

JAN 19 1911

THE PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME IX

JANUARY 1911

NUMBER I

ON THE ANTIQUITY AND THE UNITY OF THE HUMAN RACE.

The fundamental assertion of the Biblical doctrine of the origin of man is that he owes his being to a creative act of God. Subsidiary questions growing out of this fundamental assertion, however, have been thrown from time to time into great prominence, as the changing forms of current anthropological speculation have seemed to press on this or that element in, or corollary from, the Biblical teaching. The most important of these subsidiary questions has concerned the method of the Divine procedure in creating man. Discussion of this question became acute on the publication of Charles Darwin's treatise on the *Origin of Species* in 1859, and can never sink again into rest until it is thoroughly understood in all quarters that "evolution" cannot act as a substitute for creation, but at best can supply only a theory of the method of the Divine providence. Closely connected with this discussion of the mode of origination of man, has been the discussion of two further questions, both older than the Darwinian theory, to one of which it gave however a new impulse, while it has well-nigh destroyed all interest in the other. These are the questions of the Antiquity of Man and the Unity of the Human Race, to both of which a large historical interest attaches, though neither of them can be said to be burning questions of to-day.

The question of the antiquity of man has of itself no theological significance. It is to theology, as such, a matter of entire indifference how long man has existed on earth.

follows in the footsteps of Johannes Weiss, but goes one step further, in that he makes the atonement refer not to the unrepentant Jews but to the sinful world as such. Still further the eschatological Jesus resembles the Christ of the Church, in that He is and acts as a thorough believer in fixed dogmatic conceptions, indeed makes dogma the parent of history. And finally there is to be registered the great gain that the eschatological school has driven out of the life of Jesus the "liberal" figment of a subjective development in his consciousness both with regard to His work and His person. Taking it all in all there is abundant warrant for saying that the writers of this school have strikingly vindicated the right of supernaturalists, Augustinians, Calvinists to claim Jesus as their own. Everybody will have to admit that the historic church has more faithfully preserved the image of the Christ, if thus He lived and thought and preached, than any school or phase of theology that has criticized her faith.

The translation, so far as we have been able to compare it with the original, has been admirably done. In the title of Dulk's book on p. 324 "The false *Step* in the Life of Jesus" does not correctly render the original "*Der Irrgang des Lebens Jesu*". John occurs for Peter on p. 127. Bruno Bauer's birth-year is given as 1809, and yet it is said on p. 138, that, when in 1839 he removed from Berlin to Bonn, he was "just at the beginning of the twenties". The original has not "beginning" but "end" of the twenties, but the slip is pardonable since the age of thirty is too advanced to be called "that critical age" in the life of a young man when he is apt to "surprise his teachers".

Princeton.

GEERHARDUS VOS.

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

LETTERS OF JOHN MASON NEALE, D.D. Selected and Edited by his DAUGHTER. With Portrait. London, New York, Bombay and Calcutta: Longmans, Green & Co. 1910. 8vo. pp. xvii. 379.

There is no more picturesque figure in the history of the "Catholic Revival" than that of John Mason Neale. We were not ungrateful for the *Memoir* of him published three or four years ago by Mrs. Charles Towle, although in many respects it left much to be desired. It is a pleasure now to be permitted to get somewhat closer to his interesting personality by means of this selection from his letters. His daughter, in the choice of the letters to print, seems to have had precisely this in view. The letters here presented tell us something of Dr. Neale's work: his work to such an eager worker was a large part of himself; and it is a distinct advantage to be enabled to view his work from the inside and to estimate more justly from the insight thus received the motives which impelled him and the spirit which animated him. What we chiefly value in these letters, however, is the glimpses they afford us of the personality behind the work, the

revelation they give us of the man that he was. It is a very attractive personality they present to us; crotchety no doubt, somewhat pugnacious, running in a narrow groove, but earnest, high-minded, indefatigable and animated by a true devotion to the causes he gave himself to. Never physically strong, he yet accomplished an amazing amount of labor. And he has left behind him not only a fragrant memory, but a triple monument in three great achievements. The nursing Sisterhood which he founded has prospered and become a beneficent power in the land. The reform in Hymnology which he introduced has affected the entire body of English hymnody and left a permanent impression on the worship of English-speaking churches. And his method of the indoctrination of the young by means of "truth embodied in a tale" remains until today the insufficiently followed example of a successful endeavor to mould the minds and hearts of the rising generation: have any stories in Church History as yet supplanted his?

Like several others of the leaders in the "Catholic Revival" Neale sprung from Evangelical soil and was bred in Evangelical traditions. His early letters from Cambridge introduce us to the Evangelical circles there. Charles Simeon died at the close of his first year, and Neale's letters of the time reflect the feelings of the Evangelicals on the great event. "Poor Mr. Simeon", he writes on Oct. 20th, 1836, "I am afraid, is dying. Mr. Carus watches over him, as if he were really, as he is fond of calling himself, his son." A fortnight afterwards he transcribes from Carus' own lips a moving account of the veteran's death-bed talk, recalling what may be read more at large in Carus' own *Memoir*; and then on Nov. 13 he records his death. "I, as you may easily conceive", he writes, "have thought of little else all day . . . So the day he has been preparing for fifty-six years has come at last. Oh, what a meeting he and Henry Martyn must have had! All the pleasure of thinking of that would be taken away by that horrible thought that friends will not know each other in another world. I cannot think how anyone can believe it. Poor Mr. Simeon; I cannot tell you how much I am grieved for his loss. I should think there was a great deal of sorrow tonight in Cambridge. I was going to say, 'What a glorious night for him!' but there is no night there."

Simeon had desired that his funeral should be very simple, and it was not designedly public, but the state of feeling in the University and town, partly in revulsion from former ill treatment, was such that the funeral became "unavoidably one altogether of public character." It fell on Saturday, Nov. 19—market-day—and the town was full: few greater displays of public sorrow and reverence have ever been seen in Cambridge. Dr. Moule in his memoir of *Charles Simeon* (in the *English Leaders of Religion Series*) gives two accounts of the scene at the funeral by "interested spectators." Neale gives another dated the day after (Nov. 20) but speaking as if it were written on the day itself:—"Today Trinity Church was a most striking sight: the deepest mourning everywhere, not silk but crape, and the crowded state of

every part, the altar and the ante part being overflowing. Though I was a quarter of an hour before time, I did not get a foot in the real Church, and had to stand all the time, as three or four hundred more had. Numbers had to go away. A beautiful sermon by Dr. Dealtry from "Them that honour Me I will honour."

Yet other than Evangelical influences were working on the ardent young man. The Oxford Tracts were agitating the world when Neale entered Cambridge, and not least the world of Cambridge. It was they and the successive parts of the "Pickwick Papers" which stirred the imagination of the eager undergraduates. A ferment was produced which a participant in it tells us no one can understand who did not witness it. Neale was caught in the effervescence of the hour and was so carried away that his friends thought of him as simply standing ready to "take up with the *ipse dixits* of a Newman or a Pusey." The letters do not enable us to trace the process of his change from Evangelicalism to Tractarianism. They pass over at once from the Evangelical letters of 1836 to the Tractarian ones of 1839. The change, however, no matter how accomplished, was thoroughly wrought. It was scarcely fair, nevertheless, to represent him as becoming a mere blind follower of Newman and Pusey. This he never became. Sharing, from his own Cambridge standpoint, the new views proclaimed at Oxford, he never became a personal follower of the Oxford leaders. To Newman's personality he was indeed rather antipathetic, and he looked somewhat askance at Newman's whole point of view. He did not even admire him as a writer of English prose. Among the few literary judgments expressed in these letters is this one: "I am disgusted with the article in the last *Christian Remembrancer* on Newman's Sermons. In our own communion I look on Andrewes and Taylor as superior to him as one man can be to another; and out of it, how could they have forgotten S. Francis de Sales, to mention no other?" And Newman's book on *Development* he had little patience with. He cannot imagine how any one could imagine Newman to hold a view compatible, for a moment, with Bishop Bull, and himself considered that Newman refrained from openly attacking Bull, only to avoid scandal. "The test way", he thinks, "very unfair." "Of course, N. would naturally choose such tests only as suited his purpose." "What I also object to is N's constant reference to his own past works. He means, of course, to say: 'You, the reader, believe now what I believed then: develop as I do, and you will in time think as I do now.' And doubtless, so far as his extracts go, we do hold now what he did. But there is another element in his then opinions which we never had—his exceeding hatred to Rome. And that may, almost unconsciously to himself, have made him what he is, on the principle of desire to reverse a wrong. So that I am more than ever inclined to go with Hope's theory, and believe that the first generation of reformers may perhaps be absorbed by Rome: but that the second will remain in our Church and renovate it. I don't care what Irons or anyone else thinks. I am quite sure that if we don't desert ourselves, God will not desert us. If you

all go, I shall stay. If Andrewes is not saved (who had far less reason than we have to remain) there are so few that will be that really it can little matter whether one goes on or not."

With so much detachment from the Oxford leaders, however, Neale's standpoint was essentially theirs. There may have been less primal "hatred of Rome" to be overcome in his case, and there was a more distinct drawing to the Orientals in him than in them. But the effect was the same; and one cannot help observing that the drawing to the Orientals was largely literary and sentimental. It led Neale, however, very far. In the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit he went with the Orientals absolutely. "In my own mind", he writes in 1850, "I am convinced with Palmer that the Latin doctrine, if consistently carried out, would become heresy, and that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son at all except in the way of Temporal Mission, and then not according to His Divinity, but only according to His operations." At bottom the meaning of this can only be that he could not conceive the Trinity save under the form of Subordination; and the equalization of the Son with the Father in all things seemed to him to be Sabellian. The roots of the Oriental view of Procession are indeed set in a subordinationism which is a caricature of the Nicene doctrine. So Orientalizing were his tendencies that his friends were alarmed lest he should become in his fundamental thought sectarianly Oriental. Early in 1844 he writes to his friend Benjamin Webb, to whom most of the letters in this volume are addressed:—"I know you are afraid I shall take an Oriental view, *i. e.*, I suppose so Oriental that it will cease to be Catholick. At the same time without becoming a shade more Anglican, I do see more and more clearly that the High Papal Theory is quite untenable. . . . I cannot think, as Montalembert does, visible union, or as the B[ritish] C[ritic] sometimes seemed to wish to do, the desire for visible union with the Chair of St. Peter, the keystone, as it were, of the Church, at least not in the sense in which the Western Church has sometimes done. We *Orientals* take a more general view. The rock on which the Church is built is S. Peter, but it is a triple Rock, Antioch, where he sat, Alexandria which he superintended, Rome where he suffered." Certainly this passage is compact of legend: but it makes very plain the position which Neale consciously sought to take up. He wished to be truly "Catholic", with conscious withdrawal from all that was peculiar—and therefore sectarian—whether in Oriental, Romanist or Anglican. His tendency was, however, very distinctly to identify Catholicism with Orientalisms. An amusing outgrowth of the reverence, amounting to idolatry, with which he stood before the very idea of "Catholicism", as well as of his zest in controversy, was the habit he acquired of employing the adjectives "Catholic" and "Protestant" as mere synonyms of "fine" and "horrid". Thus a beautiful oak wood is described by him as "Catholic", while of a Cathedral service he writes: "The chants were admirably well sung and *the* thing: but the Antiphons were just as Protestant and operatic," and of the undigni-

fied behavior of some Portuguese nuns, he says: "Truly I never beheld anything more horribly protestant."

To his own mind Neale was above all things a Reformer. The Church of England had fallen into a deplorable condition and it was the duty of all true men to do their part in lifting her out of the slough. And certainly the usages which he found here and there obtaining in isolated churches were enough to shock an earnest spirit. "I must tell you of a thing", he writes on one occasion, "practiced in Tong Church. The Squire has built a pew in the Chancel; when the Commandments are begun, a servant regularly enters at the Chancel door with the luncheon tray." This *apropos* of a crusade he was leading against pews, for which, a little later, he set to work systematically to collect appropriate anecdotes. "I have thought of a good idea", he writes to his friend Webb, "as I think you will allow. It is a collection of anecdotes against pews, such as the editor of the *British Critic* gave us, for instance. You and I will do it, and put our names to it, as proofs that the stories are authentic; we will set about it immediately. Scrape up all the stories you have been credibly told, or know yourself, and send them to me and I will digest them in order." There were more serious abuses. A clergyman "taking the duty" in a little parish, and being called upon to baptize an infant, on taking the child in his arms found there was no water in the font. "He thought it, of course, an accidental omission, and asked for some. The Clerk was in astonishment; however he sent for a glass of water, thinking the clergyman wanted it to drink. And on conclusion it came out that they never used it there!"

Among the usages which had grown up in the Church which Neale considered corruptions and felt called upon to reform was, oddly enough considering what he has come to stand for in the Churches, hymn-singing. No doubt his early dislike of hymns may have been in part due, as his daughter suggests (p. 45), to a revulsion from Dr. Watts' hymns, "which he and his sisters, in common with most of the children in Evangelical families, used to learn by heart." It was certainly more largely due, however, to reaction from all that was Evangelical; for hymn-singing was distinctively Evangelical, and when Neale reacted again from his dislike of hymns Benjamin Webb is accordingly found twitting him with not having fully cast off his Evangel-prevalent among the leaders in the "Catholic Revival" in opposition not merely to Evangelical hymns but to vernacular hymns, and indeed to hymns in public worship altogether. No hymns are included in the ical slough. It was partly due, also no doubt, to a general sentiment Prayer Book, and already in Palmer's *Origines Liturgicae* published in 1832, an attempt is made to show that hymn-singing is not "Catholic"; and Neale could speak in 1840 (p. 22) of his own dislike of hymns as something well known and altogether natural. Three years later, however we find him already fully converted to at least the practical value of even English hymns, and endeavoring to convince his friend Webb of it, too. "Why should Hymns" he now argues, "be less Cath-

olick than prayers? and therefore, why English Hymns less Catholick than English Prayers? We may wish to restore Latin in both, if you like. But till we can, surely English Hymns, if good, are better than none. . . . Depend upon it, we shall be acting more on the general principles of the Church, in making the best of a bad thing—allowing the universal abrogation of Latin to be so—than in saying, If we can't have that we will have none." (p. 58.) Webb proved difficult to convince; and a half-dozen years later called out from Neale a full argument in favor of the practical necessity and feasibility of creating an English hymnody by translation from the Breviary, by writing him frankly "I expect I shall loath your Methodistical snuffling hymnizing article. It is the oddest thing to me that you never slipped off that Evangelical slough: and it is due, I take it, to your fatal facility of versifying." (p. 124.) To Neale's leadership in this reaction from the earlier position of the "Catholic Revival" as to the use of hymns in public worship, and to his "fatal facility of versifying", the English Churches owe much,—how much has lately been told the readers of this *Review*, briefly but satisfyingly, by Dr. Louis F. Benson (July 1910: VIII. 3, p. 388 sq.). Neale's researches in mediaeval and ancient hymnology, were epoch-making also for our knowledge of a large and much neglected branch of devotional literature. He brought to light a great number of forgotten sequences and discovered the secret of their structure. His knowledge of Liturgiology on all sides but the aesthetical (where he allowed the superiority of his friend Webb) was unsurpassed, and especially so far as it was connected with the hymnological element. His sense for values in hymnology was remarkable and in his renderings of mediaeval hymns he had an unerring instinct for their adaptation both in content and language to modern needs. His feeling for sonorous sound is somewhat curiously illustrated by his mentioning these two lines—

"Michaelem in virtute
Conterentem Zabulon"

as "two of the finest lines, I think, in mediaeval hymns". This praise of course can attach only to the cadence of the verses: they have no substance. To our thinking, indeed, it would require a very keen sense of the witchery of words to extract music from this collocation of vocables: but Neale's own hymns are witnesses to the exquisite ear he had for melody. Their extreme popularity is testified by their almost universal use. The editor of this volume (p. 175) tells us that one-eighth of the hymns in one of the editions of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (61 out of 473) and one-tenth of those in the *English Hymnal* (72 out of 656) come from his pen. Going further afield we note that in the admirable *Hymnal* edited by Dr. Benson now in use in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, twenty-one hymns are accredited to Neale, and that in Dr. E. H. Johnson's *Sursum Corda* the most recent Hymn-Book prepared for the American Baptists, nineteen are his.

Apart from matters brought into controversy by the "Catholic Revi-

val" there are few allusions in these letters to doctrinal subjects. Even to these matters themselves the allusions are brief; there are no extended discussions. There are, however, one or two interesting allusions to views on the Real Presence in the Eucharist. "I have had a curious correspondence with Popoff about Transubstantiation", he writes on one occasion (p. 122). "I confess it seems to me nonsense to say, We believe in *μετουσίωσις*, but we say nothing of the *modus*; and we use the word in a sense of our own, quite distinct from the Latin meaning. And the Slavonic *Presvshchestvenie* is almost stronger, and means—were there such a word—transapparentiation." A few days afterward (so it seems; but the dates of the letters seem awry) he writes again: "What we both wish to express is this: the Bread and Wine are in the Liturgy changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord, as much as one thing can be changed into another; how it is done we don't decide; it may be by Transubstantiation, or by Impanation, or by a Hypostatical union. Now what are we to call this change? I name it Transmutation because it seems to me the vaguest word as to *modus*, the strictest as to *res*. I agree with you, however, that *transmutare* is not strictly *μεταποιεῖν*. Therefore, I will give another word, 'transfactured'. But if *μετουσίωσις* be not transubstantiation, how is *ὁμοούσιος* Consubstantial? In fact, you can draw no distinction between substance and essence. If you believe the essence of the consecrated Bread and Wine is the essence of our Lord's Body and Blood, you believe in the gross idea of Transubstantiation (which I am not denying)." Some years later he writes again (p. 197): "I think St. Cyril's words are much more explicit than mine. He says clearly, 'Which is *not* bread,' and that I take to be the only thing of importance. In the difference between *not bread* and *not simply bread*, lies, I think, the whole question." Thus hard it was to keep from confessing Transubstantiation and yet confess a change of substance which does not carry with it a change of attributes. One feels reasonably sure that if it were not for the desire on the part of the Greeks, and the necessity on the part of the Anglicans, to separate themselves from "Romish error" here, no difficulty would be made with the word "Transubstantiation". If *μετουσίωσις* is just Greek for Transubstantiation (and who can deny that but a Greek?), is not the assertion that what was a moment before just bread and still has all the attributes of bread is not bread at all any longer, just plain English for Transubstantiation (and who but an Anglican would ever think of denying it?). Apropos of the Eucharist, there is a curious story told (p. 258-9) which has an application. We read: "Here is a story which I heard yesterday. Lord Strathallan, the great-grandfather of the present, was mortally wounded at Culloden. His chaplain, the Abbè Maitland (for the old Scotch clergy, from their great connection with France, took that title), was with him on the field of battle, and the dying man wished to receive Holy Communion. But no bread or wine could be procured. So he was communicated with the only procurable things—oatcake and whiskey. Of course, as a real Communion, it was utterly invalid in both

kinds; but making all due allowance for invincible ignorance, it was a beautiful act of Spiritual Communion." It is a matter of interest to inquire what Neale could mean by pronouncing an act which from his standpoint must have been sacrilegious "a beautiful act of Spiritual Communion." From the Reformed point of view it is needless to say that the Communion thus administered, in the circumstances recited, while irregular, was entirely valid: but we cannot see any thing particularly "beautiful" in it.

Of the troubles which disturbed Neale's life at Sackville College, we naturally hear a good deal in these letters; and what we hear is very welcome. We gain from it a sense of the uncomplaining patience with which he endured what to him was veritable persecution. Of the rights and wrongs of the general case the letters do not enable us to judge, but they do enable us to perceive the very high temper in which Neale passed through the serious annoyances which came out of it all. The later years of his life were largely devoted to the institution and firm establishment of the nursing Sisterhood of St. Margaret's, and it was in the service of this Sisterhood that he wore himself out in the end, and met his death. His daughter obviously considers this Sisterhood his most "abiding and visible monument". It is doubtless not free from the faults which mar the most of the Sisterhoods established by the leaders of the "Catholic Revival", though it is clear that Neale's good sense and good feeling saved him from the extremities to which some of them went: and it is plain on the face of it that this Sisterhood has been a beneficial institution. When we speak of the religious usages introduced by the Tractarians and made a part of the "Rule" of these Sisterhoods, we touch on the least attractive side of Neale's activities. He was very tenacious of his priestly functions and sought to make full proof of his ministry. Take the practice of Confession for example. He placed the highest estimate upon its exercise and was persistent and insistent in pressing it upon all over whom he exercised authority or acquired influence. We say nothing now of its legality in the Church of England, a matter on which Neale from the beginning felt quite clear. The practice seems to us on grounds of mere ethics or even common decency indefensible,—a matter on which Neale appears to have felt no qualms. We defy anyone of unsophisticated mind, nevertheless, to read even the touchingly simple and transparently sincere letter here given, written to a lady wishing to prepare for her First Confession, without a sense of the horror of the thing. Think of urging, with all the compelling authority of an obviously pitying priest, delicate-minded and shrinking girls to pour into an attentive masculine ear a full account of all the movements capable of being construed or misconstrued as sin which they may from the dawn of memory have felt in their hearts. "To me you had better begin from the beginning—'The first sin that I remember was that I—' and so on. When you have gone through your life till the present time, then will be the time that I should go over it with you, taking the Commandments in order . . . " It certainly is a humiliating exercise which is here

demanded of people, and we cannot wonder that Neale adds: "I know, from my own experience the dreadful pain of a First Confession". What we wonder at is that he should feel authorized to promise "comfort" from it. As we read, we have a distressing feeling that the analogies to the scene here presented to our imagination are to be found in such others as the Hindoo priest's urging mothers to cast their babies into the Ganges with the plea that the pain will no doubt be great, but the comfort will be sure.

Neale had just entered upon his forty-ninth year when he died. He had begun life under the pall of pulmonary disease. His great desire was for parish work. But he was able to carry on that work, in the neglected living which was given him, for only six weeks, when the verdict fell upon him and he went forth in bitterness of disappointment to find whatever life could be snatched by him from the destroyer. He snatched from the destroyer a life of rich variety, of profound learning, of abounding activity, of world-wide influence. And he died, in the midst of his usefulness and in the fulness of recognition, still in the harness. We have his books; his works live after him. We would fain know as much of such a man as we can. He is an example to us all.

The editing of the volume is good so far as it goes,—and it goes far enough to provide a fairly good Index. We wish it had gone far enough to provide full annotations. Fifty, seventy-five, years are a long stretch of time for these full days of ours, and this is the period which has passed by since these letters were written. There are many allusions in them to people, transactions, even places, which will need explanation to the majority of the readers of the book.

Princeton.

B. B. WARFIELD.

VICTOR MONOD. *LE PROBLÈME DE DIEU et la Théologie Chrétienne depuis la Réforme. I. Étude historique.* Foyer Solidariste: Saint-Blaise, près Neuchâtel (Suisse); Roubaix, 123, Boulevard de Bel-fort, 1910. 8vo pp. 169.

M. Victor Monod is profoundly disturbed by the condition of current opinion upon the nature and activities of God. The idea of God he thinks has perhaps never before been made the object of more intense and wide-spread study. But the issue of the prolonged debates of recent centuries has been little more than an immense confusion. Nearly every thinking man has formed a different conception of the Divine Being for himself. "In the teaching of the Churches heterogeneous philosophies and contradictory religious aspirations are juxtaposed or superficially amalgamated." The question is raised whether "the Christian doctrine of God is essentially amorphous and irrational or is only compromised to-day by lack of critical spirit and of historical knowledge in some of its adherents." M. Monod's convictions lie in the line of the latter alternative, and he naturally wishes to do his part to clarify the atmosphere. The task he has undertaken is essentially a dogmatic one. But it has its natural if not necessary historical approach. "To draw out in order,"