
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.

When our Lord said, 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me,' what did He mean? Did He mean that it was just the same as if we had done it to Him, He being so much concerned for His brethren?

Mr. A. Clutton-Brock says no. It is much more than that. What we do to one of these His brethren we literally do to Him. We cannot isolate an act. We cannot say to it, Thus far shalt thou go and no farther. And it is not merely that every act has consequences. Of course it has, consequences which are incalculable. It is that every separate act is an inseparable act. If it touches one of the least of these it touches them all. It touches the universal brotherhood. It touches—and this is the point at present—it touches the universal Brother.

Mr. Clutton-Brock has written a book about Christianity. *Studies in Christianity* he calls it (Constable; 4s. 6d. net). He has written it for the purpose of telling us what Christianity is. And no one will be surprised that it takes a fairly large book to do that. He never runs Christianity into a definition. He expects us to read his book. But once he comes near to a statement of what Christianity is, so near that we shall quote it.

The statement is: 'Man is born within a natural order in which he is governed by his instinct for self-preservation; but it is possible for him to rise out of that natural order into another order in which he is no longer governed by his instinct of self-preservation but by his relation with a power above humanity, yet personal; and he attains to this relation, which is love, by the help of that power, a help which is called the Grace of God.'

Mr. Clutton-Brock does not call that a definition of Christianity. He calls it 'the doctrine of the Grace of God.' But we can see that the doctrine of the Grace of God is for him—is it not for us also?—that which makes Christianity what it is. And we see that its secret is love. For the Grace of God is the Love of God in exercise. And what it works in us is love, love to God and man.

It is not surprising therefore, when Mr. Clutton-Brock speaks of what we do to Christ's brethren, that he should select loving them as the example.

There are two things, he says, which we have discovered about loving. The one is that, if we love at all, we must love the particular. We must love *one* of these. The other is that when we love the particular we love the universal. We do not lose the love of the particular in the universal.

The more intensely we love one of these, the more intensely we love Him.

And so it comes to pass that if we are to love Christ at all we must love one at least, and one of the least, of these His brethren. The little one is not Christ; he is himself. And we love him for himself. Yet in loving him for himself, and only then, we love Christ. He prayeth best who loveth best. Does he pray at all who does not love? As St. John has it, If we love not our brother whom we see, how *can* we love God whom we do not see?

Here then are two things about loving. First, if we love the little one we love the Great One. 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, ye did it unto me.' And next, unless we love the little one we do not love the Great One. 'Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.'

In discussing the question of the teaching of Religion in schools, we seem to be concerned only with what we teach. Mr. E. T. CAMPAGNAC believes that what we teach is of much less consequence than how we teach it. As Professor of Education in the University of Liverpool, he delivered five lectures on the teaching of religion. These lectures have been published. The title is *Elements of Religion and Religious Teaching* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 3s. net).

Professor CAMPAGNAC told those whom he addressed, and who were in training as teachers, that if they were to teach religion they must first be themselves religious. Why should men or women be teachers at all? To satisfy the curiosity of children? To give them information? To tell them that two and two makes four, that the world is shaped like an orange, that the names of the kings of Israel were Jeroboam and the rest? We give too much information. 'Be very sparing of your knowledge,' he said; 'do not tell your pupils too much.' But, tell them much or tell them little, this is not education. It is not in order to impart knowledge that men and women become teachers.

'I think there is only one good excuse for teaching, and it is this, that you have for the thing which you want to teach so strong an affection and in it so fervent a belief that you cannot be silent about it, and for the people whom you have to meet in the course of your business so kindly a feeling—a feeling so intimate of kindred and of affection—that you cannot help talking to them about the things you care for. That is the only excuse for teaching. Otherwise all teaching is an intrusion.'

Especially is the teaching of religion an intrusion. If, in order to teach mathematics, you must believe in mathematics, that is to say, be mathematical; much more in order to teach religion, must you be religious. 'Why should you disturb the placid lives of children, why should you disturb the gaiety of youth, by telling the children or youths things you do not care much for, while all the time you do not care much for your unwilling listeners?'

Now religion is a venture. The religious man is one who 'has risked the things he sees for the sake of the things he does not see—the safe for the unsafe, the paying for the things that do not pay, the tangible for the intangible—that is the religious man.'

He is not a perfect example. 'He has a high strung nature and irritable nerves, and a sharp tongue—he has a thousand faults, but he has got, with all that, a fund of tranquillity which nothing destroys. He may go from extremes of joy to extremes of sadness—he is not overturned by either. He is like a well-balanced ship which, tossed by the waves, will not turn right over, because it has ballast. At the heart of emotion, however varied, he has tranquillity—that is one of the marks of a religious person.'

'Another of his marks is this: he is persistent. He will be baffled, discouraged, tormented with the opposition of the world and the inconsistencies of his own nature, but he will go on and on, and he will still go on. He counts in the long run because his influence is persistent.'

That is the man who can teach religion. 'If,' says Professor CAMPAGNAC, 'you tell me that your business is to teach religion, I should say, "Be religious, maintain this tranquillity, keep this persistence."' The religious man is not perfect as an example, but if he has tranquillity and persistence he will carry 'conviction to other minds, not in all he does, but in the main tenor of what he does, that he is somehow representative—he is himself, of course, but he is representative of more than himself. He speaks with the tradition of all truly religious people behind him; he speaks with the weight of their authority. He has penetrated into lonely places, which are yet, as he finds, strangely inhabited by other lonely creatures like himself, held together in communion with a presence of which his life becomes the imperfect, but the tranquil, the persistent and in its persistent tranquillity, the invincible, witness.'

The aim of all true teaching is to make the pupils what the teacher is. It is to make them mathematical if he is mathematical. If he is a teacher of art it is to make them artistic. And so is it in the teaching of religion. The aim of the teacher of religion, and his only aim, is to make his pupils religious.

But the teacher of religion has a peculiar difficulty to overcome. All other teachers can furnish proofs of their teaching. If it is true teaching, they can show that it is true. Every proposition in Euclid is a demonstration. Even the artist has some evidence in favour of his art. But the teacher of religion has no proofs to offer. Religion is a venture. It is a hypothesis. When your pupils ask for proofs all that you can say is that 'what you have been claiming is a great hypothesis; your working theory, an assumption which you make, and that you cannot prove the truth of your assumption to other persons except upon the condition upon which you proved it to yourself, namely, that they make the assumption too. You cannot convince another that what you taste and enjoy is good if he refuses to taste and enjoy it.'

And 'the difficulty is not disposed of by that. Suppose they say to you that they are glad to hear that you are candid enough to admit that all this is a hypothesis—it is your hypothesis, a very pleasant hypothesis, very comforting and even useful, "but," they will go on, "it will break down; it maintains you now, but not for ever will it maintain you." What answer is there to that?'

'The only answer to that is the answer which courage draws from the heart of love, namely, that you will risk it. One can and ought to try to anticipate the results of experience. You must make your risk and then see whether the risk has been justified. You cannot get the justification first and make the risk afterwards—there would be no risk. For faith is a venture—the faith which we repose in other people, the faith we repose in ourselves, the faith we repose in God. And a man who says to himself, "I will have my proof first, and repose my faith afterwards," is a man who is saying he will do what is impossible.'

We have to realize that there is a risk. And we have to make others realize it. More than that, 'a hypothesis made once is a hypothesis to be made again and again; it is not a certainty in advance; you leap in the dark, and all leaps that are worth taking are in the dark; whether you arrive upon a jagged rock, or a pitiless sea, or in a haven where you would be, remains to find out, and a courageous man, whether religious or scientific, or scientific and religious both, makes that venture: and if a hypothesis often made and confirmed induces security, he finds new exercise

for his courage by making a new and still bolder venture.'

The Rev. Edwin A. ABBOTT, D.D., delivered a lecture before the British Academy on '*Righteousness' in the Gospels*, which has been published by Mr. Humphrey Milford at the Oxford University Press (1s. net).

'Righteousness'—it is a Biblical word. 'Shakespeare never uses it; nor does Pope or Shelley. When it is used by Milton, Cowper, and Wordsworth it is tinged with ecclesiastical or theological associations, which remain to this day, so that even now, when we enumerate the good qualities of some friend, we cannot—without some sense of unreality—speak of his "righteousness." We may praise his "justice," but that is a narrower thing. We may praise his "goodness," but that is a vaguer thing. We may praise his "kind-heartedness," but that is a different thing. We have no English noun corresponding to that noble use of the Greek adjective which we find in Plato: "God is as righteous as is possible [for divine nature], and there is nothing more like God than a human being that is as righteous as is possible [for human nature]."'

But though Biblical, it is not found everywhere throughout the Bible, or even throughout the Gospels. Rather is its occurrence peculiar and quite perplexing. It does not occur at all in St. Mark. In St. Matthew it occurs very often, but only in the words of Christ. In St. Luke it occurs nowhere in the words of Christ, not even in parallels to St. Matthew, and only once elsewhere. The single occurrence is in the Song of Zacharias: 'that we should serve him [the Lord] without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all our days.' In St. John also it is found only once. The passage is an important and difficult one. Jesus in His last discourse says that when the Paraclete is come He 'will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgement.'

The word in the New Testament which is translated 'righteousness' is used by the Seventy. Its first occurrence in the Septuagint is in Gn 15^6, where it is said of Abraham that he 'believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.' 'The same Hebrew is repeated twice in Deuteronomy, "It shall be *righteousness unto us* if we observe to do all this commandment *before the Lord our God*," and, more particularly, "Thou shalt surely restore to him [*i.e.* the needy borrower] the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment and bless thee: and it shall be *righteousness unto thee before the Lord thy God*." In all these passages,' says Dr. ABBOTT, 'the "righteousness" is regarded as "*reckoned*" *unto some one* ("him," "us," "thee") even where "reckoned" is omitted. It is also "*before God*," that is to say, as seen by the eyes of God, who sees the truth.'

But in Deuteronomy the same Hebrew word, translated by the Seventy in Genesis *dikaiosuné* or righteousness, means 'charity,' in the sense of 'charitable alms'; and that meaning occurs sometimes in the Psalms, in Isaiah, and in Daniel. It is thus clear that, as Hooker says, 'there are two kinds of Christian righteousness, the one without us, which we have by imputation; the other in us, which consisteth of faith, hope, charity, and other Christian virtues.' As Dr. ABBOTT has shown in the passages in Genesis where it occurs, 'righteousness' is reckoned or imputed, but in Deuteronomy and other places of the Old Testament it is a matter of conduct, and is translated in the Septuagint *eleemosuné* or almsgiving. How is it with the Gospels?

The first occurrence of the word in St. Matthew's Gospel is in Mt 3^{15}, and there is not a more difficult occurrence anywhere, with the single exception of the single occurrence in St. John. Jesus comes to the Baptist to be baptized by him. 'The prophet expostulates, saying, "I have need to be baptized by thee." But Jesus replies, "Suffer [it] now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil *all righteous-*

ness." What is meant by "it becometh" as distinct from "it is needful"? And does "us" (instead of "me") mean the Baptist and Jesus, or "all Israel of whom I am one"? And how can the reception of baptism, which is not prescribed either by the Law of Moses or by the Law of Nature, come under the head of a "fulfilling" of "all righteousness"?

These questions have been answered divergently from the very beginning. Not every early expositor even attempted an answer. 'Ignatius writes that Jesus Christ "was baptized by John in order that *all righteousness* might be fulfilled by Him"—asserting in the same sentence that He was "*truly* from the race of David . . . Son of God . . . *truly* born of a virgin . . . *truly* nailed [to the cross]"—as if protesting (against the Docetics) that there was "*truly*" some objective "righteousness" that was to be "fulfilled" by the baptism. But he does not tell us what it was. Origen says, "Christ Himself is related to have been baptized by John, not with that baptism which is in Christ (Rom. vi. 3), but with that which is in the Law. For so He Himself says to John, 'Suffer it now . . . *all righteousness*.' Whereby He shows that the baptism of John was a fulfilment of the ancient things (*expletio veterum*), not a beginning of the new things (*inchoatio novorum*)." On the other hand, Jerome says that Jesus refrained from adding the nature of the righteousness—whether it was the righteousness of the Law or the righteousness of Nature—for the express purpose of making us understand that it meant both. But he, too, does not explain how the acceptance of baptism "fulfilled" either kind of righteousness. Chrysostom says, "How is it 'becoming'? Because we are thereby fulfilling the whole Law. . . . For 'righteousness' is the complete fulfilment of the commandments [of the Law]."'

Dr. ABBOTT prefers Origen. 'The Baptist, the last of the prophets, was making a final prophetic attempt to put new life into the fulfilment of the righteousness of the old Law, and Jesus, while awaiting further revelation, said that it was "becoming" or "seemly" for all Israel to join in this attempt "for the present" (R.V. "*now*"), although He anticipated that it would be insufficient.'

The next two occurrences are in the Sermon on the Mount, and they are remarkable, not so much for their own sake as for their total omission by St. Luke. The parallels are:

Mt $5^{6.\ 10}$.	Lk 6^{21}.
Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after *righteousness.*	Blessed are ye that hunger *now.*
Blessed are they that have been persecuted for the sake of *righteousness.*	Luke omits.

Dr. ABBOTT discusses the matter at some length. He does not think that St. Matthew altered St. Luke or that St. Luke altered St. Matthew. He believes that both had access to originals, not to one original only but to two, a Manual and a Biographical Collection of Logia. And he concludes: 'We are justified in believing that Matthew is not amplifying, or summarizing out of his own head, but is adding a longer and more poetic version taken from the Logia. Luke, on the other hand, if he is not here himself abridging and summarizing, is taking his version from the Manual. This may well have seemed to him more practical and comforting to Missionaries, more true to experience and history, and more intelligible to Gentiles.'

'The next two instances use "righteousness" in a technical sense for "almsgiving." "*Your righteousness*," says Jesus to His disciples, must exceed "*the righteousness of the Pharisees*," and "Take heed that ye *do not your righteousness* (A.V. alms) before men to be seen by them." Why does Luke nowhere insert these surely very needful warnings? Perhaps because of their technicality. At all events he inserts a non-

technical parable directed against those who "trusted in themselves that they were *righteous* and despised others." They are typified by a Pharisee praying by the side of a Publican. The Pharisee says, "God, I thank thee that I am not as the rest of men . . . or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week. I give tithes of all that I get." The Publican says, "God, be merciful to me a sinner." Luke adds, as the comment of Jesus, "I say unto you, This man went down to his house *made righteous*"—that is, *beheld as righteous by God*—"rather than the other."'

The remaining passages in St. Matthew may be passed over that we may come to St. John. Jesus has been speaking of the Holy Ghost the Comforter. 'He has promised them a Paraclete to take His place, being (as it were) His Second Self, the Spirit of Truth. And now He says, "And he [the Paraclete], when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of *righteousness*, and of judgement . . . of *righteousness* because I go to the Father and ye behold me no more" (Jn 16^{8-10}).'

How is the Spirit of Truth to convict the world in respect of righteousness? Dr. ABBOTT'S view is new to us. He says, and says rightly, that there is no thought at all of the Jewish righteousness of the Law, even in its broadest sense, much less in the sense of almsgiving. And then he says: 'It is a personification. The Father looks down from heaven to men on earth and sends His Paraclete to ask them, "Where is my Righteousness, whom I sent down to live among you, and to make you righteous?" And men, convicted and ashamed, are regarded as compelled to reply, "We did not love, we rejected, we cast out, Thy Righteousness, because we ourselves were unrighteous." Thus will the Paraclete "convict the world," or constrain the world to convict itself, "in respect of righteousness."'

He offers an illustration. 'The picture bears some resemblance to that of Astraea, the goddess of Justice, who lived on earth during the Golden Age, but was finally forced to depart to her home in heaven, banished by the injustice of men. Or it might be illustrated by the story of Aristides the Righteous, banished from Athens because the Athenians were tired of hearing him called righteous. But what is probably in the Evangelist's mind is the thought of a sad reversal of the glorious prospect depicted in the Psalms: "Truth springeth out of the earth, and righteousness hath looked down from heaven." How different was the prospect now! "Truth," or "the Spirit of Truth," is a title of the Paraclete, and instead of "springing out of the earth" the Paraclete will come down to convict the earth! "Righteousness," also, instead of "looking down from heaven" to bless the inhabitants of earth, is on the point of being banished to heaven, as an exile from the unrighteous earth.'

What is Mysticism? The question is not asked as if it were a novelty. It has been asked before. It is asked now because it has not yet been answered, and because it has just been asked again by Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH, King Edward VII. Professor of English Literature in the University of Cambridge.

'What is Mysticism?'

There the question stands, in a paragraph by itself, prominent on the page of Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH'S new book, *Studies in Literature* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 10s. 6d. net). Now when such a man asks such a question so ostentatiously there is hope that he has found an answer.

But shall we be able to receive it? For Mysticism is something which not every one can understand. Johnson could not understand it. He 'had small care or capacity to understand it.' Shakespeare did not understand it. Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH says so. He says, 'You may choose your grandest passage from Shakespeare: choose Prospero's cloud-capped towers and

gorgeous palaces; or choose Cleopatra's wail upon dead Antony:

O! wither'd is the garland of the war,
The soldier's pole is fall'n; young boys and girls
Are level now with men; the odds is gone,
And there is nothing left remarkable
Beneath the visiting moon.

Then set beside it a line or two of Blake:

When the stars threw down their spears,
And water'd heaven with their tears. . . .

or

A Robin Redbreast in a cage
Puts all heaven in a rage. . . .

or Wordsworth's *Ode to Duty*:

Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong;
And the most ancient heavens, through Thee,
are fresh and strong. . . .

and you will perceive that there are more things in heaven and earth than find their way into great Shakespeare's philosophy; and in particular a something which Plato had known, which Shakespeare did not know, which therefore had to be rediscovered by poets, wise men and children.'

What is Mysticism? You do not understand yet? Then follow the Professor of English Literature at Cambridge further. He refers to previous lectures with 'sundry scattered tenets,' as 'things dropped disconnectedly, casually, on occasion.' Now 'I shall try (if you will allow the simile) to piece these scraps of glass together into a small window through which you may not only, as I hope, have a glimpse into the true meaning of "Mysticism," but even perhaps, into the last meaning of poetry. Oh yes!—a most presumptuous hope most presumptuously uttered. But we have to do our best.'

Well, first of all, the Mystic sees that *the Universe is not a Chaos but a Harmony*. This vision, however, is not peculiar to the Mystic. All great thinkers have made this discovery. It conditions all their thinking. For 'if the Universe were a chaos, which is anarchy—if the sun rose unpunctually and lay down when it felt inclined, if no moon commanded the tides, if the stars were peevish, running to and fro like spoilt children—any connected thought would be impossible and we no better but worse than blind men jostled about by a crowd.'

Does the harmony of the Universe demand God? Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH does not say so. At least he does not say so yet. It is true that in the very next sentence he says that 'whatever it be, watching over Israel, it slumbers not nor sleeps,' and quotes first from Job and then from Ecclesiasticus. From Job:

'Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?'

'Canst thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his season? or canst thou guide Arcturus with his sons?'

And from Ecclesiasticus:

'The beauty of heaven, the glory of the stars, an ornament giving light in the highest places of the Lord.'

'At the commandment of the Holy One they will stand in their order, and never faint in their watches.'

But it is clear that he does not want to commit himself at once to the demand for a personal 'Creator, Preserver, and bountiful Benefactor'; for he proceeds to quote from Meredith, a quotation which ends with 'the army of unalterable law.' Then he passes to 'the music of the spheres':

Sit, Jessica, Look . . .
There's not the smallest orb which thou
behold'st
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young-eyed cherubins.

And—'You remember in Plato the story of Er the Pamphylian, whose relatives after ten days sought his dead body on the battle-field, and found it without taint of corruption: and how on the

twelfth day, being laid on the pyre, he came back to life and told them where he had wandered in the other world, and what seen: but chiefly of the great spindle on the knees of Necessity, reaching up to heaven and turning in eight whorls of graduated speed—"and on the rim of each sits a Siren, who revolves with it, hymning a single note; the eight notes together forming one harmony."'

'Plato learned of Pythagoras, Dante of Plato, Chaucer of Dante, Milton of Plato again. Hearken to Milton:

Then listen I
To the celestial Sirens' harmony
That sit upon the nine infolded spheres
And sing to those that hold the vital shears,
And turn the adamantine spindle round
On which the fate of gods and men is wound.
Such sweet compulsion doth in music lie,
To lull the daughters of Necessity,
And keep unsteady Nature to her law,
And the low world in measured motion draw
After the heavenly tune.'

Unalterable law, the music of the spheres, the celestial Sirens' harmony—he has not found it necessary yet to call in God. But he finds it necessary now to call in man.

For the next step in the understanding of Mysticism is to see that 'this macrocosm of the Universe, with its harmony, cannot be apprehended at all except as it is focussed upon the eye, intellect and soul of Man, the microcosm. All systems of philosophy—from the earliest analysed in "Ritter and Preller" down to James and Bergson—inevitably work out to this, that the universal harmony is meaningless and nothing to man save in so far as he can apprehend it, and that he can apprehend it only by reference to some corresponding harmony in himself.'

'He is, let us repeat the admission—You are, I am—but the million-millionth atom of a speck. None the less that atom, being sentient, is reflective: being reflective, draws and contracts the whole into its tiny ring. Impercipient, what were we but dead things?

Rolled round in earth's diurnal course,
With rocks, and stones, and trees.

Percipient—solely by the grace of percipience, we are inheritors of it all, and kings. To quote one of the poets, Traherne:

But little did the infant dream
That all the treasures of the world were by:
And that himself was so the cream
And crown of all which round about did lie.
Yet thus it was: the Gem,
The Diadem,
The ring enclosing all
That stand upon this earthly ball,
The Heavenly eye,
Much wider than the sky,
Wherein they all included were,
The glorious Soul, that was the King
Made to possess them, did appear
A small and little thing!'

First then a Universe, cosmical, harmonious, apprehensible and to be depended on. Next the pupil of your eye or mine threaded to a brain infinitesimal and yet infinitely capable of apprehending that harmony and depending on it. What is the third step? It is that this little soul of man aspires, instinctively aspires, yearns to know the greater harmony, if only to render it a more perfect obedience; and that it aspires, yearns, through a sense of likeness, of oneness, of sonship.

Aspires, yearns—after what? After likeness, says Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH, after oneness. And that may be likeness to, oneness with, the Universe. But sonship? For he says the soul of man yearns through a sense of sonship. That cannot be to the Universe. It is true that Sir Arthur still uses 'it'—'man nurses a native impulse to merge himself in the greater harmony and be one with it.' But at once he adds, 'a spirit in his heart (as the Scripture puts it) "of adoption

whereby we cry Abba, Father."' And then he quotes Browning, and Browning and Scripture settle it. 'Open your Browning,' he says, 'and read Johannes Agricola'—and find God:

There's heaven above, and night by night
I look right through its gorgeous roof;
No suns and moons though e'er so bright
Avail to stop me; splendour-proof
I keep the broods of stars aloof,
For I intend to get to God,
For 'tis to God I speed so fast,
For in God's breast, my own abode,
Those shoals of dazzling glory, passed,
I lay my spirit down at last.
I lie where I have always lain,
God smiles as he has always smiled;
Ere suns and moons could wax and wane,
Ere stars were thunder-girt, or piled
The heavens, God thought on me his child.

What is Mysticism? It is the sense of sonship to God, the God of this Universe of order and harmony, of which we ourselves are part.

Then comes the question: Can any one be a Mystic?—the personal question: Can I? Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH answers that you may be a Mystic. You are a mystic, if you have the power of apprehension. He puts it this way: 'There are certain men, granted to dwell among us, of more delicate mental texture than their fellows; men (often in the rough-and-tumble unhappy therefore) whose minds have, as it were, exquisite filaments to intercept, *apprehend* and conduct stray messages between the outer mystery of the Universe and the inner mystery of the individual soul; even as telegraphy has learnt to snatch stray messages wandering over waste waters of ocean. And these men are poets.'

These men, he says, are poets. But that need not trouble us. He does not limit the name of poet to those who write verse. It is more disturbing that he says the Mystics are of more delicate mental texture than their fellows. But we can get over even that. For as soon as he has told us that the Mystic is a poet and of more delicate mental texture than his fellows, he proceeds to tell us how any one whatever with the right will may apprehend, and with such apprehending become a Mystic.

For spirit attracts spirit as surely as matter attracts matter. It is by having the spirit of poetry that we appreciate poetry. It is by being like them that we apprehend a spiritual truth in Dante, Shakespeare, or Tolstoy. It is by being like the Universe, this harmonious Universe, and the God of it, that we can be Mystics. And the closer the likeness the better the Mystic. One with God and the Universe we are Mystics indeed. 'You may not agree with me,' says the Cambridge Professor of English Literature, 'that here lies the deepest secret of poetry: but I present it to you as a historical fact that here lies the central tenet of the Mystics. Man and the Universe and God are in nature One: Unity (if we can find it) runs through all diversities and harmonises them. Therefore to know anything of God Himself we must be, to that extent, like God.'

Is that all? Oh no. Sir Arthur QUILLER-COUCH knows very well that you will still ask him how. And he has his answer. Now remember that he is Professor of Literature, not of Theology. If he gives a wrong answer you will not excuse him therefor. But if he gives the right answer you will rejoice. And he gives it.

First he says: 'Man has in him—I will not say a "subliminal self"—but a soul listening within for a message; so fain to hear that sometimes it must arise and tip-toe to the threshold:

News from a foreign country came
As if my treasure and my wealth lay there;
So much it did my heart inflame,
'Twas wont to call my Soul into mine ear;
Which thither went to meet
The approaching sweet,

And on the threshold stood
To entertain the unknown Good.
It hover'd there
As if 'twould leave mine ear,
And was so eager to embrace
The joyful tidings as they came,
'Twould almost leave its dwelling-place
To entertain that same.

And then he says that 'the news comes from without, in its own good time and often in guise totally surprising, like the Messiah:

They all were looking for a king
To slay their foes and lift them high:
Thou cam'st, a little baby thing,
That made a woman cry.'

You must await the hour, he says, 'and trust the invitation, neither of which you may command. The poets do not read the Word by rigorous striving and learning, as your philosophers do: neither, like the priests of Baal, do they cut themselves and yell. Nor do they wrestle with God like Jacob; but wait, prepare themselves with Mary, and say, "Be it unto me according to thy word." They wait, in what one of them has called "a wise passiveness":

The eye—it cannot choose but see;
We cannot bid the ear be still;
Our bodies feel, where'er they be,
Against or with our will.

Not less I deem that there are Powers
Which of themselves our minds impress;
That we can feed this mind of ours
In a wise passiveness.

Think you, 'mid all this mighty sum
Of things for ever speaking,
That nothing of itself will come,
But we must still be seeking?'

Yes, we must still be seeking. But what hope in that? It would not be well with us if that were all. That is not all. The greatest and the best is the last thing in the exposition of Mysticism. *God is always seeking us.*

It must be so. For if the 'Universe be an ordered harmony, and the soul of man a tiny lesser harmony, vibrating to it, yearning to it, seeking to be one with it: if, again, of recollection it knows itself to *have been* at some time one with it, though now astray upon earth, a lost province of the Kingdom of God; why, then, it follows that the King himself passionately seeks to recover, to retrieve, that which was lost.'

And we find it is so in literature as in life. 'The idea of a Christ bruising his feet endlessly over stony places insatiate in search of lost Man, his brother, or the lost Soul, his desired bride, haunts all our mystical poetry from that lovely fifteenth-century poem *Quia Amore Langueo*, down to Francis Thompson's *Hound of Heaven*.' And then Sir Arthur quotes out of 'a small innominate poem' of the seventeenth century:

My blood so red
For thee was shed,
Come home again, come home again;
My own sweet heart, come home again!
You've gone astray
Out of your way,
Come home again, come home again!