

Discussions.

[The contributions contained under this heading are comments on articles in the previous number of the CHURCHMAN. The writer of the article criticized may reply in the next issue of the magazine; then the discussion in each case terminates. Contributions to the "Discussions" must reach the Editors before the 12th of the month.]

"SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH OF INDIA."

(The "Churchman," August, 1912, p. 605.)

WITH much of the article by the Rev. S. H. Clark appearing in the current issue of the CHURCHMAN I am in complete accord, but it also appears to me that the author (himself a retired Indian missionary) has drawn some of those cheques on the bank of futurity which are so light-heartedly signed by good-natured people in England, because they can leave the meeting of them to the Englishmen resident in India.

Mr. Clark talks of the time to come when the work of the English will be done, and an Indian Christian King shall have been proclaimed in Delhi. Were an Arya Samajist to look forward to the purification of Hinduism, and to speak of the work of his Samaj being consummated by the proclamation of an Hindu Sovereign at Indraprastha (Delhi's ancient Hindu name), the issue of his paper would be marked by the Criminal Investigation Department for report as dangerously near sedition. And if this is so, it behoves an ex-missionary to write with sober carefulness as to his day-dreams, for the excuse "I was day-dreaming" is not lightly accepted in a court of law. Mr. Clark ignores the fact that a Christian King has already held his Coronation Durbar at Delhi—a King who is infinitely nearer in race to the Aryan people of Northern India than a King from the Dravidian people of Southern India could ever be. North and South may well rally more easily to an Englishman than a Panjabi to a Telegu, or a Tamil to a Pathan.

Again, Mr. Clark writes of the enthronement of an Indian Archbishop, but the discussion of the metropolitanate which the Durbar announcement of the change of capital has called forth has shown that the conditions of North and South are so diverse that two, if not three, archbishoprics are needed; and the appointment of the first Indian Assistant Bishop has raised a quarrel between Tamil and Telegu which is child's-play to the storm that would result if a man of North India were put over a South India See, or *vice versa*.

Mark Twain once said, "Never prophecy till you know," and I cannot but feel that they who sow to the wind in their kindly-meant but unsubstantial day-dreams deserve to reap the whirlwind of disappointed ambition, which they tend to foster in immature and unbalanced minds.

Mr. Clark's own experience of Bengal ought to have taught him that the Englishman should be very chary of making promises which involve conditions expressed or implied, for the promise is remembered, while the conditions are ignored, and the opening paragraphs of his article will touch the imagination when its more balanced close will be forgotten. When he builds airy castles of political and ecclesiastical fancies in the study of his English vicarage, he should remember that, if these visions meet the eyes of Indian Christians in Bengal, it is of his successors in Calcutta that it will be demanded, "How long are we to wait before we receive from you English in India what Englishmen in England are so ready to give us?"

I cannot believe, as I read the history of the rise of the British power in India, that God has brought us to Bengal, or to the Punjab, or to Bombay in vain, and that being so, I should count myself rash indeed if I should lay it down that He who has brought us here will also take us away when such and such conditions have been fulfilled. It might have robbed Mr. Clark's article of much of its interest to have omitted these gorgeous visions, but I believe the doing of the thing that's nearest, though it's dull awhile, is worth many reams of airy literature which is remote from everyday realities. If England left India to-day, or for many a long year to come, India would not be left alone, for Russia would come, or Germany, or Japan. But the task to which God in His providence has called the Englishman in India of setting forward the cause of Unity and Righteousness, is made infinitely harder if the rising generation of Indian youth are to be taught by so-called friends of India that *the* thing to look forward to is the day when the last Englishman shall sail from Calcutta. It was a grim story told in the "East and West" of a few years since of a North India Prince who, on being asked what he would do if the British left India, replied: "The day the British leave India, I and my army will be on the march for Calcutta, and in a month there will be neither a virgin nor a rupee left in Bengal." And while things are so, it is not the wisdom of the seer, but the folly of the unwise, to talk of what will happen in the way of crowning a Christian King when the British Raj has done its work. He is no friend of the growing lad who is always impressing upon him the grand days he will have when he is of age and freed from parental control. He only sows the seeds of discontent and of rebellion. He is the true friend who encourages the lad to fit himself to enter into his parent's noblest aims. God in His providence has put India to school in the British Empire, and her salvation and hope lie in the diligence with which she learns the lessons God has for her to learn, without at the present moment concerning herself as to what shall be her position when school-days are over, or when they will be over, for her teachers are progressing as well as herself. Co-operation and sympathy may have a drab hue about them compared with the gay colours of *Swaraj*

(Home Rule) ; but the path of duty is the way to glory, and the path of impatient defiance of present tutelage and of inordinate yearnings after premature independence leads only to disillusionment and bitterness. It is because Mr. Clark's opening paragraphs tend to the rasher instead of the more sober of these counsels that I have addressed to you these words of protest.

AN ENGLISHMAN IN INDIA.



Notices of Books.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST IN MODERN THOUGHT: DONNELLAN LECTURES, 1912. By Rev. E. Digges La Touche, Litt.D. London: *James Clarke*. Price 6s. net.

"The supreme question for Christians is not whether Christianity is true or false—they know from their personal experience that the Son of God has come—but whether it can be so stated in terms of the thought of the age as to win men intellectually as well as morally." So writes the author, and his book is an attempt to answer the question. The subject is of such vast importance that even a small contribution to a successful answer deserves to reach the hand of every Christian student, and we are grateful to Dr. La Touche for his accounts of modern teaching. But in these days of many books and of strenuous life it is impossible enthusiastically to commend a book if, for all the good it gives us, it makes too large a demand upon our time and temper. We have no time in the twentieth century to search for a needle in a bundle of hay. There are many needles here, and some of them well pointed, but we should have preferred to find them more easily. The book is verbose and heavy, so that it becomes dull and difficult to read. We can easily illustrate. In his introductory pages the writer discusses his method. He calls it "methodology," and right through the book it is always his method metaphorically to extend to five syllables that which could be as well expressed in two. He speaks of "my learned and able friend," and when he desires to refer to Farrar, Geikie, Edersheim, and Bernard Weiss, we have "the eloquent Farrar," "the learned and sober Geikie," "the profound Edersheim," and "the venerable Bernard Weiss." Little wonder that his second Lecture, that on the negative criticism of the age, extends to 175 pages, and we hope, for his hearers' sake, was not all delivered. The book is overloaded with quotations and references to authorities of very unequal value. Dr. La Touche has evidently read widely, but we cannot feel that his reading has always been discriminating. For instance, in dealing with the criticism of the Old Testament, he speaks of the unbelieving scholars "from whose pens almost every creative contribution has come." Can he really mean that? Either "unbelieving" or "creative" has lost half its meaning if this is so. The whole question of our Lord's relationship to the Old Testament is dealt with in very scrappy fashion. It is not fair to speak of the "kenotic vagaries of Bishop Gore," and then to evade the issue oneself. It is not fair to spend but a couple of pages over a difficult question,