
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WHY should a man, when he chooses another form of Church life than that into which he was born, think it necessary to inform the world of the reasons for his choice? It may be because one who makes this change is sure to be somewhat deferential to his ego, and judges the world's interest in it by his own. But it is more than that. It is an idea, which never seems to have been challenged, that a man is not entitled to choose a religion for himself. If he does he must show the world that he had compelling reasons for it.

The idea is contrary to the mind of Christ. Every man is bound to choose a religion for himself. If he is content with that into which he was born, or in which he was educated, he must see to it that his contentment is not easy acquiescence but the deliberate choice of his manhood. If it is not so, his religion is of little value, and is little likely to bear itself well in the battle of life. It is more likely to fall away from him altogether as soon as he passes into life's first real testing experience. A mocking word may be enough or even a ripple of malicious laughter.

In the book entitled *My Confession*, Tolstoy tells the story of a youth whom he designates simply by the letter S. He says: 'S——, an intelligent and truthful man, told me how he came to stop believing. When he was twenty-six years old he once, at a night's rest during the chase, followed his old habit, acquired in childhood, and stood up to pray. His elder brother, who took part in the chase, was lying in the hay and looking at him. When S—— got through and was about to lie down he said to him: "So you are still doing these things?"

'That was all that was said; and S—— that very day ceased praying and attending church. Thirty years have passed since he stopped praying, receiving the communion, and going to church. Not that he knew the convictions of his brother and had joined them, not that he had decided on anything in his mind; but only because the sentence which his brother had uttered was like the pressure exerted with a finger against a wall which was ready to fall of its own weight. The sentence was merely an indication that where he thought there was faith there had long been a vacant spot, and that, therefore, the words which he spoke, and the signs of the Cross and the obeisances which he made during his praying, were quite meaningless actions. Since he had come to recognize their meaninglessness, he could not keep them up any longer.'

The choice of a religion costs something. When our Lord was on the way to Jerusalem, on that last journey which He made to the Cross, He was surrounded by pilgrims who were going up to the

Feast. He discoursed as He went. Ever and anon one would come out of the crowd and make the offer of discipleship. St. Luke records three, obviously typical, examples. Of these three cases one remained in His mind as He proceeded on His journey. The man said enthusiastically, 'I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest.' Jesus answered, 'The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.' This man was making the right choice, but he was in danger of making it too lightly.

This case, we say, seems to have remained with our Lord as He went on. Sometime after—it is recorded in another chapter by St. Luke, but it belongs to a later stage of the same journey—Jesus spoke two parables. 'For which of you,' He said, 'desiring to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count the cost, whether he have wherewith to complete it? Lest haply, when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to finish, all that behold begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish.'

That was the one parable. The other had exactly the same meaning. 'Or what king, as he goeth to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him that cometh against him with twenty thousand? Or else, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an ambassage, and asketh conditions of peace.'

What is the meaning, and why did He emphasize it by two identical illustrations? The meaning is that the choice of a religion is a great thing and not to be undertaken lightly. It *is* to be undertaken. We *must* forsake all that we have and become His disciples, else our religion is of no account. But we must set our whole heart to the choice and carry it through.

Under the title of *A Spiritual Æneid* (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net) there has appeared a book written by the Rev. Ronald A. KNOX, formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, in which the story is told of one man's choice of a religion.

We have read some tracts written by Mr. KNOX, and found spiritual strength in them. We have also read his previous book. It was not sent for review when published, and we missed the opportunity of rejoicing with our readers in the delight of it. Its title is *Some Loose Stones*. It is simply a criticism of the Oxford volume of essays entitled *Foundations*. But its lightness of touch and its incisiveness, its perfect application of word to thought, and its unmistakable contribution to theology, especially on the Person of Christ, make it a book to be read with pleasure and remembered with gratitude.

Why, then, is this new book so disappointing? The author has deliberately written it ineffectively. He is a man of moods, and his particular mood, on entering the Roman Church, is that of intellectual self-denial. He must not use the gifts God has endowed him with. He must be slow and solemn and dull. And that is not all.

When a man changes his form of religion he has to see to it that the choice he makes is of a form of religion that is worth choosing. It is the greatness, the grandeur, of the religion which Jesus stood for that made the choice so important in His day, and makes it so important still. We do not say that the Roman religion is not worth choosing. We say that Mr. Ronald A. KNOX has never had a glimpse of a religion that was worth choosing.

What is a religion that is worth choosing? We should say that the religion of the Old Testament is worth choosing. Take it in the form in which the prophet Micah expresses it: 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' Does Mr. KNOX recognize justice, mercy, or humility in the religion which he has chosen? He recognizes

none of them. Humility is certainly in his thoughts, but it is not humility before God; it is the humility that shows itself in submitting to the Pope.

Again, we should say that the religion of the New Testament is worth choosing. Take it in the form which came down from the Old Testament but received the stamp of our Lord's approval: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself.' Does Mr. KNOX choose that form of religion? It has not once occurred to him that a choice of religion has anything to do with love of God or man.

His book is the story of departure from the evangelical religion of his father, the Bishop of Manchester, and arrival at the utmost bounds of Roman ritualism. But all the way he is chiefly concerned with things that are external, even with external trivialities. The religion he has chosen is not the religion of Christ. Christ's is a great religion, and demands great sacrifice. 'If any man will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow me.' Mr. KNOX thinks he has made some sacrifices. He dared to go about in Cambridge while he was yet an Anglican with a cassock on. But wherein has he denied himself? He acknowledges his wilfulness—'contrairiness,' he calls it. He has simply been obedient to his own will throughout.

When a religious man remains outside the Church of Christ, it is well for us to find out the reason. We have an excellent opportunity in the case of that late eminent scientific scholar, Professor Silvanus P. THOMPSON.

Before he died Professor THOMPSON had almost ready for the press the manuscript of a volume to which he gave the title of *A Not Impossible Religion*. It has had the final touches given to it by Mr. T. Edmund HARVEY; and it has been issued by Mr. John Lane at the Bodley Head in London (6s. net).

From its title we should conclude that it is more constructive than critical. The conclusion is correct. Professor THOMPSON is more anxious to tell us what he himself believes than to criticise and condemn what we believe. And by this resolve he is able to maintain an inoffensive tone throughout. But some criticism was inevitable. At the very outset he tells us that he will have nothing to do with organized religion in this land. And he has to tell us why.

It is no surprise to find that he rejects our theology. There are other things no doubt to which he takes exception. The one and only occasion upon which he lets himself go is in what can only be called a contemptuous reference to ritualism. But the real reason why he will have nothing to do with churchgoing is that in the churches there is preached some doctrine of atonement.

It is the doctrine of the Atonement that he objects to. He objects to it with his whole soul. He speaks of it with loathing. And he is courageous enough to assert that there is no such doctrine, or anything like it, in the New Testament. He says that the gospel which our Lord Himself preached was a gospel of simple forgiveness—and of course he refers to the Parable of the Prodigal Son in evidence. He says that the gospel which the Apostles preached was a gospel of Resurrection. He denies that they ever made anything of the death of Christ. They made everything of His rising again from the dead.

Now it cannot be denied that Professor Silvanus THOMPSON, great scientific authority as he was, makes out his case by the familiar but utterly unscientific procedure of quoting the passages which agree with his thesis and ignoring those that oppose it. But after he has gone all the way with this method of interpretation he finds himself face to face with certain facts which are too broad and open to be ignored. The most important of these facts is the emphasis that is laid on Redemption.

Professor THOMPSON takes the bull by the horns. The redemption spoken of in the New Testament is not redemption from sin, and it needs no sin-bearer. It is redemption from Hades. Listen to his words: 'Eternal life is to be given as the result of Christ's death and resurrection, but not as any buying off of condemnation, or sacrifice offered up for sins of others. What, then, do the allusions to redemption mean? Unquestionably they refer to the then current opinion that the souls of men at death must all descend into an under-world, a Hades, the abode of spirits where all men, from Adam downwards, had gone. We may see traces of it in the passage in the first Epistle of Peter about Jesus going down to preach to the spirits in prison. Into that Hades, so the tradition of the Church ran, Christ had descended, being, however, by His Divine nature able to escape, to loose the bonds of death, the first of men to return to the light, bringing Adam with him after an imprisonment of four thousand years. By being the first to rise again into life, He had overcome death, and thus proved to men that God had removed the penalty of sin. In this way His resurrection demonstrated the completeness of the reconciliation or atonement. It was a redemption not in any sense by the innocent suffering for the guilty. But its essence lay herein that Jesus, having devoted His life freely for the sake of others, had by His triumph even over death, revealed the divine and crowning gift of eternal life, converting it from a dim speculation into a glorious certainty. Any one who will re-read the Epistle of John with this key to his meaning will not fail to see how much its language gains in force. Not until he has grasped this key will he realise the fullness of the Apocalyptic declaration: "I am the first and the last and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold I am alive unto the ages of the ages, and I have the keys of death and of Hades."'

We have quoted the passage in full. It makes comment superfluous. But here are two striking consequences. This man, who insists upon every belief being subjected to the sternest rules of scientific investigation, declares his own belief both in the Descent of Christ into Hades and in His Resurrection from the Dead.

Where was the Epistle to the Philippians written?

There are three claimants—Cæsarea, Ephesus, and Rome. Dr. Maurice JONES considers their claims, and delivers his judgment in his new Commentary on *The Epistle to the Philippians* (Methuen; 6s. net). He delivers his judgment at greater length than would be tolerated in a criminal court of justice. For prisoners tell us that they prefer a year's sentence to an hour's 'jaw' from the judge. But the claims of Ephesus, says Dr. JONES, have never been discussed in any previous commentary on the Epistle, and they must be discussed 'at considerable length.'

Cæsarea is easily set aside. The contents of the Epistle to the Philippians 'are decisively against any connexion of the letter with that city.' There are two decisive phrases. In 1^{13} St. Paul says: 'My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace.' That is the familiar Authorized translation. And that would suit Cæsarea well enough. But in the Revised Version the translation is: 'My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole prætorian guard.' And that would not suit Cæsarea so well. How do the advocates of Cæsarea get over it? They go closer to the original Greek than even the Revised Version. They go to the Revised Version margin—'My bonds became manifest in Christ in the whole Prætorium.' Now the word 'Prætorium' is used to designate the residence of a Provincial Governor. In Ac 23^{35} it is actually applied to the Governor's residence in Cæsarea: 'He commanded him to be kept in Herod's palace' (R.V.m., 'Gr. Prætorium'). But the word 'Prætorium' has to be translated. For it has two meanings. Throughout its whole history it was used both of places and

of persons. And here it is taken by most modern scholars in the personal sense as referring to the men who composed the Prætorian guard; and although there might have been a Prætorian guard in Cæsarea, it is not so likely as in Rome.

The other phrase is found in Ph 4^{22}: 'All the saints salute you, especially they that are of Cæsar's household.' Upon this Dr. JONES says simply: 'It is difficult to see how "the household of Cæsar" could mean any institution outside of Rome itself.' So much for Cæsarea.

The claims of Ephesus are stronger. It is true they were not heard of thirty years ago. For it was in 1890 that Lisco made the tradition of an imprisonment of St. Paul at Ephesus a matter of probability. And if the Apostle was really imprisoned in Ephesus it is not so difficult to believe that he wrote this Epistle there. Of those who favour both the imprisonment and the writing of the Epistle in Ephesus, Dr. JONES names Deissmann, Albertz, B. W. Robinson, Kirsopp Lake, B. W. Bacon, and E. W. Winstanley. Nor are these all. The case is worth considering.

Now, first of all, it is evident that in the Book of Acts St. Luke does not give us a complete list of St. Paul's imprisonments. The Apostle himself (in 2 Co 11^{23}) speaks of being 'in prisons more abundantly,' and Clement of Rome says that he was 'seven times in bonds.' One of the seven times may very well have been in Ephesus. For there, he tells us himself, he stood in jeopardy every hour, he died daily, he fought with beasts, he was pursued yet not forsaken, smitten down yet not destroyed, he had the sentence of death within himself, but God delivered him out of so great a death. That language carries us beyond the deeds recorded in the Acts of the Apostles. To not a few it means that in Ephesus St. Paul had been imprisoned, tried, and condemned to death, but by some unknown influence had been allowed at last to escape.

That is the first argument for the Ephesian imprisonment, and it is the strongest. The other depends on removing the last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans from its present place and making it the whole or the part of a letter to Ephesus. If that chapter was addressed to Ephesus the case for an imprisonment there is established. For 'in Ro 16^{7} St. Paul describes Andronicus and Junias as "my fellow-prisoners," and where could they have shared his prison except at Ephesus? Again, in 16^{3}, he speaks of Aquila and Priscilla as having "for my life laid down their necks," and where could they have risked their lives for the Apostle's sake if not at Ephesus, where they were his close companions and fellow-workers?'

Add, however, the evidence of tradition. There are certain early Prologues to the Pauline Epistles. They are published in some versions of the Vulgate. These Prologues are attributed by Corssen to Marcionite influence, and they are therefore of considerable value as evidence of second-century beliefs. Well, the 'Monarchian Prologue' to the Epistle to the Colossians reads: 'Ergo apostolus *jam ligatus* scribit eis ab Epheso.' Once more, there is a tradition of imprisonment in Ephesus in the Acts of Paul and Thekla, 'a document which in the opinion of those who are qualified to judge goes back to the second century and is generally trustworthy in its historical details.' Last of all, there is in existence at Ephesus to-day a tower which is called 'St. Paul's Prison.'

Well, if St. Paul was imprisoned in Ephesus that is so much in favour of his writing the Epistle to the Philippians there. But that is not all.

'The style and content of the Epistle to the Philippians bind it closely with the great central group of letters, those to Corinth, Rome, and the Churches of Galatia, and if it was written at Ephesus much about the time that the letters to the Corinthians were written, we are rid of the difficulty which confronts the Roman theory, viz.

the adoption of one style of writing in the Corinthian and Roman letters, of another style in the Colossian-Ephesian group, and then a reversion to the original style in our Epistle.'

Again, 'the Apostle's own situation and his relationship to the Philippian Church are more intelligible if the Epistle was written at Ephesus and not at Rome. The frequent communications between St. Paul and Philippi and the journeys of Epaphroditus would be much more practicable if the Apostle was at Ephesus, within comparatively easy reach, than if he was in Rome, some hundreds of miles away. The Epistle also implies that the Philippians were perfectly acquainted with his circumstances, and that there was no need to enter into any detailed description of these. His imprisonment is only casually referred to, and only then as a fact which was well known to them. The intimate intercourse which such a close acquaintance with the Apostle's condition implies was much simpler between Philippi and Ephesus than between Philippi and Rome.'

'St. Paul's plans for the future also point in the same direction. His most urgent desire if he is released is to return to Philippi, and that not because there was any serious trouble in that community which demanded his presence, but merely because of his earnest longing to see his beloved Church again. From his Roman prison his eyes were turned towards the farther West and not backwards to the Churches of the East, whereas from Ephesus Philippi would be the most natural place to visit once he had regained his freedom. As a matter of fact we know that he did actually proceed from Ephesus to Macedonia when he was forced to depart hurriedly from that city (Acts 20^{1}, 2 Cor 2^{12}). Further, there is no trace in our Epistle of any preaching activity on the Apostle's part, which is inconsistent with the situation at Rome as outlined in Acts 28^{31}. His one grievance in our letter is that while others are active he is condemned to silence. He cannot preach, his adversaries can' ($1^{12\text{-}19}$).

Then come the two decisive passages, already discussed for Cæsarea. Can the Prætorium be found in Ephesus? Certainly. And that however we translate it. If it is the residence of the Roman Governor, that residence would be, for the Province of Asia, in Ephesus. If it is the 'Prætorian Guard,' the Imperial body-guard was often sent on special duty to the provincial capitals. 'And it would be much easier for St. Paul to make himself known to a detachment of two hundred "prætorians" in Ephesus than to the whole Prætorian corps in Rome which numbered about nine thousand men.'

The other phrase is more difficult. How could 'the household of Cæsar' be found in Ephesus? Dr. JONES replies that the term is used 'to designate the freedmen and slaves attached to the Imperial court. Now the evidence of inscriptions reveals the fact not only that were there resident in Ephesus individuals answering to this description, but that there were actually "colleges" composed of these two classes to be found in that city.'

The best arguments for Ephesus have been left to the end. There are two of them.

First, the description in Phil $1^{15\text{-}17}$ of the Christians 'who "preach Christ of envy and strife" and "proclaim Christ of faction" harmonises well with what we know of the situation at Ephesus. In this city there was probably a section of Christians associated with the name of Apollos, analogous to the "Apollos party" at Corinth, which was animated by ignoble motives, and took advantage of the Apostle's bonds to push itself into the foreground. Apollos is known to have been in residence at Ephesus both before and during St. Paul's ministry there, and his method of teaching would meet with a ready response in a city where the Greek spirit was strong and where Alexandrian ideas prevailed.'

And secondly, 'the opponents so fiercely denounced in $3^{1ff.}$ were Judaisers with whom at the time of writing he was manifestly in bitter conflict.

Now if the Epistle was written at Rome it is difficult to understand the recrudescence of the Judaistic controversy, seeing that St. Paul had apparently many years before gained a complete victory over these particular opponents. If, on the other hand, the letter belongs to the period of the Ephesian ministry it saw light when the controversy was at its height and the presence of the outbreak against them in it becomes quite intelligible.'

Yet Dr. Maurice JONES has little hesitation in giving his judgment for Rome. How does he come to it? He does not reject any of the arguments used for Ephesus. He simply shows that the same arguments can be used for Rome with greater force. Then he uses two arguments that tell against the Ephesian origin.

First the Epistle to the Ephesians is completely 'silent as to the "collection for the saints," which was the one practical matter upon which the whole mind of St. Paul was bent when his Ephesian ministry was drawing to a close. It is mentioned in every Epistle known to have been written at this period, and it is unthinkable that, with his mind full of this Christian duty, the Apostle should write to the Philippian Church, which, as we know from other sources, was specially concerned with this bounty, and ignore that completely while he has much to say of the generosity of the Church towards himself.'

Last of all, 'the joyous, grateful tone of the Epistle is manifest even to the most superficial reader. Now if it originated at Ephesus somewhere about the time that the Epistles to the Corinthians were written it belongs to a period which was the most stormy and turbulent in the whole of St. Paul's activity, when the Judaistic controversy was at its most bitter stage and when his own situation and that of the Churches with which he was most closely concerned were of the gravest possible character. The Apostle was, as we know, a man of moods, but it is difficult to imagine even St. Paul writing to the Philippians a letter which is overflowing with joy and gladness in the very thick of this "storm and stress."'

Is it possible to understand the miracle in the Book of Joshua in such a way as to find it a miracle still? Professor DICK WILSON of Princeton Theological Seminary believes it is possible. In *The Princeton Theological Review* for the quarter ending in March he asks, 'What does "the sun stood still" mean?'

And he answers that it means an eclipse of the sun. He comes to that conclusion by the unexpected road of Babylonian astronomy. He had been reading a syllabary contained in the Cuneiform Texts which certain American Assyriologists like Professor Clay have so admirably edited. There he found that the word translated 'stood'—'and the sun stood still'—is in Babylonian used for an eclipse. He made investigation further. He found that the phrase 'about a whole day' could be translated 'as when a day is done,' and evidently referred to the fact that the eclipse brought on darkness as if it had been night.

Then Professor DICK WILSON translated the whole passage. This is the translation: 'Then spake Joshua to Jehovah in the day when Jehovah delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel:

"Be eclipsed, O Sun, in Gibeon,
And thou moon in the valley of Ajalon!

And the sun was eclipsed and the moon turned back, while the nation was avenged on its enemies. Is it not written upon the book of Jashar?

And the sun stayed in the half of the heavens,
And set not hastily as when a day is done.

And there never was a day like that day before or since, in respect to Jehovah's hearing the voice of a man."'

But how is an eclipse a miracle? It is not a

miracle in the way it used to be understood to be a miracle. Professor DICK WILSON is as unwilling to give up a miracle as any man we know. And he does not give up this miracle, as we shall see. But he gives it up in so far as it involves the solar system and the law of gravitation. He even confesses to a feeling of relief, 'as far as I myself am concerned, that I shall no longer feel myself forced by a strict exegesis to believe that the Scriptures teach that there actually occurred a miracle involving so tremendous a reversal of all the laws of gravitation.' But he holds by the miracle still.

For he believes that the eclipse took place at the prayer of Joshua and in immediate answer to that prayer. 'How stupendous,' he exclaims, 'was the faith of Joshua as shown in his prayer! How immediate and complete was God's answer to that prayer! He who knew beforehand what Joshua would ask, had made all preparations to grant his request. For His are hearts and stars, and darkness and light, and faith and love and victory, excelling in their lasting glory all the transient miracles of standing suns.'

Christ is against war, and will bring it to an end. Do you believe that? We would send those who do not yet believe it to an article in *The Times Literary Supplement* for April 25, 1918.

Why do men say that Christ will never bring war to an end? Because it is human nature to go to war. Because man is a fighting animal. Well, read that article. It is not found in a theological magazine. It is found in a paper wholly given to the literature of the day. The article is written, not in the interest of Christ, but in the interest of human nature, that human nature with which art and science have to do.

The title of the article is 'The Devil's Disciples.' This is its first paragraph. '*Paradise Lost* is a great work, but it has dangerously misled us about the character of Satan. Milton's Satan has the virtue of frankness; he cries—Evil, be thou my good. But we may be sure that the real Satan has no virtues. Complete evil is complete because it believes itself to be good, because it thinks that it is making the best, and facing the facts, of this evil world. The real Satan does not say—Evil, be thou my good. He says:—So long as human nature is what it is, it is vain to attempt to make it any better; or, Since man is a fighting animal there can never be an end of war. He is always telling us to face the facts; but facts are to him changeless and evil; the very virtues of man can be explained by his animal past, and are but more subtle expressions of instinct. For the real Satan, and for all those who are deceived by him, there is no good or evil, no truth or falsehood, no beauty or ugliness, but only a process which deceives us in its very working; and the best we can do is not to be deceived by it, but to see ourselves for the mechanical products we are.'

Those who assert that man is by nature a fighter point to the past. What man has been, they assume that he will be. For what man has been, that he is. But the assumption is unworkable. They do not work it themselves. They say that men are fighting animals, and the next moment they praise our soldiers for their heroic self-sacrifice. If the soldiers are obeying an instinct, where does the self-sacrifice come in? They are no more worthy of praise when they fight than when they eat. They are less praiseworthy. For the eating is at least an instinct that is harmless.

If men are fighting animals, what difference is there between ourselves and the Germans? 'Both are fighting animals, and fight because it is their nature to. Yet the very people who tell us that we can never make an end of war because we are fighting animals would be the most indignant if they were told that there was nothing to choose between us and the Germans, that their sense of the righteousness of our cause was merely the fighting instinct of the herd camouflaged with an ethical disguise.'

'They cannot have it both ways. They cannot exercise their reason to prove that there is no reason in mankind; for, when they have proved that, they have discredited the very process by which they prove it. They have discredited all their own arguments, all their own emotions, all their own values, and, even so, they still fail to convince us that there can never be an end of war. For, if man has such a power of self-deception, or is so deceived by nature for her own purposes, he may come to believe, contrary to all the facts, that he is not a fighting animal and, harbouring that delusion, may cease to be one. Undoubtedly our ethical delusions have often acted just as if they were facts. They have abolished slavery for us; they have caused us to band together for the suppression of crime. Why, then, should they not cause us to band together for the suppression of war? Society will not accept from a footpad the excuse that man is a fighting animal; it arrests, tries, and sentences him, under the delusion that man is man. May it not, under the same delusion, establish an international power to suppress national footpads? and, when it has done so, will it not be just as well content with the working of that delusion as with the working of the no less illusory criminal law?'

No doubt it is possible for a man to make himself a fighting animal for the moment. The Germans have done it. They have done it for the period and the purpose of this war. When Professor Kuno Meyer was reproached with treachery and ingratitude and lying, he put the German view frankly. 'You English, he said, do not understand that war is a serious thing; we Germans, when we are at war, mobilize all our forces, moral and intellectual, as well as physical; in fact, morals and intellect joyfully own themselves the servants of the ultimate reality, force: of course I forget my former friendship with you and unsay all that I have said about you and the Irish; of course I tell lies knowing them to be lies; we are at war; and there is no more truth or morals; there is only a trial of strength. All this he said, or implied; and how can those who say that man is a fighting animal find fault with him? He obeys his instincts and fights as best he can, using those faculties which we very inconsistently call higher in the service of those which, with the same inconsistency, we call lower.'

This war has happened, says the writer in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 'not because men are fighting animals, but because they have sinned; and if they were fighting animals they could not sin or be conscious of their sin. It is strange how those who tell us we are fighting animals do not see that they are preaching despair; and that it is despair because we are not fighting animals. If all that youth had died fighting only, and blindly, for the pack, for ourselves, that elderly remnant of it that is left at home, how could we escape despair at the waste of their lives? What memorial could we raise to them that would not be a mockery? And if a future life were possible to mere pack animals, how bitterly they would laugh in it at the spectacle of the pack commemorating their silly sacrifice and pretending that it was concerned for anything beyond its own worthless survival. But there is only one memorial we can raise that will not be a mockery to them or an expression of our own despair, only one in which all nations can take part; a memorial that shall express our resolve for the future as well as our grief for the past, the memorial of a league of peace.'