans. We are therefore brought into touch with a civilization antipodal to that known in the United States, but which on that very account is complementary to our own, just as the North Pole is to the South. How wholesome for our commercialism is this pronouncement of a Spanish critic: "The grandest enterprises are those in which money has no part and the cost falls entirely on the brain and heart."

We must come to know the people as they are, a highly cultivated and sensitive race at the top of their society, with little or no middle class as yet; while below lie the great populations, still more or less ignorant, with little knowledge of us, and politically without a voice. We must understand that this is a proud people, inheriting chivalric and European ideas regarding their homes, their women and their deportment. We must learn that only men who can get quickly the points of view of other people should be sent there.

Untold harm has been done in the past by narrow provincialism and superciliousness on the part of North Americans, adverse criticism, and general contempt of those who happen to be of darker color than we are. Only on the basis of equality, not theoretical but real, can we hope to win the Latin-American.

The Farmer Missionary of India

Is the missionary's task to minister or to make proselytes? Sam Higginbottom chose the former task, and the story of this man's career in the *World Outlook* reads like a novel. He has succeeded in digging romance out of the soil. While engaged as a teacher of economics in a college in India, he came to the conviction that the chief factor underlying the social, moral, and spiritual problems of that densely populated country was the economic problem of inferior agricultural production. The farmers of India were desolately poor. All their worldly possessions would not be worth more than five dollars. In one decade there were thirteen million deaths from famine. How could self-supporting and self-respecting Christian churches be the outgrowth of such conditions as these?

He persuaded his mission to send him home to study agriculture, and he took his degree at Ohio State University, specializing in animal husbandry. With this technical knowledge, two companions, and twenty-five thousand dollars in cash he started back to India, where a farm of two hundred and seventy-five acres had been

secured for him. These small beginnings have become a mighty institution, comprising agricultural college, experimental station, and model farm, with pilgrims on a new mission flocking to it from all over the country, in order that they also may learn the secret of this man's success.

The reason of this institution's popularity is that it has proven its worth in the land. He has introduced modern machinery and proven that the cost of operation is only one-third of that of manual labor, in spite of the cheapness of such in India. He has succeeded in raising thirty bushels of wheat to the acre where they were only able to obtain six or eight; his sheep grow four times as much wool as theirs and the wool sells for twice as much. The ox is the Indian farmer's only source of power. When famine comes these animals die by the thousands and the farmers are left helpless. What could be done to prevent this? Not only must better crops be raised, but the crops must be preserved. The Indian farmer knew nothing of building a silo up in the air, but he did know how to dig a well. Consequently they were taught to dig their silos, into which fodder of all kinds, even roadside weeds, are now packed away, and when drought comes the animals are not left to starve. Higginbottom is doing for India what Joseph did for Egypt; he is teaching them to so husband the resources of the years of plenty that they may be able to survive the years of famine.

A Forward Move in Co-operation

Our foreign churches are leading the way in the movement toward closer Christian co-operation. The June number of the *Chinese Record* brings the significant news of the organization of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of China, after several years of negotiations and preliminary proceedings. The number of bodies holding essentially the Presbyterian faith and polity and affiliating now in this general communion is ten, four of these being supported by American boards and six by societies of the British Empire.

Three somewhat serious difficulties were encountered in the negotiations for union: (1) China's great distances and imperfect means of communication, which it is hoped to overcome by raising a permanent fund to subsidize the traveling expenses; (2) the numerous Chinese dialects which would necessitate at least a bilingual assembly; it is hoped that this difficulty will eventually be remedied by the increasing use of the Mandarin dialect and of the English language; (3) the considerable difference of opinion as to the extent of the powers which may wisely be conferred upon such a General Assembly; this consideration, it is urged in reply, is in reality an incentive to the early consummation of the Union, in order that a practical problem of this nature may be solved in the actual working of the scheme before the different bodies grow more set in their respective ways. In order to preserve flexibility for the time being and facilitate future modification both in polity and in creedal basis, if such be deemed advisable, the Assembly just organized is recognized as "provisional," and an Executive Commission has been instructed to more thoroughly canvass the situation.

Nor is the movement likely to stop here. The Congregational churches of the London Mission and of the American Board, in response to a cordial invitation, have entered into negotiations looking toward the formation of a preliminary council which might prepare the way for the organic union of the total one hundred thousand communicants on terms agreeable to all concerned.

The Appeal of Christianity to the Chinese Mind

It is seldom that we have the privilege of following the native mind as it looks in

analytically upon itself and then out upon the propaganda of Christian missions and tries to evaluate the latter in terms of the former. This has been attempted in two recent numbers of the *Chinese Recorder*, by Professor T. C. Chao, M.A., B.D., of Soochow University. His conclusions are well worth quoting:

As the Chinese mind is dogmatic, Christianity makes a rational or philosophical appeal which at once emancipates it from dogmatism and leads it on to larger worlds of thought. As the Chinese mind is utilitarian, Christianity makes the practical appeal which ennobles China's pragmatism and elevates her into the task of working out practically the loftiest of personal and social ideals. As the Chinese mind is conservative and formalistic, Christianity makes the social appeal showing that by social progress, rather than by a petrifaction of social institutions, it can effect a thoroughgoing social regeneration which will place China among the great powers of the world. As the Chinese mind is ethically conditioned in its thinking, Christianity makes the ethical appeal and presents a moral system and life, which will at once fulfil the requirements of Chinese ethics and provide a perfect ideal and an adequate power for moral living. As the Chinese mind is particularistic, Christianity makes the humanistic appeal and lays emphasis upon the unity of mankind, in needs, interests, aspirations, and destiny. And finally, as the Chinese mind misapprehends the nature of religion, Christianity makes its most vital appeal, the religious appeal, which is not only rational but also complete in that it furnishes the ground, in its fact of incarnation, for the fellowship between the finite and the infinite, between God and mankind. In these appeals we see numerous points of contact between Christian thought and life and Chinese thought and life.

Big Sisters to Our Little Brothers of the South

According to Bishop Oldham, in the *World Outlook*, the Monroe Doctrine is as odious to the republics of South America as it is to Germany, and will in no way facilitate the missionary's task.

Happy in our self-confidence we rather enjoyed the pose of playing big sister to the "little brother republics." It made a good picture—Brazil, the Argentine, and the rest as shy youngsters peeping out warily from the folds of a matronly Liberty's flowing gown. But our neighbors did not appreciate the theme of this picture. And they are glad that at last the Monroe Doctrine is melting away and a Pan American Doctrine is taking shape. They welcome the growing bonds that will unify the Americas, join them as equals. Less of the spirit of protection of the weak by the strong. More of the spirit of brotherhood.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Socialization of Education

The conception of the essential unity of the mind, says Albert B. Cunningham, is destined to be of large service to religious education. Under the old psychology the mind was supposed to have about as many divisions as it had functions to perform. There was a faculty for this and a faculty for that, and if one wanted to be religious he exercised his religious faculty without bothering in the least, say, his faculty for mathematics.

But we have swung far away from this conception today. We look upon the mind as a unit, and as a unit it functions, no matter what its object. The value of this conception for religious education resides in that we are enabled to transfer over into religious education the pedagogical principles of secular instruction. The boy brings the same mind to Sunday school that he uses in the public school.

We get near the real purpose of education when we say that it really is *life* itself. Morally and religiously then we must make the Sunday school *Life Real*. That is, we must provide moral and religious situations differing in no wise, save in degree, from

adult situations, in which the children may sustain precisely the same relationships that they will encounter in adult experience. It is of supreme importance then that the Sunday school should be a social unit. On a small scale it should be a reproduction of the sphere of adult activity. The boy who learns to conduct himself properly in this organization will not be long in getting his bearings in the social groups of adult life, for with slight variations all social groups are alike.

Morality is largely a matter of the habit of right conduct in group life. We must therefore form habits of moral rectitude in our boys and girls by putting them in life-situations where they may react toward other people in an upright way. This can only be done when the Sunday school is socialized to conform to actual life conditions.

The Dramatic in Sunday School and Church

One of the surest ways in which to deepen the interest of the young people in the affairs of the church and Sunday school is to turn their passivity into activity by giving them something to do. W. B. Forbush, a recent convert to more modern methods, has contributed two articles to the *Graded Sunday-School Magazine* on the introduction of more of the dramatic element into our services.

Three-fourths of all play is dramatic, and most of the child's time is spent in fancying imaginary situations which are all intensely dramatic; and yet we try to interest him by making him sit bolt upright in a chair and listen to a prosy harangue. The Bible is a most dramatic book, as any book must be that consists so largely of biographies. We lose most of the sense of the dramatic by the way we teach the Bible. The writer would disarm criticism by assuring his readers that if dramatizing the Bible means merely aping the theatrical he wants nothing to do with it. He would at once make this distinction: that proper dramatizing is a means of self-expression, improper dramatizing is a self-exhibition. The dramatizing of a Bible story is not a "show"; it is a religious exercise. It is not done simply for the amusement of the audience, but for the benefit of the performers. It is intended for their religious education.

Several illustrations are given indicating the ways in which biblical presentations may be made in an interesting and yet unpretentious manner. Boys are given the name of Bible heroes and each is required to give a five-minute sketch of "his own life," putting the narrative into the first person. The shorter epistles are condensed into abbreviated form, written in modern style, and addressed to some present-day person, class, or church. A child is asked to write an imaginary letter from Simon Peter to his wife just after he left home to follow his Master, telling what he is doing and how he is finding his new life. If one wishes to undertake something more elaborate, the life of Elijah or of any of the biblical heroes might be dramatized.

The essential thing in all these devices is to identify each pupil with some character other than his own, so that he may get inside and think his thoughts from within.

Can the Child Experience God?

Writing in the *Graded Sunday-School Magazine*, A. G. Wardle seeks to answer this question in the affirmative. Now can a child of tender years experience God? Even by the adult God is experienced, in part at least, as *immanent* in his world. How much more will the little child find God in the created world about him: physical blessings, home care, and nature's beauty. At first these will suggest nothing but comfort and pleasure to the child, but the Christian parent will connect them with the name of God, and the child will

unconsciously be laying the foundation for the later conscious relating of all of life to the thought of God.

As the child grows older and home care calls forth the consciousness of parental personality, God takes on the form of being in his mind, and in the receiving and appreciating of life's ministries to him he learns fellowship with God. From the consciousness of parental personality he passes easily to the conception of divine personality. There will doubtless be repeated again the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament age. God will be a human father grown large. The motor-minded child will think in terms of physical prowess, as did the Hebrews of old; while the sensory-minded one will dwell in a sort of fairyland of the soul, and unless care be taken will imagine God to have a ghost existence with the ability to speak out of dark corners during the night hours.

As the child passes out of the kindergarten period to that of the primary department, the parental conception of deity expands into that of ethical authority. God is then thought of as pleased with goodness and pained when the child goes wrong; and wrong is largely disobedience to parents and failure to conform to the morals of the group. But the sense of sin normal to the adult moral wreck and the introspective heart-searching consistent with later years are not to be expected in the tender age which so easily and naturally seeks God. These are not essential prerequisites to the child's consciously relating himself to God—a fitting climax to the earlier years in which the sense of God has been that of delight in his presence and confidence in his care.

Reconstructive Forces after the War

We take the liberty of culling out a few thoughts dealing with the foregoing subject taken from "Prospects of Liberal Education after the War," by President Chas. F. Thwing, in the *Hibbert Journal*.

The author sees the world's attention given over to the one task of perfecting *efficiency* in order to destroy the menace of German efficiency. The years succeeding the war must of necessity be devoted to the repairing of the enormous material waste incurred. In the meantime an alarming number of the world's idealists, the poets, the seers, and the college men, have perished, for they were the first to respond. If the prize of higher idealism, for which we are fighting, is not to be submerged under the weapons of material efficiency, special thought must be given to what is termed "liberal education"; that is, education which liberates from narrow provincialism of any kind, education which teaches a man to appreciate as well as to weigh facts and construct things.

The quartet of studies to which Dr. Thwing looks for the salvation of mankind are: history, in that it gathers up the experiences of the past; literature, in that it above all things is cosmopolitan and gathers up the experiences of all people—the four greatest poems are written in four different languages; philosophy, in that it seeks to appreciate and co-ordinate the fundamental and the true in all forms of learning; and religion, which represents God upon earth. "Religion gives a sky to the life of the community, a sense of infinity in the midst of its minute finiteness, and a God to a world living in the lust of the flesh and of the eyes. Thus interpreted, religion is to become the mightiest force in the rebuilding of man." No other forces are comparable to these. "They represent the eternal spirit of humanity of the past, they shall make the eternal spirit of humanity in the future."

But for the securing of these results one other factor must be reckoned with, the force of the teacher himself. In the teacher two forces are pre-eminent—personality and

truth. If personality be lacking, the result is weakness; if truth be lacking, falseness and error will prevail. The teacher is himself the great force in education. "Personal character devoted to duty, under the force of love, will be the guiding star of humanity.

Do We Teach the Truth about the Bible?

Under this caption Rev. E. L. Pell, D.D., writing in the *Westminster Teacher*, has some very pertinent remarks to make with reference to the way in which the Sunday school and the home must share the responsibility for the loss of faith of many of our young men and women as they pass through college.

Many people do not accept the Bible, not because they don't want to believe it, but because they cannot believe it, and that for a very simple reason. That reason will be found in the vast gulf that yawns between the ideas of the Bible which they gathered in their childhood and the ideas of the Bible which they found floating about in the world when they grew up.

Nobody ever told me when I was a child that God wrote the Bible with a pen made from a quill that he had plucked from an angel's wing. They only said that it was written by the finger of God. But some teachers never stop to reflect that if you don't explain what you mean to a child he is going to find an explanation for himself. And of course nothing was easier than to see God sitting on his throne, writing in a book in his lap, while the angel from whose wing he had plucked the quill stood by waiting to carry the book back down into the world as soon as it was finished. Nor was that all. Those early teachers, so far as I can recall, always spoke of God as the author of the Bible, just as they would speak of Dickens as the author of my Christmas book. I knew that Dickens had the help of a printer, but I thought that my Bible was all God's work, and if any *i* remained undotted or a *t* uncrossed God alone was responsible for it. And the way those teachers would repeat those terrible words: "If any shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy." I have hardly gotten over the horror of it yet.

"Our children will learn the stern reality soon enough; let us help them to enjoy life while they can," said our good mothers, and with the best of intentions they proceeded to transform child life into a beautiful fairyland. That is what is the matter with many a young man and woman just home from college today. So many of our young people go to college with a fairyland Bible. No wonder they come back with no Bible at all.

What Can Be Done with a Postcard

Some of the most effective means are those which lie right at our hands and are frequently overlooked because of their very nearness and simplicity. M. Florence Brown calls attention to the possibilities which lie unnoticed in the humble little messenger called a postcard. The beauty of a postcard rests in the fact that it is personal and it is concise; it bears your name, it bears a signature, and lack of space forces brevity in statement. While what follows is addressed particularly to Sunday-school workers, we are sure that the wide-awake pastor will find a hint or two.

Little people like to receive a message through the mail with their own names written on the outside. What a thrill of importance is felt when the good-natured postman calls out the name, or when, as the case may be, the mail is brought to the father at the breakfast table and he singles out a piece and with great surprise and pomp hands it to the one-who-is-just-beginning-to-read. The new pupil who has just been enrolled is both surprised and flattered when he receives a pretty postcard with an expression of pleasure at his coming, the sincere hope that he will be at Sunday school the next Sunday, and a word about some "nice and special" thing that is to be done and the desire to have him help. Again, an invitation to some simple function in connection with the Sunday school seems to be much more interesting when addressed personally on a postcard. Memory work, and home work of any kind can be effectively stimulated in the same way. The tedium of a long illness is brightened con-

siderably by a short message from the teacher frequently sent on a cheery-looking picture postcard. Considerable care must be given to the selection of the cards if they are of the picture type, and at all events it must be made the bearer of a personal message. All "manifolded" communications lose half their flavor. You will find that it amply repays for the time expended; and many of the quaint and ingenious little replies will give you a peep into their hearts, and will cause you pleasure indeed.

Teacher Training

For one month, from September 15 to October 15, the united effort of the Sunday-school forces of the evangelical churches of the United States and Canada, representing a Sunday-school membership of more than nineteen million, is to be centered enthusiastically upon the promotion of teacher training during the coming winter.

This Teacher-Training Drive has the following objectives:

1. At least one teacher-training class in every Sunday school of North America, meeting at the Sunday-school hour.

2. A monthly worker's conference in every Sunday school, meeting at least ten months out of each year.

3. A midweek training class for present Sunday-school teachers in every Sunday school where such a class is needed.

4. A co-operative community training school of religious education for every community where practicable; this school to have three functions: (*a*) to do graduate and specialization work; (*b*) to train leaders for classes in the local church; (*c*) to provide central training-class facilities for those churches of the community unable to maintain their own classes.

The following general community program has been agreed upon:

1. On September 22 the pastor of every evangelical church is asked to preach a sermon on "Teacher Training a National Necessity."

2. On the afternoon of this same Sunday an interdenominational community conference should be held to consider the best means of securing trained teachers for the Sunday schools of the community.

3. On this same Sunday an inspirational evening service, either a union service or a separate service in each evangelical church, should be held, having for its theme "The Importance of the Sunday School in the Present Crisis."

4. On some evening preceding Teacher-Training Sunday, and also on another evening following, there should be a worker's conference with supper to perfect plans for the coming Sunday and to conserve the results obtained.

It is evident that these plans depend upon local co-operation. Unless pastors and superintendents enlist in active co-operation they cannot succeed. The program should command itself to all.

CHURCH EFFICIENCY

Church Strategy

A recent exchange calls attention to the parallelism which should exist between the church militant and the present campaigns upon the Western Front. Summer is the campaign season on the battle fronts. In the winter plans are made and the strategists have their innings; but the real drive does not get well under way until summer.

On the contrary, most churches do their most effective work in the fall and winter, and some are practically forced to close during the hot weather months. Why not then reverse the military procedure and make the summer and early fall a season of planning and strategy leading into an intensive campaign as soon as weather conditions permit?

So much can be done during the summer in the way of checking up results, improving methods and equipment, and laying plans for a more energetic offensive as soon as

conditions are right. The summer is an ideal time for making a community survey and for attending to the numerous details in the necessary repairs in equipment which should not be allowed to hang over and delay or even cripple operations when they are supposed to begin. The early fall, just as soon as absentees are back in their places again, should witness a grand council of war, where all the data of the summer scouting is presented, the maps are laid out on the table, and the strategists of the church formulate an aggressive campaign for the coming winter. The general and his staff are not off their job during the winter time. No more should church leaders be during the relaxation of hot weather. Any church or Sunday-school leader who does not make these necessary provisions is only courting defeat and should be disappointed if it does not come.

The Training School for Chaplains

The training school for chaplains was officially opened at Fortress Monroe, Virginia, March 1, 1918. The faculty consists of one Methodist, one Episcopalian, one Baptist, one Catholic, and one whose denominational affiliation is not given. Seventy-one students were enrolled. One of the students, writing of the school, says:

> These men are from many of our best churches and colleges—men of broad and varied experiences. In barracks, not in classes, views on doctrine, polity, etc., are exchanged freely and candidly. The finest fellowship obtains. General and sectional conferences, of course, are held to discuss our work with relation to the army. In these sectional conferences the Catholics form one group, all Protestants the other. The period of this school will continue over five weeks from date of opening, at which time all will be assigned to their various regiments; but it is generally agreed that our common task and training will have created in us a mutual interest which could probably have been gotten in no other way.

Commenting on this, the *Christian Union Quarterly* has the following to say:

> It furnishes a good example for our theological schools. Men who are being trained to win the world for Christ are always at a disadvantage when trained in isolation. Perhaps this army experience may be of some value in unteaching our theological schools of the sectarian policy of having only those teachers who are members of their own communion. On the great vitals of Christianity there is a substantial agreement, to say the least among Protestants; but it would be of advantage both to Protestants and Catholics for each to have special courses of lectures from each side, that they may get a first-hand information regarding the problems of both. One of the best lessons of this war will be the combining of denominational schools and denominational papers for the common task of winning a lost world to Christ.

The Playground and Democracy

T. Dinsmore Upton, superintendent of recreation, Grand Rapids, Michigan, speaking on "Recreation and War," says in part:

> There never has been a time when we have needed organized play for the younger generation as we do today in the midst of a world-war. Already juvenile delinquency in the warring nations of our Allies has increased 53 per cent since the war began. The one greatest combating influence against the terrible effects of war on those too young to take part is training along the right lines with regard to games and playing them fairly.
>
> The worst product of autocratic rule is the losing sight of all fairness in an effort to win by any possible means. Four years ago, before this war began, a splendid Olympic athlete told me that German athletes thought first and foremost of winning—by any means. That was the same spirit which was manifested when the German autocratic powers pronounced a treaty not worth the paper it was written on.
>
> When the Japanese champions in tennis returned to Japan from America, they bore home wonderful tales of the American ideal of sportsmanship. In my estimation, there could be no finer compliment paid to any nation.

The splendid English idea of fairness is as proverbial as their bull-dog tenacity and courage. What fostered it? Primarily their love of a generous winner and of a courageous loser on the playing field.

We are engaged now in a most terrible war for the reason that the government of a nation doesn't know what fairness in the playing of the finest of all games—life—means. Isn't the true spirit of democracy the "fair play" spirit?

I have heard it said that in times like these we should not think of joyous things—of play, of song, of laughter. There never has been a time since God's original dawn when we just had to have such things as we do now. What will count for as much as the true spirit of manliness, taught in the playing of games, where the sense of fairness and courtesy is encouraged?

The world is to be won for democracy; and democracy means team work, oneness, and fairness in playing the game of life. Democracy therefore needs that the younger generation play and prepare. The church can assist in this.

The Social Value of the Chaplain

No saner counsel can be given to the minister or the social worker who is not permitted to go to the front than this: "Keep your eye on the chaplain in the army or the navy." An article by Rev. C. F. Armitage in the *Social Service Review* for July gives an insight into their manifold ministrations.

The main service of the chaplain is that of prophet, pastor, or priest; but this article presents his social value as it is bound to appear if he is faithful as such. The duty of a chaplain is not alone the offering of religious consolation. The boys in the field go to the chaplain and confide in him their personal difficulties, very probably their troubles at home. The chaplains also take part with the soldiers in their games. They umpire baseball games and referee football matches. In some cases they oversee the boxing bouts and keep the art manly. Moving pictures and other entertainments are frequently under the management of the chaplain. He lectures on social hygiene and discipline and keeps the supply of reading matter replenished. In general his business is to make himself a useful unit in the total organization, co-operating with the Y.M.C.A. and with the Knights of Columbus, for the common task is greater than the particular affiliation.

This service in the chaplaincy will bring changes in the church after the war. For some time the social movement has been gaining momentum; but when the chaplains return and the Y.M.C.A. secretaries, there will be a notable advance. It will be impossible for these men to be contented in the pastorate without the proper social equipment and activities. It will be equally impossible for the soldier layman, when he returns, to be content with anything less in his pastor than he has found in his chaplain. The methods and spirit which have proven their worth in the strain of active service will be demanded in the church life at home.

When Efficiency Gave Way to Self-Complacency

Bishop Nicholson says that the origin of Mohammedanism can be traced to Christian slackers.

> Once all Northern Africa was Christian. They had five hundred bishops. They had countless great scholars. But they were self-satisfied and they were exclusive. "We live in a different world," cried Cyprian, one of these old church fathers, "We draw to ourselves and feast our souls on the vision of God. We are Christians."
>
> While they were so eaten up with egotism, there were hungry souls out in the desert. And while they were quibbling over such theological puzzles as the number of angels that could stand on the point of a needle, a crafty fellow took the Old Testament into the desert and brought forth the Koran. Mohammedanism need never have been had those early Christians had a vision and a forward looking plan.

THE BOOK OF THE MONTH

A PHASE OF WAR-TIME THINKING[1]

OZORA S. DAVIS, PH.D., D.D.
President of the Chicago Theological Seminary

A careful observer of the phenomena of contemporary religious thinking cannot avoid a sense of dismay at the rapid growth of premillennial ideas induced by the war. It is a condition commonly attending periods of deep movements in international affairs; but it is more grotesque and radical than usual in the present instance.

What is needed is such a thorough study of the whole millennial conception as will enable thoughtful people to understand it in the light of its origin and history. This essential service has been performed by Professor Case with great clearness and skill.

The book contains five chapters and is furnished with an excellent selected bibliography and an index. The first four chapters are historical in treatment of the subject; the last furnishes a discriminating and earnest estimate of the millennial hopes entertained in war time.

The first chapter covers the gentile hopes as seen in the religions of Egypt, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Thus it is clear that the religious longings of Judaism and Christianity are not isolated from the great yearnings of preceding periods.

The second chapter surveys the Hebrew and Jewish hopes, first faintly defined, gradually growing more definite, coming to expression in the activity of the pre-exilic prophets, and reaching a turning-point in the disaster of Judah in 586 B.C. Then came the visions and dreams of postexilic Judaism. Jerusalem was to be rebuilt; the nation was to be restored; humanity was to be transformed. Messiah was to reign and the nations were to be converted or destroyed.

Professor Case furnishes a brief but most necessary and illuminating interpretation of the message and value of the Book of Daniel, which every Christian who would understand his Bible ought to read. It would save a world of misunderstanding and dismay (pp. 80–87). The treatment of the apocalyptic literature is most satisfactory. The ordinary reader of the Bible does not understand how much material there is of this sort or what light it sheds on the interpretation of such a canonical book as Daniel.

Chapter iii reviews the early Christian hopes. The "advent of a purely heavenly messianic age to be established by an outright act of Jehovah" was expected by pious Jews when John the Baptist began to preach in the wilderness. They were waiting for a new "heavenly society upon a miraculously purified earth." John, however, warned men of impending judgment; his passion was like that of the older prophets and not in accord with the apocalyptists. Jesus was closely in harmony with John. After his death, however, there arose a vivid form of apocalyptic expectation. "The heavenly Christ was soon to return to inaugurate a new régime upon a miraculously renovated earth."

The definition of the hopes that marked the two generations that followed the death of Jesus is traced with great clearness and accuracy. In the case of Paul, "the dura-

[1] *The Millennial Hope.* By Shirley Jackson Case. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1918. Pp. x+254. $1.25.

tion of the present age is so brief that the marriage relationship and other social obligations are to be avoided." The synoptic and Johannine ideas are clearly set forth.

The fourth chapter surveys the later Christian hopes. Both sides of the question are passed in review, especially the opposition voiced by Origen. The treatment is condensed, clear, and well proportioned.

The last chapter contains a criticism of the whole millennial speculation—for there is no definite and positive millennial program or uniform doctrine in the Bible.

Professor Case shows clearly that the miscellaneous proof-text method of confirming the teachings of any particular exponent or school, as, for example Blackstone's *Jesus Is Coming*, is a plain wresting of Scripture, either done in ignorance or sheer dishonesty. He says:

> Imagine, if you can, the postexilic prophets urging their Jewish kinsmen of Assyria and Egypt to hold fast their faith in God, awaiting with assurance a coming deliverance to be initiated some twenty-five hundred years later by the use of a modern railroad from Joppa to Jerusalem. The true premillennialist can perform this feat of fancy with the ease of a professional acrobat, at the same time affirming that he stands upon the solid rock of Scripture.

Of course Professor Case is familiar with the chief instrument in the performance, a curious magic wand known as the "law of double reference."

The differences in the modern teachings are touched upon, differences which may be seen at a glance if one wishes to compare "W.E.B." with Professor Erdman in the *Congregationalist* of July 18 last. The whole criticism is carried on calmly but with deep earnestness. At no point is it unfair.

The volume is timely, able, vital. It ought to be read widely by all who are seeking to think clearly in these days of strain and perplexity.

BOOK NOTICES

An Introduction to the Old Testament. Chronologically arranged. By Harlan Creelman. New York: Macmillan, 1917. Pp. xxxiv + 352 + Index. $2.75.

Practically all conventional Old Testament introductions discuss the Old Testament books as they appear in the Bible, either in the order in which they are found in the English versions, or as they are arranged in the Hebrew Canon, or in convenient literary groupings. In recent years there have been several departures from this method of treatment, and various attempts have been made to trace the origin and growth of the Old Testament literature in chronological order, irrespective of the form or forms in which it has been handed down.

Professor Creelman adopts the chronological method of treatment, but he introduces an additional element. He classifies and discusses the Old Testament literature, not only from the standpoint of chronology, but also from the standpoint of the historical situation in which it arose or to which it relates. In the author's own words, "The different books, or sections, or chapters, or verses, as the case may be, are taken up in chronological sequence as they relate to definite periods in Hebrew history, either as the Old Testament furnishes the history of those periods, or as its literature had its origin in them."

The author distinguishes seven periods: (1) from primitive times to the conquest; (2) the Judges, (3) the united kingdom, (4) the divided kingdom, (5) the exile, (6) the Persian period, (7) the Greek period. A question may be raised as to the wisdom of separating the period of the Judges from that of the conquest and of including the Maccabean age in the Greek period. The discussion of the

material relating to each period is arranged in two parts: the first furnishes a brief introduction to the history of the period and to the material relating to it or originating in it; the second gives an outline of the material, arranged chronologically.

The preparation of a work of this kind requires time. Professor Creelman worked fifteen years or more on his task, and there is abundant evidence to show that he made a careful study of all important contributions in the field of Old Testament introduction. His references to literature are confined to works in the English language, but this is no disadvantage in a book intended for the nonexpert, especially since there are enough books on biblical subjects written in English to constitute an excellent working library. Great care is exercised by the author, so that the reader may rest content that he has before him a fair and accurate summary of the discussions and conclusions of other scholars. Moreover, the author possesses a well-balanced historic sense; and after presenting all sides of a question he usually allows the student to draw his own conclusions. There are, indeed, times when one wishes the author had expressed his own opinion a little more definitely.

The volume is scarcely suitable for use as a textbook in the ordinary sense of that term. The peculiar arrangement of the material would make it difficult for the ordinary student to follow the discussion, and the abundance of details might prove confusing. Its real value will be as a reference book, for which it is well adapted. It is a storehouse of critical, historical, and chronological material and should receive a warm welcome from all students of the Old Testament who wish to acquire an intelligent appreciation of the Old Testament from the modern point of view.

A History of the Christian Church. By Williston Walker. New York: Scribner, 1918. Pp. xiii+624. $3.00.

In a volume of 624 pages Professor Walker compresses the entire history of the Christian church. The subject is divided into seven periods. The first period is from the beginning to the gnostic crisis; the last the transition to the modern religious situation. Each of these periods is subdivided into from eleven to twenty topics which embrace the leading emphases of the period. The dates are distributed through the narrative, so that the reader will feel the need of fixing them as he reads, for there are no convenient summaries.

The volume is closely packed, but the author's breadth of sympathy and mastery of the subject have enabled him to keep the connections of cause and effect, and so to present a well-balanced, enticing, and readable story.

The work is entirely ecclesiastical. The author evidently felt that the complexity and vastness of his material would not permit him to take into account the contemporaneous social and political movements and their relations to the development of the church.

There are four good maps, thirteen pages of bibliographical suggestions, and an excellent index.

Beginnings in India. By Eugene Stock. New York: Macmillan, 1917. Pp. iv+124. $0.80.

The purpose of this little book is a rapid sketch of Anglican missions in India. Incidentally the missions of other communions are noticed with due appreciation. Dr. Stock begins with the founding of the East India Company in 1600 and the first mission, and traces the steps and ramifications of Anglican missions, such as the first bishop, the first educational mission, the first Indian clergy, divinity colleges, medical missions, first work among women, and ends with a chapter on "First Steps toward an Indian Church." He recognizes the difficulties of denominationalism in foreign missions. At present he thinks there is no way of overcoming them entirely, but in the meantime there should be a large spirit of brotherhood and co-operation among all communions, and thus the asperities of denominationalism will be mitigated and progress will be made toward the elimination of these asperities.

The book puts the whole story within easy reach of missionary workers.

Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. With notes and Introduction (Cambridge Bible.) By W. E. Barnes. Cambridge: University Press, 1917. Pp. lx+118 and xv+27. *2s. 6d.*

This little volume is quite worthy of the series in which it takes its place. It has the faults of the small popular commentary, but scant discussion of the Hebrew text, and too slight recognition of certain difficulties in exegesis with the various solutions advanced; indeed, in this latter regard it fails to attain even the standard of many of its sister-volumes. In addition its detailed exposition fails rather conspicuously at times to give the local background of thought necessary to a true understanding of certain passages. Yet none the less it is for its purpose a highly commendable work. The critical position adopted is one of sane moderation. Throughout the editor refuses to be stampeded by mere clever theories; in particular is this noticeable in his brief but incisive discussion of the metrical system of

Zechariah. In the introductory material the excellent little sketch of the Persian history of the period is deserving of mention as a feature of special usefulness.

The book is in two parts: Haggai and Zechariah in one, and Malachi the other. By this arrangement Malachi is assured a tolerable measure of prominence, but Haggai suffers to the advantage of Zechariah: his introduction is very scanty; the disproportion is even greater than the relatively greater bulk and significance of the material in Zechariah warrants. The contention for the early date of Zech., chaps. 9–14, that it was, indeed, written by a disciple and possibly a younger contemporary of Zechariah, is worked out with care and argued with considerable force, yet one completes the discussion with a feeling that it falls short of conviction. Typographical errors occur, as, for example, *hōrāh* given as the Hebrew root of Torah (p. 15), and *I. M. P.* as the initials of the author on "Malachi" (p. lvii) in the *International Critical Commentary*.

Religious Education and American Democracy. By Walter S. Athearn. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1917. Pp. xiii+394. $1 50.

Democracy depends on the enlightenment of the people, but it depends not less on their spirit and ideals; for the former we have our public schools and our colleges, while for the latter we have made no general social provision. Religious training, absolutely necessary in a democracy, has as yet no adequate institutional life. This need Professor Athearn surveys; he proposes to meet it by the development of community effort and by the correlation of the many agencies already in the field. The book rises out of practical and valuable service and will aid others in working out their problems in their own communities. The community council is the author's special contribution. It deserves most careful study, for it is rich in promise. But he treats here also the work of the college in teaching the Bible and in training religious teachers. Some of the fundamental weaknesses of the present situation are disclosed especially in that the church colleges have given their largest attention to preparing teachers for public-school work instead of training those leaders who would solve the problems of the local church and community.

The Essentials of Religious Education. By Charles W. Heathcote. Boston: Sherman, French & Co., 1916. Pp. 290. $1 50.

So long as we think of religious education simply as instruction about religion its scope will be confined to knowledge, its activities to the Sunday school, and its materials to the Scriptures. Except in the sketchy historical survey this is the point of view of this treatment of some of the elements of religious education. It would be helpful to any church-school teacher, for it gathers up much sound advice; but it hardly justifies the breadth of its title.

The Psalms and Other Sacred Writings. ("Biblical Introduction Series".) By F. C. Eiselen. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1918. Pp. 348. $1 75.

This is the third of a series of four volumes, the first of which has already appeared (see *Biblical World*, L, 49). Like its predecessor this volume is well adapted for the purpose for which it was written. It is what it claims to be, "a scholarly, nontechnical introduction" to the books with which it deals. It covers the Psalter, Proverbs, Job, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. It does not, like some too concise introductions, exasperate the reader by a dogmatic statement of opinion, unaccompanied by any sufficient presentation of data in support of the opinion. The grounds for a decision are as fully presented as they can be within reasonable limits and for the nontechnical reader. The spirit of the book is thoroughly historical. Its evident purpose is to let the facts speak for themselves and to accept their testimony unreservedly. It is a most encouraging sign of progress to receive such a book from the press of a denominational publishing house. Publications of this type will aid greatly in producing an intelligent church, one of the supreme needs of this needy age.

Anyone who wishes a very brief account of Palestine in the New Testament times will find *The Cradle of Christianity* by S. P. T. Prideaux (New York: E. P. Dutton, $1 50) a very valuable aid. The book deals with important matters, such as "The Messianic Hope," "Hellenism and the Dispersion," "Apocalyptic Literature," and "Jewish Parties." The volume is of especial value in that, brief as it is, it makes constant reference to the original sources.

After forty years of faithful service *Philochristus* (New York: Macmillan, $1 75) has been republished. It is reissued without change and is too well known to need comment.

Essays in Orthodoxy. By Oliver Chase Quick. London: Macmillan, 1916. Pp. xliii+310. $2 00.

It is hard pulling against wind and tide, and the able author of these *Essays in Orthodoxy* the chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury

—is well aware that he has chosen a task little favored by the current of popular interest. He seeks "to restore to living activity the theological and dogmatic tradition of the Catholic Church." Speaking of the religious needs of the plain man of our day, he contends—with some justice—that what we need is not less theology, but a great deal more. He considers, also, that the first necessity is not to restate the creeds but to explain them.

Accordingly in a series of nine essays he discusses the doctrine of the persons of the Trinity, with excellent temper and with considerable sympathy for the modern point of view. His aim is not so much apologetic as it is to reach a clearer conception of the meaning and application to life of the ancient creedal affirmations. It may be doubted how far he will be successful in finding a hearing. We of today are so preoccupied with other lines of thought that we have not too much patience either for his matter or his method. Religion as dogma has had the center of the stage for well over a thousand years. Perhaps the reaction is as wholesome as it is inevitable that for a little while religion as life should crowd it quite out of the foreground into the shadow.

The Highway of Life and Other Sermons. By Hugh T. Kerr. New York: Revell, 1917. Pp. 186. $1.00.

The Committee on Men's Work of the Shadyside Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh is responsible for the publication of this volume of sermons by its pastor. Dr. Kerr is a stimulating preacher. These fourteen sermons have interesting titles and are full of timely truth. The war is frequently reflected in them. "Life at Its Best" is on the same text as the familiar sermon by Brooks entitled "The Wings of the Seraphim," and has the same three divisions. In such a situation comparisons are inevitable, and we found ourselves turning to the older discourse. After reading the two we missed in the more recent volume that note of distinction which has made the sermon by Brooks a permanent piece in the literature of preaching. An interesting treatment of a familiar text is in the sermon entitled "The Greatest Gift in the World," on John 3:16. Dr. Kerr says, "During the week that has gone I have been going over scores of sermons which the major and minor prophets of the Christian church have preached during the centuries the church has had this treasure in her possession, wondering if I could discover some suggestion that would make these familiar words live again in our hearts." Now "scores" is a large word; it means forty at a minimum; and to search forty sermons is surely some labor. Perhaps Dr. Kerr used "The Great Texts of the Bible," where the divisions that he selects may be found on page 187 of the volume on John. He credits the suggestion to Maclaren (whose name he furnishes with a capital *L*) and uses it well. A fine example of honest work.

The New Country Church Building. By Edmund de Schweinitz Brunner. New York: Missionary Education Movement, 1917. Pp. xvi+141. $0.75.

Among recent developments in ecclesiastical theory and administration the new attention being paid to the country church is significant. The problem of the "downtown" city institution was somewhat overstressed; the church of the countryside is coming to its own. This low-priced volume contains sensible principles based on careful study, is furnished with excellent illustrations, and is the best book at hand for its purpose.

The Challenge of St. Louis. By George B. Mangold. New York: Missionary Education Movement, 1917. Pp. 271. $0.60.

Of primary interest to the people of St. Louis and designed as a textbook for local study classes, this comprehensive, thorough, and most interesting study of the city claims the attention of all students of sociology and philanthropic service. The book is well made, published at a remarkably low price, and is the first of a series which will render an essential service to all Christian workers.

Ordered Liberty; or an Englishman's Belief in His Church. By A. S. Duncan-Jones. New York: Longmans, 1917. Pp. viii+147. $1.25.

This book is made up of the Hulsean Lectures, delivered before the University of Cambridge in 1916–17. The author is the perpetual curate of St. Mary the Virgin, Primrose Hill, and examining chaplain to the Bishop of Lincoln. As might be expected from title and author, the lectures are a plea for loyalty to the Church of England as an integral and genuine part of the Catholic church.

The recent rapid rise of inquiry—due to the war—as to whether the state church in England is maintaining its hold upon the masses of the people, and whether it fairly brings home to the average man the actual teaching and religion of Jesus, is bringing into being a number of eager arguments in her defense. It is perhaps natural that most of them should seem to American readers to appreciate imperfectly the strength of the reaction against a type of religion so largely sacerdotal and sacramental. To the writer of this book "the Church, with its

priesthood and creed, its sacred books and its rites," is the pledge and support of the realities of Christianity. He fears that it may lose its essential character by being merged into "the shapeless chaos of indefinite Protestantism." To him the Holy Eucharist is the central act of worship, and should form the principle service each Sunday, as being "the key and center of the world." The argument as a whole is one that will appeal to loyal High Churchmen, but probably to few others.

The Manual of Inter-Church Work. By Roy B. Guild (editor). New York: Commission on Inter-Church Federations of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, 1917. Pp. xv+221.

This informing book contains the reports of the various commissions that were considered at the Congress on Inter-Church Federations that was held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 1-4, 1917. These reports were gathered and discussed with great care. At the close of the congress a committee prepared a valuable body of recommendations; these are also published here. The book is necessary to any group that is seeking for the wisest available counsel in organizing and conducting federated church work in American communities. We commend especially the seventh section devoted to "International Justice and Good Will." The chapter on "Community Evangelism" is clear and sane.

The Christ We Forget: A Life of Our Lord for Men of To-Day. By P. Whitwell Wilson. New York: Revell, 1917. Pp. xvi+328. $1 50.

The publisher has given interesting biographical material concerning the author which is suggestive in arriving at an estimate of this vivid piece of writing. Mr. Wilson is a distinguished London journalist who has studied the four Gospels with care and sketched from them, without any regard for the results of modern critical and historical research, another portrait of Jesus which he designs especially for "men of to day." We see here the hand of the journalist, skilled in making summaries, quick to turn a phrase, and discerning the human values in the story of Jesus with precision. He will not "go one inch beyond what is actually stated in the New Testament." Problems are disposed of quickly and comfortably as follows: "Though inaccuracy is not proved, the pedigrees of Matthew and Luke are not identical, either with each other or with certain documents in the Old Testament. At this distance of time, no research can compose the discrepancies which, I confess, is no difficulty to me, for I see therein the truth that the God of the Past is and ever will be as unsearchable as the God of the Present and the God of the Future." Perhaps this is satisfactory to the brilliant London journalist; but to another type of mind it might seem less a proof of the inscrutability of God than the witness to the fact that someone had boggled the records. Here is a bit of picturesque angelology: "Here, then, we see the angels hurrying, as it were, with a resplendent rivalry to tell their news to the shepherds, so that when one spoke—the first of missionaries—it was in breathless phrase, as if, panting, he had outflown the others. 'Behold'—he cried—'a Saviour—born to you—this day—in the city of David—Christ the Lord!' What an eager message—not one syllable wasted!" Nothing could be lacking in this description of a breathless angel; the "Gloria in Excelsis" gets its consummate newspaper setting here.

The writer is reverent, devoted to the divine Character, which he sets forth with kindling zeal. He leaves the great Figure arresting, vivid, and triumphant. We found our mind running to another book with a similar title published within a year, *Jesus for the Men of To-day when Science Aids Religion*, by George Holley Gilbert. If one would see the difference between the old and the new, each expressed in the highest form, each reverent and enthusiastic, let him read these two books. For there are evidently two sorts of "men of to-day."

Can We Believe in Immortality? By James H. Snowden. New York: Macmillan, 1918. Pp. xiv+227. $1 25.

In view of the superabundant material on this question, one may be pardoned for wondering what is the special justification for the present volume. The author recognizes the justice of this inquiry and we think fairly meets it in his Introduction. The problem of a future life, always of fascinating interest, has suddenly become an urgent one for millions. And it has to be answered in terms of present day thought and live with sympathetic recognition of the new spiritual crisis thrust upon us by the war. Many of the philosophical discussions of the subject in recent years, as by leading psychologists in the Ingersoll Lectures at Harvard, merely radiate the gloom and darkness that seem so attractive on this theme to the professional scholar, while others, more conservative, have lost their convincingness through mere lapse of year. There seems always to be room for fresh discussion of the matter not for the expert but for the plain reader for the common people who know what it is to live and suffer, but who care little for the entertainment of psychological speculation.

The present volume is such a study. It cannot lay claim to any great originality or distinction of treatment, but is a worthy and effective presentation of the argument along

various lines, always from a strongly Christian point of view. Its style is forceful and pleasing, and its quotations, though mostly familiar, are numerous and well chosen. In spite of a tendency here and there to speak too confidently or rhetorically of things that lie hidden from our understanding, it will be likely to find a wide circle of interested readers.

Religious Progress on the Pacific Slope. By Charles Sumner Nash and John Wright Buckham (editors). Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1917. Pp. ix+326. $2.00.

In October, 1916, the Pacific School of Religion, formerly known as Pacific Theological Seminary, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary, the first of its kind to be observed by any Protestant theological school west of the Rocky Mountains. The papers presented at this festival were carefully prepared and were designed to give a wide survey of the religious progress of the coast during a half-century. They are here published, well edited and printed, and make an interesting volume of permanent value. The address by President Main of Grinnell College entitled, "Will Jesus Survive?" is a strong treatment of the subject. Among the historical papers, that of Dr. J. W. Buckham on "Religious Thought" is of superior quality. The book will be a source of the second rank for the religious history of the Pacific coast.

Adventures of the Christian Soul. By K. J. Saunders. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. Pp. xii+145. 3*s*. 6*d*.

This is an essay in the psychology of religion, based upon careful research and verified by the results of teaching in mission schools in India. The subjects treated are: the subconscious; religion and childhood; religion and adolescence; conversion; mysticism; prayer and meditation. The adventures of the soul in the experiences of religion are traced in reference to the biological and physiological facts to which they are related in the process of daily living. There is nothing especially new in the treatment of the subject; but the experiences of the writer give a fine freshness to his statements. The chapter on "Prayer" is particularly good.

War-Time "Over Here." By William Allen Knight. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1918. Pp. xii+139. $1.00.

This is a war-time book, containing forty-nine short articles, the majority of them originally appearing in the editorial columns of the *Boston Herald*, in which Dr. Knight has endeavored to interpret the meaning of the last year of American history. The composition is done with the usual deft, clear workmanship of the author. A few of the articles are of more than transient value, but editorials at best are fugitive pieces, and these are of this kind. The interpretation of our complex life is clear, and readers who want a sympathetic and heartening message for war time will find it here.

The Christian Idea in the Modern World. By Raymond Calkins. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1918. Pp. xii+124. $1.00.

The author of this book is Rev. Raymond Calkins of the Shepard Memorial Congregational Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts, well known as a clear thinker and master of a forceful literary style. He has gathered here nine articles, which have apparently been used in public address, discussing subjects vital to American thought during the war. He sets forth the Christian idea, clearly and positively, seeking to fit it into the present world-situation. His analysis is trenchant; his insight is accurate and discriminating; he speaks like a prophet. "The Meaning of Non-Resistance" is as thorough a treatment of this challenging subject as we have seen. The two chapters, "The Servant State" and "The Christian Nation," are well-nigh perfect. This book ought to find a wide circle of readers, for it is clarifying to thought, timely in its propositions, and is one of the finest pieces of war literature that has yet appeared in America.

Christ and the World at War. By Basil Mathews (editor). Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1917. Pp. 195. $1.00.

Here are twelve sermons, preached in England by clergymen of various Christian bodies, including the archbishop of Canterbury, Professor D. S. Cairns, Rev. J. D. Jones, and Rev. G. Campbell Morgan. They are gathered now in order to show the way in which the British pulpit is treating the great subject of the war. It is evident that it is handling it in many ways. Rev. R. F. Horton discusses the subject "Thou Shalt Not Kill" in masterly fashion. Principal Garvie presents "The Theological Outlook in Time of War" in a form that tastes of the lecture-room. Dr. Jones is impassioned in the leash of fine restraint as he calls for a deeper experience of Christ. The general impression produced by this volume is that British preaching in war time is positive, confident, comforting, and deeply earnest. So far as these sermons go, they are not "great"; but they are timely, charged with religious feeling, and are suited to help the average man carry on through dark days. But the pulpit must rise to a higher elevation than these sermons reflect if it is to furnish the inspiration and leadership imperative in a generation as needy as the present.