

than he would have liked to do. Yet he continued always to be a power in Scotland ; and in Aberdeen especially the memory of him is still fresh, and his name was an influence throughout his life.

W. M. RAMSAY.

PRINCIPAL A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

ON July 9, 1908, Lord Morley was installed as Chancellor of the University of Manchester. Among those whom he had selected as recipients of Honorary Degrees Dr. Fairbairn was included. The Senate decided that the Degree most appropriate for him was that of Doctor of Divinity, and since I was the Dean of the Faculty of Theology it fell to my lot to present my dear and honoured master. I had to condense in the briefest space my estimate of the man and his work, and I venture to quote what I said, since it may form a kind of text for this article, and make up to some extent for certain omissions in it.

“ It is with singular pleasure that I present for the first degree of Doctor of Divinity conferred in this University my former teacher and colleague Dr. Fairbairn. His services to theological science time would fail barely to enumerate. With a profound belief in the trustworthiness of reason and the rationality of history, it has been the main passion of his life to understand and interpret religion. Intimately acquainted with the comparative study of the various forms it has assumed and with the course of philosophical speculation, he has risen from the mass of intricate detail to large and luminous generalisations in the philosophy of religion. An alien in no part of the dominion ruled by the queen of sciences, he has been especially distinguished as an exponent of historical and constructive theology. Himself a preacher whose sermons have been characterised by solidity

and depth of thought and by a massive and inspiring eloquence, he has laboured to create a learned ministry with an adequate technical equipment based on a broad and generous culture. Of this, Mansfield College will be his enduring monument. He did much to frame the scheme of theological studies in the University of Wales, and we gratefully remember the help he gave us in our own similar enterprise. He will pass into his retirement followed by the gratitude of many who owe much to his writings, and with the warmer and deeper affection of those who date a new epoch in their lives from the time when they sat in his classroom and came under his influence. It will be their desire that as the evening closes in after his strenuous day he may find it a season of tranquillity, brightened by many memories and by the assurance of the place he holds in the hearts of all his pupils."

I pass over as briefly as possible the biographical details. He was born near Edinburgh, November 4, 1838. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, though, strangely enough, the recipient of so many Honorary Degrees in later life, Edinburgh itself leading the way, completed his course without graduating. In the summer vacation he took courses at the Theological Academy of the Evangelical Union Church under Dr. Morison. The time for theological study was short, but in later years he gave an account of the intensity with which the Principal did his work and packed into those brief months a course of training which in institutions of ampler leisure would have been spread over a much longer period. His first pastorate in the Evangelical Union Church was at Fraserburgh, but he soon removed to Bathgate, where he remained from 1860 to 1872. He married in 1868, and this was the beginning of a very happy home life, to which reference was fittingly made, on the occasion of their silver wedding, in the tribute he paid to his wife in the dedication of *The Place of Christ in Modern*

Theology. In 1872 he went to Aberdeen, where he quickly made for himself a great reputation by his Sunday evening addresses. In 1877 he became Principal of Airedale College and remained there till 1886, when Springhill College was transferred to Oxford, its name being changed to Mansfield College, and he became its first Principal. This position he held for nearly twenty-three years. He retired at the close of the Lent term 1909. He was Chairman of the Congregational Union in 1883; Muir Lecturer at Edinburgh 1878-1882; Gifford Lecturer at Aberdeen 1892-1894; Lyman Beecher Lecturer at Yale 1891-1892; Haskell Lecturer in India 1898-1899. He served on the Royal Commission on Secondary Education 1894-1895, and on the Royal Commission on Endowments of the Welsh Church 1906. English, Scotch, German and American Universities gave him their Honorary Degrees. To this bare biographical record I may be permitted to add, as indicating the background of my article, a few words on our personal relations. I met him shortly after he came to Oxford in the autumn of 1886. During his first year at Oxford I often heard his Sunday evening lectures and I missed no opportunity of hearing him preach. I saw something of him also in his home or in walks. From 1887-1890 I attended his lectures at Mansfield College, though I was not a student of the College. At the end of this time he invited me to join the staff of the College. I was his colleague for two years only, since, with his warm approval, though to our mutual sorrow, I came to serve my own Church in Manchester in 1892. For several years after this time, however, I was a good deal in Oxford and saw much of him. I am afraid it was my fault if, with much advantage to myself, we generally talked a great deal of 'shop.'

A complete bibliography of his writings apart from his contributions to the daily press or unsigned contributions to

the weekly press is appended to the volume of Mansfield College Essays which we presented to him in honour of his seventieth birthday. Here I simply give a list of his books, appending the dates. They are as follows: *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History* (1876); *Studies in the Life of Christ* (1880); *The City of God* (1883); *Religion in History and in Modern Life* (1884); *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* (1893); *Christ in the Centuries and Other Sermons* (1893); *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican* (1899); *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1902); *Studies in Religion and Theology* (1910). I need not add that he wrote a very large number of articles and reviews. It is a matter for profound regret that his books are not more numerous. I often talked over his literary projects with him, and was struck with the changes which came over his plans. He was announced to contribute the work on Comparative Religion to *The International Theological Library*. At one time the work was to be in two volumes, then he felt that he must boil it down into one, then the task was in this form abandoned, though he still hoped to do some work on this line in another form. Meanwhile it had for long been his intention to write a comprehensive work on The Philosophy of Religion. A kind of compromise between the two enterprises was later hit upon, and he planned a series of works on the Philosophies of individual religions, of which his last great work, *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, is the only instalment which has seen the light. No doubt in the books he succeeded in writing, but also scattered in articles and reviews, there is much to suggest the lines along which his treatment of many subjects would have gone. It was his habit to handle any subject on which he was writing in a large and comprehensive way; and many readers felt that he had a tantalising trick of prefixing elaborate introductions and going off on irrelevant issues.

There was more substance, I think, in this criticism in his latest period, but for the greater part of his career I at least could not urge it. They were really relevant in his own mind, they gave atmosphere and background to his treatment of the subject, they put the reader in his attitude towards it. And now that he has been taken from us, with so much of his work undone, they acquire a new importance to students of his mind in that they make up to some small extent for the books which the pressure of affairs never permitted him to write. The four books I should myself have most wished to receive from his pen would have been a Philosophy of Religion, a History of Religion, a History of Christian Doctrine and a Systematic Theology including an apologetic.¹ For the first two we have to turn to his earliest book and his *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, supplemented by his *Religion in History* and by certain articles and reviews. For the last two chiefly to his *Christ in Modern Theology*, but also on some sides to his *Studies in the Life of Christ* and his *Catholicism*. His volume on *The City of God* was of a more miscellaneous character, touching among other things the Philosophy of Religion, Systematic Theology and Apologetic. Looking back I cannot help regretting in particular that his *Christ in Modern Theology* was not twice the size; that he had not turned the first part into a History of Christian Doctrine, which, with his wealth of material, would still have been only an outline; and that instead of making "a sketch of the first lines of a Christian Theology" he had given an exposition of the Christian faith as he himself conceived it, without reference to the views of any other theologian. Better still, of course, would have been separate treatises on the History of Doctrine and Systematic Theology and Apologetics;

¹ The lines on which he thought an Apologetic should be written are laid down in his *Catholicism*, pp. 51 ff.

but we should have had less cause to lament their absence if *Christ in Modern Theology* had been written on twice its scale. He hoped, in fact, to return to the constructive section of the book and deal with some subjects in it much more fully.

His qualifications for such a task were of an exceptional order. He was happily gifted with great strength of constitution and power of endurance, so that his days could be both long and laborious without overtaxing, at any rate till age began to steal upon him, his physical resources. He was a rapid reader, and had to a remarkable degree the faculty of catching quickly the drift of a book and the salient points of an argument. And he had a stupendous memory which seemed to be instantly available. Thus he came to gain his encyclopædic knowledge, to use the hackneyed phrase which in this case at least is not misapplied. I can speak of him simply as I found him, and others may have had a different experience; but I do not remember ever asking for his judgment on any matter in which I was interested without finding him ready to discuss it with a full appreciation of the points at issue. It was astonishing to see how he managed to keep in touch with the development of subjects on which he was not specially working at the time. No doubt this boundless acquisitiveness might have been a real hindrance to the performance of his task if he had conceived it as something to be achieved by speculation alone. But he was never tired of denouncing the practice of those who elaborate theories without an exhaustive study of the facts. No one, he held, however gifted with speculative genius, could construct a stable philosophy either of history or religion who had not laid his foundations deep in a thorough investigation of the actual history of mankind or a patient and prolonged study of all the religions accessible to the investigator. I never knew a man more scornful of pretentious and

dogmatic ignorance, of the airy amateurism which blew brilliant soap-bubbles and mistook them for solid realities. He spoke of one of the tribe as "displaying all the qualities, passions, prejudices, and inability to understand an opponent or his standpoint, distinctive of the mere amateur." (*Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1887, p. 746). It is striking that one in whom the speculative interest was so strong should have resisted the fascination it might have exercised upon him and so strenuously recalled others from the *a priori* path to the actual facts of development. Similarly he approached Philosophy itself through its history, of which it is needless to say he had a wide and exact knowledge. The same applies to his investigation of Christian Theology. Moreover, he was not arrogant enough to think that he could afford to neglect the work which was being done by other labourers in the field. Reviews of individual books often indicated how familiar he was with the whole range of contemporary literature on the subject. He had nothing, however, of that impatient modernness which flippantly dismisses the great achievements of the past; and he would go back to some book centuries old and speak of it as still the greatest achievement in its own particular realm.

And here I must touch on the question whether, with all the mass of his knowledge and the masterliness with which he handled it, we may speak of him as an original and constructive thinker. It was inevitable that his method of treatment should have left on many minds the impression that while he could expound with admirable insight and precision the thoughts of great philosophers and divines; while he could see the weak places and put his finger upon them; while he could trace the organic movement of thought as a living whole in continuous interaction with its environment; he had not himself the architectonic gift and contributed nothing original to philosophy or theology.

I speak on this point with diffidence, well knowing that others with far greater qualifications for expressing an opinion have held a different view. My own belief is that his gift for construction and his capacity for making his own contribution have often been underrated. To some extent his procedure was no doubt to blame. The historical and the critical path which he followed in expounding his subject tended to dwarf by comparison his constructive statement. But he would so manage his account and criticism of the development as to lighten very much the account of his own position. Many issues which he would otherwise have had to face had been faced and disposed of already. Principles had emerged in the course of the earlier discussions which did not need to be expounded again when the time for expressing his own judgment had come. Nor ought we to forget that those who found his position unsatisfactory might easily be less than just to the speculative power he really exhibited. And it was quite natural that an age which has been so profoundly influenced by Ritschlianism should be largely out of sympathy with one who saw in it a retrograde movement in Theology and Philosophy. For my own part I have the impression that behind all he wrote there was a coherent system of thought which he had made his own by profound and exhaustive study at first hand of mental and religious phenomena, thought through and thought together, in the light of intimate familiarity with the best that others had thought and said on these high themes, but also with independence. At the same time I readily grant that the constructive statement was too often meagre and disappointing. Some of his books were far too long postponed, especially his *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, which would have made a much deeper impression if it had been published twenty years earlier.

Whatever may be said of his views it can hardly be denied

that he was original in his way of expressing them. Not a few found his style almost intolerable. It struck them as rhetorical, laboured, artificial, excessive in antithesis, disfigured by purple patches and fine writing. I certainly could not defend his style through thick and thin. I sometimes wished for less rhetoric or rhetoric of a different kind, for less antithesis, for a lighter touch and easier grace of movement. But his style was more spontaneous than those who criticised him were always aware. I happen to know of addresses given on great occasions with but the slenderest opportunity for preparation, in which the descriptive reporter detected a very strong odour of midnight oil. He once told me apropos of some criticism on his love of antithesis that this was the way in which his mind actually worked, and that it came quite naturally to him to express himself in this manner. But there is far more to be put on the other side. I shall never forget one of his addresses which he began by teasing a series of contrasts and distinctions till I writhed in my seat, but which rose into splendid eloquence as he warmed to his theme. And this was characteristic, though in an extreme degree, of the effect his style has upon me. I cannot help feeling it to be at times ponderous or uneasy, and he sometimes attempts to fly in an uncongenial air. Here a juster self-criticism would have been of advantage to him. But he had a singular gift of lucid, powerful and exact exposition. He had unusual readiness, wealth, and resourcefulness of expression ; he had a facility in coining illuminating and easily remembered epigrams, which would hit off a person, a principle or an idea. The great thinkers or men of action of whom he spoke were real men to him, significant because they were the embodiment of some great cause or idea, but true bone of our bone. And his great passages, when he really succeeded in getting away, stirred and moved, exhilarated and uplifted the sympathetic

listener in no ordinary degree. The secret lay in the intensity of emotion and the lucidity of vision out of which they were born ; we caught the soaring rapture as we read or heard his words. When he was at his best his style was the expression of the whole man. In those moments I used to be reminded of the description of Luther's words as half-battles, of Luther's own description of Paul's words as having hands and feet, of James Thomson's saying with reference to Browning's words that if you pricked them they would bleed. They seemed indeed to be true words of God, quick and powerful and sharper than the two-edged sword, cleaving without resistance to the heart of some intricate problem or tracking us into the recesses of our conscience ; or like the forge-hammer smashing the stubborn rock. Or one thought of them as a stream of lava in which the hard substance of thought had been fused by the intensity of his emotional heat. For no true estimate of the man himself could fail to recognise the richness and strength of his emotional nature.

Where his central interest lay was indicated by himself in the preface to his *Philosophy of the Christian Religion*. He says : " This book, then, is neither a Philosophy nor a History of Religion, but it is an endeavour to look at what is at once the central fact and idea of the Christian faith by a mind whose chief labour in life has been to make an attempt at such a philosophy through such a history." In the case of one who always conceived his questions in the largest way, it was inevitable that many elements should enter into the problem as he understood it. Religion could not be studied in a vacuum, but only as part of man's whole life. It was organically one with its environment, sensitively responding to all its changes and incessantly reacting upon it. Hence a true philosophy of religion, he says, " will be equally a philosophy of man and history, of human nature and human civilisation." The examination of any religion involved

for him deep research into all that concerned the history, the civilisation, and the culture of the people who professed it. I well remember how nearly a quarter of a century ago our talk turned, during a walk, on the Irish question, and he told me that he had reached his views on it because many years before in his study of Irish religion he had been compelled to examine the system of land tenure in Ireland. Further, his conception of religion forced him to throw the greatest emphasis on philosophy. It was for him neither thought alone, nor emotion, nor will, but all of these, since religion was the expression of the whole man. But he was specially emphatic on the intellectual element. He was never tired of insisting on the greatness of reason and its trustworthiness, or of warning those who flouted its claims for the sake of religion that they were striking a blow at its vitals. "Unless religion," he says, "be an eternal challenge to the reason it can have no voice for the imagination and no value for the heart" (*Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 5). His criticism of Newman and Mr. Balfour turned largely upon this point. Philosophical scepticism or agnosticism was for him one of the deadliest foes to faith, all the more deadly that its corroding action was so insidious.¹ It explains his lack of sympathy with Ritschlianism, an attitude which no doubt limited his appeal to many students of theology, though I believe he saw the truth in this matter more

¹ "Scepticism is a double-edged weapon, and very dangerous in audacious hands. If faith in one class of beliefs is broken down, the result is more likely to be that all classes will suffer than that any one class will specially benefit. Doubt of the veracity of mind in its simplest operations, has a subtle way of becoming doubt all round" (*Catholicism*, p. 369).

"It becomes those who believe that the highest truth of reason is one with the highest object of faith, to make it clear that in their view at least a true theology can never be built on a sceptical philosophy, and that only the thought which trusts the reason can truly vindicate faith in the God who gave it" (*l.c.* p. 388).

"To exercise the intellect is to serve God; Religion has been most vital and most vigorous when the intellect was most critically concerned with it" (*l.c.* p. 132).

clearly than they. His position here may be gathered from a brief notice of Pfeiderer's discussion of Ritschlianism (*Critical Review*, 1892, p. 7). In this Dr. Fairbairn describes Ritschlianism as "a system that attempts to make up for its speculative agnosticism by its historical acuteness and activity. We may, while admiring the work of the Ritschlianer in history, dislike the philosophy which underlies their attitude to doctrine and its construction. This philosophy is as marked a retrogression from the standpoint and the spirit of the older German schools as the Ritschlian historical method is in advance on that alike of Berlin and Tübingen." As this quotation indicates, he was drawn far more to the great speculative movement culminating in Hegel. It would be misleading to speak of him as a Hegelian, but he regarded Hegel's Philosophy of Religion as the one worthy attempt which had been made in this field. But as I have already indicated, he had the firmest conviction that the law of development was not logical but biological. This is clearly stated in his earliest book. He says: "No Philosophy of History is possible without a patient and sufficient study of the facts and phenomena of mind individual and collective. Speculation must build on the solid rock of reality if it is to build into heaven and for eternity" (p. 255). Still more clearly and with explicit reference to religion the law is enunciated in the following passage: "The dialectic that evolves religion is never a purely self-regulated process, working out its conclusions according to its own laws. All kinds of accidents or digressions interfere with its harmonious working. . . . It seems to me then that religion is much too complex, and that the outer factors of its development are too potent both as regards matter and form to allow me to represent it as a sort of spontaneous product or immanent dialectic, or self-regulated evolution of the rational consciousness" (*Critical Review*, 1893, p. 203, in a notice of

Edward Caird's *Evolution of Religion*). The same principle may be found more fully argued, though here with reference to the development of Christian doctrine in his *Christ in Modern Theology*. Abstract speculation accordingly was not adequate to the construction of a Philosophy of Religion. Investigation must move into the realm of the concrete and study the actual facts. And here a great change has come since the days of Hegel. A new science has been born and the anthropologist has collected and classified the facts of savage religion and made them the basis of far-reaching theories. What was Dr. Fairbairn's attitude to the situation thus created? ¹ Of course he recognised that the facts of savage religion must be taken into account and given their full value. But he also believed that the most vigorous criticism should be applied to the reports, and a resolute scepticism adopted towards the theories. He was keenly alive to the difficulty which the civilised must experience in understanding the savage, and to the danger that the facts might in all good faith be very easily misreported, and even if accurately reported might be completely misunderstood. But quite apart from this, while a convinced evolutionist, he held that the higher must interpret the lower, not the lower the higher. For him religion was "the greatest of all man's unconscious creations," to be honoured indeed wherever found, to be studied with sympathy and love in its most rudimentary, as in its most developed forms; but to be adequately understood ² only through its loftiest achievements, which cast back their

¹ On this see *The Critical Review* for 1897, pp. 132-134, 140 ff., and *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 204 f.

² Lest any one should imagine, however, that he had any undue confidence in results, I append this quotation: "In the history of religion we are beset more than anywhere else with insoluble problems, and philosophers and scholars alike have here to learn how either to leave the insoluble unsolved, or be content with an approximate solution" (*Contemporary Review*, Nov. 1887, p. 749).

transfiguring radiance even on its unloveliest forms. So he was drawn especially to the greater religions, above all to Christianity. And in saying this I am not saying something which might be taken for granted in the case of a Christian theologian. It is well known that at one critical period it seemed to him as if the Christian ministry must be abandoned; and had it not been that Germany gave him what Britain had not then to give, his career as a minister of the Gospel would have come to a close.¹ And he applied consistently this principle of interpreting the lower through the higher in the claim he made for Christianity that it was the interpretation of all other religions. He was far removed, indeed, from that debased form of apologetic which seeks to win credit for its own cause by slandering or depreciating its rivals. "He who would maintain the Christian must be just and even generous to all the religions created and professed by man" (*Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. ix.). But on the following page he says: "The Son of God holds in His pierced hands the keys of all the religions, explains all the factors of their being and all the persons through whom they have been realised" (l.c. p. x.).

I come then to his conception of Christianity. Believing that man was religious by a necessity of his being, he had no doubt touching the permanence of religion. The too common fallacy that to trace the history of a phenomenon back into savagery, fatally discredited the belief that it had a permanent standing in civilisation, he would have regarded as shallow in the extreme. He was in truth very sceptical about the anthropologist's "primitive man," but quite apart from this he would have said that the vital thing was not the type of satisfaction which the religious instinct of the savage impelled him to seek, but the fact that the instinct was there. But even so the question might still arise, Is

¹ See *A Chapter of Autobiography* in the *Contemporary Review*.

Christianity the final religion? "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" To this his answer was clear and emphatic. He was a theist, for the very fact that Nature could be interpreted and thus science had become possible, convinced him that there was an immanent Reason in the universe which testified that the ground of being was rational. But he held, too, and that in spite of his familiarity with the difficulties which might be urged against it, that in the nature of man, in his history, and especially in the history of his religion, this ultimate Reality was manifested as Holiness and Love. Such a God must seek the happiness of His creatures and their highest good; and since He and no other was Himself that highest good, He must enter into fellowship with them and disclose Himself to them. God's supreme self-revelation was given in Jesus Christ. I must pass by all exposition of Dr. Fairbairn's Apologetic. It was many-sided and gradually concentrated along many converging lines on Jesus as God's perfect self-expression, the centre of all history, the incarnation of the ethical ideal, the perfect channel of Divine grace. It would not perhaps be quite true to speak of his theology as Christocentric, it was rather Theocentric. But he believed in the Doctrine of the Trinity and in the Divinity of Christ. The Son of God was from eternity an integral element in the Godhead and had become incarnate in time. No one was more concerned that full honour should be done to the Son, but he felt that even where the idea of a schism within the Godhead was avoided there was a danger lest the Father should be hidden behind the Son. He believed that a new day was beginning for Systematic Theology. We had had abundance of "agglomerative dogmatics," the time had come for a System of Theology relevant to the present position, which should be a System indeed, dominated by a sovereign principle. The material principle he found not as Luther in justification

by faith, but as Calvin in the doctrine of God. Only it was not God conceived as Sovereign and all-efficient will ; for the Christian theologian must think of God as Jesus thought of Him, who knew Him as no other had known Him. Here he held that the old theology had largely failed. It had indeed claimed for Christ His true place in the Godhead, He had been passionately loved and loyally served. But His own teaching had been largely neglected in ecclesiastical theology. Now, however, the movement of thought and of criticism in the nineteenth century had driven the Church back to the Person of Jesus. His life, His teaching, His influence had been studied as never before, and we knew His mind as earlier generations had not known it. So we must think of God as He thought of Him, and make His conception of God determinative of our whole theology ; and Jesus thought of God as Father. I cannot, of course, stay to follow the detailed working out of this principle in the construction of a system. But one or two points ought not to be omitted. His doctrine of Fatherhood implied no relaxation of ethical stringency. He urged with convincing power that the Father must be more merciless to sin than the Sovereign, since, while the latter saw in it the disturbance of order, the former knew it to be the ruin of His son. Further, " the return to Christ," which was so emphasised in this connexion, might have seemed to involve an undue depreciation of the apostolic writers and notably of Paul. There was no real justification for such a misconception ; but it was effectually destroyed by *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*. The portrait of Jesus in the Gospels is indispensable, but it alone would have assured no permanence to the religion. It is the interpretation placed upon Jesus which has given the religion its permanence. " It is not Jesus of Nazareth who has so powerfully entered into history ; it is the deified Christ who has been believed, loved, and obeyed

as the Saviour of the world." He says: "Without the personal charm of the historical Jesus the œcumenical creeds would never have been either formulated or tolerated"; but he says further: "Without the metaphysical conception of Christ the Christian religion would long ago have ceased to live."

It will be seen from what I have said that he was very far from undervaluing the apostolic Christology. And this brings me to his general attitude toward Scripture. He had at a quite early period been confronted with Biblical criticism and the problem it created as to the estimate of Scripture. His affinities with Hegelianism naturally attracted him to the Tübingen School. His exposition and criticism of the theory are among the best and most searching that have ever been written, and we may place alongside of it his account and estimate of Strauss. He held that the Tübingen Criticism had failed, and he exhibited in a trenchant manner its defects. Yet he says that its failure was in some essential respects equal to the most splendid success. In one of the last letters he wrote to me he expressed his gratification that in my *Critical Introduction to the New Testament* I had done justice to Baur. On details of New Testament criticism I cannot speak with full confidence. He expressed himself with caution and reserve, and this I believe indicated that his own conclusions were tentative. I remember once telling him how difficult I found the Epistle to the Colossians to be for the commentator. He said that he quite shared that opinion, and added, if I remember rightly, that he thought it the most difficult of the Pauline Epistles. Then he went on to say that there was in the first place the difficulty as to authorship. "I am as sure that Paul wrote Romans as I am that I live," he said, but he added that he had never been able to feel so sure about Colossians. From what he says in his *Christ in Modern*

Theology, p. 303, I gather that he accepted all the Epistles as probably genuine, apart from the Pastoral Epistles, which he does not mention in this connexion, and in these I think he would have been disposed to recognise at least a Pauline nucleus. I am not aware that he rejected the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but it was less congenial to him than the Synoptic Gospels. So far as the Old Testament was concerned he belonged rather to the mediating school. I doubt whether he ever accepted the Grafian criticism; though as an early review of his in *The Academy* showed, he was following Kuenen's discussion of it in Holland before it seems to have made much impression in England. So far as I recollect I only talked to him about it twice. Once was in my undergraduate days, before I had really begun working at the subject and the reference to it arose out of our conversation on an article in which Robertson Smith had just been pulverising Captain Conder. Dr. Fairbairn said to me that he thought the theory would have to be considerably modified before it was finally accepted. Some years later he said to me very emphatically that there was a great deal of good matter in Professor Robertson's *Early Religion of Israel*. But it must not be imagined that he had any hesitation as to principles. He strongly vindicated the right and duty of criticism, and long before such critical results as the late date of Deuteronomy and the composite authorship of Isaiah had become matters of common belief, he had accepted them. With the stiffly traditional attitude he had no sympathy whatever. At the same time I used to feel that occasionally the leaven of the old attitude still seemed to work in his use of Scripture, and now and then his exegesis struck me as artificial.

There is much on which I have not touched. His view of the Atonement was not easy to discover. That he found a certain theory of it in the apostolic literature would not

necessarily mean that he conceived it in this way himself. One of the most significant statements from his pen that I remember is to be found in a review of Dr. Stevens' *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, in which he expressed his general concurrence with the author's conclusions, while dubious of some of the paths by which he had reached them. As a general principle one might say that he was deeply impressed with the unity of the universe, and found Christianity of a piece with the religious history of the world, and was not hospitable to the irruption of the catastrophic into theology. But he believed as firmly as those who might differ from him that the power of God was at work for the salvation of man quite uniquely in the gospel. I do not discuss his doctrine of the Church, for that would take me into a controversial region which I am anxious in this paper to avoid. I must try in my closing sentences to say what I felt about the man and about the work he did.

Without external advantages, by sheer strength of personality, by right of genius and equipment, he won and kept a foremost place among the British exponents of the History and Philosophy of Religion. He helped to redeem our Theology from its insularity and provincialism, to bring it out of its backwater into the full stream of European inquiry and speculation. He taught us to be generous to religions other than our own; but he taught us also to prize our own as the highest gift which God had granted to man. He helped us to see on what firm and tested foundations our belief in it reposed. He unfolded before us in all its magnitude what the task of expounding and defending it involved. He had the loftiest ideal of the Christian ministry, and counted no preparation for it too exacting; and what he so admirably illustrated in himself, he laboured strenuously to secure for others. As one who had passed through the valley of deathly gloom and on into the sunlight,

he knew how to succour the souls haunted by spectres of negation and voices of unbelief.

He lived in harmony with his own ideals. His sense of duty was imperious, his standard of honour lofty ; in his presence meanness and hypocrisy were rebuked by nobility and sincerity, hollow pretence and insolence by competence wedded to humility. He was not so absorbed in the study of religion as to have forgotten its exacting claim on his personal relationship to God ; if he believed that all search for truth was search for God, that to exercise the intellect was to serve Him, he remembered that the Beatific Vision is vouchsafed to the pure in heart. He could say strong things on occasion, and he had a great capacity for righteous indignation ; but his disposition was sweet and sunny, his bearing gentle and courteous. It warmed the heart to see the radiant smile of welcome on that rugged, deeply-furrowed face, to touch behind it the intense, vital personality. The perplexed found in him a wise and patient counsellor, the sorrowing were assured of understanding and loving sympathy. Many of us are feeling that when he passed within the veil one of the forces most powerful in shaping our thoughts, our purposes, and our characters, was taken from us. We shall cherish his memory, and look forward with yearning to renew the happy fellowship, now for a little space interrupted by Death.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.