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INTRODUCTION

There has always been a connection between Worship and Art. It is not only that in the practice of worship certain arts are almost inescapable because religious observance needs cult objects, buildings, and words, and is therefore likely to contribute to the development of carving, architecture, and letters; but music, dance, drama, verse, and painting, arts strictly unnecessary, were early used in the service of worship. It has indeed been held that art originated in worship, and "several authors..... have been led to consider all ethnic art as essentially religious." Professor Yrjo Hirn points out that this probably goes too far, but there is certainly a very close and early connection between the two activities.

Music played a large part in primitive religion, and was "either an act of worship or an accompaniment of such acts". The Jews made much use of it from the earliest days; it was used by Jesus himself in his habitual worship in the synagogue, and at the Last Supper; and it is in common use in Christian worship today in all branches of the Church except the Society of Friends. Western music indeed owes its development very largely to the Church. As Walford Davies says, "the art of music as we know it spent a serene and prosperous childhood in the care of the Church. It was virtuously and Christianly brought up; and a guess may be hazarded that one fourth if not one third of all the best music at our disposal today is in some real sense Church music."

1. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Article "Art".
2. Ibid.
3. Wibberley - "Music and Religion" p.12. See also Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Article - "Music".
Dancing also has a long connection with worship. Many savage dances are of a religious character; the early Greeks offered their dances to the Gods; Hebrew dancing was religious; and the Church in various places, and at various times up to our own day, has also used the dance as an act of worship.

Drama was very early connected with religious ritual. Primitive religious dances were often representational, and so drama was a natural development from dancing. Semitic drama was always essentially religious; the glories of Greek Tragedy began in religious observance; the beginning of native English drama goes back to the Miracle and Mystery plays; and in our own day nativity plays and other dramatic performances in church are becoming frequent.

Painting and sculpture have a well-known early connection with religious worship, and are still in use. The particular use made of them varies considerably; the Orthodox and Roman Churches (though their beliefs and customs on this point are by no means identical) both offer worship by means of visual representations, and although the Protestant Churches do not use them in the same way, they often have paintings and carvings in their buildings as an aid to worship.

While the use of prose in religion seems essential and inescapable, the use of verse is not; and yet verse has commonly been used for religious purposes from the beginning. Some of the most ancient parts of the Old Testament are songs in verse; the prophets delivered many of their oracles in verse; Jesus himself chose verse, with metre and rhyme, as the best medium for some of his teaching; and its present use for hymns is almost

1. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Article - "Music".
universal.

Yet although worship and art have for so long kept company together, there has been found to be not only a connection but a cleavage between them. Many outstanding religious individuals have been very suspicious of art, various Church Councils have prohibited one form of it or another, and numerous sects have tried to cut themselves off from some part of its influence. The Jews were forbidden to make representations of anything in heaven or earth; the famous Canon of the Synod of Elvira forbade the painting of pictures on the walls of churches; the profession of the actor was altogether forbidden to Christians in the early centuries, and acting was again considered scandalous by some sections of the Church in more recent days; dancing as an act of worship was prohibited by the Council of 692; some Eastern monks objected to the practice of singing in the worship of God, and the Council of Laodicea in 367 deprived the congregation of all part in the vocal music of the service; Calvin did not approve of instrumental music in church, Luther looked upon the organ as unnecessary and undesirable, and no Orthodox church has ever been allowed to have one; there are some like Dr. Gossip who find "real difficulty" in beautiful prayers because they keep them from praying; and there are those like Joseph Parker who strongly object to artistic sermons, and pray the Lord to "send fire upon all such abortions and burn them up, till their white ashes cannot any more be found!"

The purpose of this essay is to attempt to clarify this relationship between art and worship, and to suggest the uses and limitations of the one

---

1 Scholes - "The Puritans and Music" pp. 335-6.
2 Schweitzer - "J.S.BACH" Vol.1, p.25.
3 Gossip - "In Christ's stead" p.47.
4 Stewart - "Haralds of God" p.40.
0 Canones Hippolyti, Canon 12; and Constitutiones Apostolorum, 8.32.9.
X See Wellesz - "Byzantine Hymnography" pp.85 and 149.
in the service of the other. One of the difficulties to be encountered is the
fact that widely differing theories are held about both of them; and it will
therefore be necessary to investigate the nature of each before their
relationship can be explored.
THE NATURE OF CORPORATE WORSHIP
I. UNION WITH GOD THROUGH CHRIST

1. Man's response to the nature and action of God

What we are first to investigate is the corporate worship of the Christian Church. We are not using here that definition of worship which would equate it with the whole of the Christian life, nor on the other hand are we using a definition so narrow as to limit it only to adoration. In the word worship we include all the various activities that may and do rightly find a place in a "Service" held for Christians.

These activities are various forms of response to the nature and action of God. God has revealed himself to us, and worship is the way in which we recognise and express his supreme worth. In all its parts therefore we find that it springs out of, and continually goes back to, thoughts about God. In adoration, praise and thanksgiving the mind is fixed upon what God is, what he has done, and what he has given; indeed some of the great prayers of this kind are little more than a kind of catalogue of his work of creation and salvation. In penitence man feels his most acute shame when his sin is contrasted with God's holiness, his weakness with God's power, and his selfishness with God's love. The lections read in church are from that book which is the record of God's revelation of himself along the main line of its unveiling. The sermon is a delivering of God's message. The resolves made by the congregation are a response to that message, and may be summed up as one form or another of the determination to love as Christ loved. The Christian offering is made along with that of Christ, is only possible because of his, is a response to his, and therefore takes place as we remember his; even that part of it which consists in the giving of money is to be made remembering the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who "though he was rich, yet for your sakes he
became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich". Petition and intercession are equally bound up with remembrance; the Church's prayers are never mere statements of need or desire, and the characteristic form of request is that of the collect, with its relative clause at the beginning calling to mind the nature and acts of God, and its adverbial phrase at the end remembering "Jesus Christ our Lord." It is because of what God is like and what he has done that we are bold to bring our requests before him, it is only as we consider his will that we know what we should ask, and it is only as we think upon his love and power that we have faith enough to trust our needs with him. Finally, the actions of Holy Communion are specifically stated to be done in remembrance of Christ; and although the word "remembrance" has been interpreted in more than one way, yet, as we shall see later, the most satisfactory interpretation is that which takes it to mean an actual remembering of Christ.

The nature of God whom we are thus stirred to worship is spirit. He is not to be perceived by our senses, but is one whom no man hath seen nor can see, who cannot be touched or handled. He is personal, and possesses the capacities of thought, feeling, and will; for he cannot be something less than man whom he has made: - indeed we must say that he alone is fully personal. The character of his personality is love; and there is in him no personal quality that is not filled with it, and no action that is not its outcome. In all things he is absolute, infinite, and immutable. As regards time he is therefore eternal, as regards space omnipresent, as regards power omnipotent, as regards knowledge omniscient, as regards goodness perfect; and the consummate glory of all the divine perfections in union we call holiness.

1 2 Corinthians viii, 9.
He is one; and although we know him as a Trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit, yet he is "Trinity in Unity", "not three Gods, but one God," and "not three Lords, but one Lord."¹

This God has revealed himself in a threefold activity in the experience of men. He is the author of all that has being; it was he who called into existence the universe and is continually active in new creation and sustaining providence. We ourselves are creatures whom he has made, originators of nothing and dependent upon him for all.

He is the author of our salvation, and in Jesus Christ became flesh and took our nature upon him. He subjected himself to the limits of matter, time, and space. He shared our weakness and mortality. He travailed for us on earth, and still works for us in heaven.

He is our sanctifier. In the Holy Spirit he has moved and worked within his creation at all times, he spoke through the prophets, he manifested his supreme power in the hundred and twenty gathered together at Pentecost, and he continues daily to work in all the world, but especially within his Church.

These activities of God give rise to what can only seem to our human minds to be unresolvable contradictions, and so we find ourselves baffled by paradox after paradox. He is spirit and not to be perceived by human sense; and yet he works in and through matter, and actually appeared in one whom eyes saw and hands handled. He is the infinite, unchanging, and absolute, unhindered by the constricting bounds of this mortal order of being; and yet he has partaken of our flesh and blood and passing breath. He is unlimited by time and yet works within time, especially the time of Pontius Pilate. He is unlimited by space, and yet has been found in particular places, especially

¹ Quicunque Vult.
in Bethlehem and Nazareth and Jerusalem. He is unlimited in power, and yet suffers himself to be hindered by the will of man. He is for ever the same, and yet for ever surprises us with new creations and new love. He dwells eternally in perfect beatitude and joy, and yet is afflicted with all the afflictions of his people, and falls to the ground with every sparrow. He is holy, and perfect in all goodness, and yet constantly unites himself with the imperfect, incomplete, ignorant, and evil. He is sufficient unto himself, and yet craves our love. He desires that we should seek him, and yet he comes to seek us. He possesses all things, and yet accounts our poor offerings to be of infinite worth. He loves and accepts us as we are, and yet works to change us into what we are not. He is the only author of our salvation, and yet he suffers us to work it out with fear and trembling. He is awful in majesty; yet he is homely as a father, and even humble as a servant.

2. The four types of response.

Our response in worship is fourfold. Corresponding to its fourfold nature there are four different kinds of worship, and perhaps the clearest way of showing our response is to describe these four types. Each of them emphasises one particular element in worship. That is not to say that the other elements are not present also, but in each form of service there is a main stress in one direction.

(a) We will consider first the Divine Liturgy of the Orthodox Church. This is a representation of the divine drama,¹ and is primarily a setting forth of the nature and acts of God that man may adore him.

First comes the preparation of the elements by the priest and deacon

¹ See Gogol - "Meditations on the Divine Liturgy" - for more details than are given here.
behind the screen which separates what in the west we might call the chancel from the nave. The people cannot see through the screen, but they know the things that are done. A loaf is taken, in the centre of which is a portion marked with the name of Jesus and called the Lamb. This is detached, placed on a paten, and covered with the asterisk or star, while the priest says "and the star came and stood over where the young child was". St. German says the detaching of the Lamb signifies the birth of Christ from the body of the Virgin. In this hidden preparation the people see the humble birth and hidden childhood of our Lord.

Thereafter the progress of the service is marked by the three entries of the priest from behind the screen into the body of the church. The first great moment is when the north door of the screen opens, and the priest and deacon come out in procession preceded by tapers, the deacon carrying the book of the gospels. This represents the earthly ministry of Jesus, Christ the Logos coming forth to teach his people the way. He is greeted with the hymn of the thrice holy - "Holy God, Holy and mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us" - and lessons are read.

Later the priest and deacon make the great entrance. The choir first sing the hymn of the cherubim - "Let us who mystically represent the cherubim, and sing the holy hymn to the quickening Trinity, lay by at this time all worldly cares; that we may receive the king of glory, invisibly attended by the angelic orders. Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia." Then the deacon having received the holy paten "with all care and reverence" on his head, and the priest having taken the holy chalice in his hands, they come through the central doors, preceded by tapers, and go round about the nave; this is the

---

1 Holloway - "A Study of the Byzantine Liturgy". p.29.
procession to Calvary. The entrance once again into the sanctuary is the going up of Christ to offer himself on the cross; the laying of the bread and wine on the altar is the laying of his body in the sepulchre; the linen corporal is the cloth enwrapping it; the veil of the paten is the kerchief surrounding his head; and the covering of both chalice and paten by the larger veil (the aer) is the rolling of the stone before the tomb. While these last acts are being performed, the words are recited "Down from the tree the honourable Joseph took thy most pure body, and wrapping it in a clean linen cloth with spices, laid it in a new tomb." The consecration is believed to cause the power of the godhead to dwell in the bread and wine, and "completes the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead."¹

Once again the central doors are opened when the priest appearing for the third time brings forth the chalice for the Communion; and the worshippers see here the risen Christ appearing to his disciples.²

The service as Evelyn Underhill says, is "bathed in an atmosphere of adoration."³ Its form has serious limitations, but it serves very well to bring home to the worshippers the majesty of God and the mystery of his ways, and to express the adoration which is one part of man's response to the worth of God.⁴

¹ Munsell, quoted by Frere in "The Principles of Religious Ceremonial". p. 53.
² Gogol - "Meditations on the Divine Liturgy". p. 87.
³ "Worship". p. 273.
⁴ It is clear that this official interpretation of the service is partly a misinterpretation. The prothesis, for example, has much more to do with the death of Jesus than with his birth. The Lamb is detached from the loaf with words that refer to the Passion. When it has been detached the deacon says, "Pray, Father, slay," and the priest cuts it crosswise with a little two-edged knife called the spear, saying, "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world is slain for the life and salvation of the world." Then the deacon says, "Pray, Father, thrust," and the priest thrusts the spear into the right side, saying, "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side...." The Great Entrance, therefore, is a procession in which is carried the dead body of Christ; and is in fact not intended as the procession to Calvary, but as a funeral procession. (So Dix, "The Shape of the Liturgy". pp. 285-6.) Nevertheless,
(b) The second type of service is the Roman Mass. If it is High Mass, there will be deacon, subdeacon, choir, incense, and a great deal of ceremonial. If it is Low Mass, there will be no assistant ministers and no music, and the ceremonial will be reduced to a minimum.

The service, of course, is in Latin, except for the lessons and three prayers said by all the congregation together when the mass is over. The average member of the congregation does not understand the Latin prayers, and if he did he would hardly be able to follow them, for they are spoken at great speed, and the whole of the canon (except its ecphonesis at the end) is said silently.

Everything is done by the priest and his assistants. There are no hymns for the congregation to sing; there is generally no sermon for them to hear; there are no prayers for them to say, except that after the mass is over they join with the priest in saying the three prayers that are in their own tongue; and there are no responses for them to make, because the responses that were originally intended to be made by the congregation are now made by others on their behalf. Some few members of the congregation may receive communion; but the main body of the people listen to the lessons, give money to the collection, adore the sacred elements when the bell rings to call their attention to the fact that the moment of the miracle has arrived, join in the three prayers at the end, and spend the rest of the time in private meditation and prayer against the background of the Latin prayers.

when one remembers that the people do not see or hear the service of the Prothesis, it is clear that from their point of view the above interpretation is entirely coherent and satisfying.

1 Sometimes a congregation may be heard singing simple hymns with choruses as a preparation for the Mass; but such a popular devotion is of course not a part of the service proper.
What is it then that is being done, and wherein lies the purpose of a service of this kind? The answer is that a sacrifice is being offered for sin. The early prayers of the Mass are full of a deep sense of unworthiness and guilt. Over and over again God is asked to have mercy, to forgive, to take away iniquities, to cleanse, and to blot out sins. And to this end the sacrifice of the Mass is offered.

The references to offering and sacrifice are continual. The first comes after the Creed, where the priest first takes the paten with the Host and says, "Accept, O Holy Father, almighty, eternal God, this immaculate Host, which I thy unworthy servant offer unto thee, my living and true God, for my innumerable sins, offences, and negligences, and for all here present, as also for all faithful Christians, both living and dead, that it may be profitable for my own and for their salvation unto life eternal." And then, pouring water and wine into the chalice, he says, "We offer unto thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching thy clemency, that, in the sight of thy divine majesty, it may ascend with the odour of sweetness, for our salvation and that of the whole world". Bowing down, he prays with a contrite heart "that the sacrifice we offer in thy sight this day may be pleasing to thee." Then he asks God to "bless this sacrifice prepared to thy holy name". After washing his fingers and saying the "Lavabo inter innocentes", he says again, "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation which we make to thee." Turning to the people, he says, "Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty", and the response is made, "May the Lord receive the sacrifice from thy hands." He then recites the secret, which again generally speaks of sacrifice: - that for the twenty first Sunday after Pentecost, for example, says "Mercifully receive, O Lord, this sacrifice, by which thou hast
been pleased to be pacified, and to restore salvation to us by thy powerful mercy." The Canon begins with the "Teigitur", which asks that God will "vouchsafe to accept and bless these gifts, these presents, these holy unspotted sacrifices". Spreading his hands over the oblation the priest says, "We therefore beseech thee, O Lord, graciously to accept this oblation of our service, as also of thy whole family," and he asks that this oblation may be made blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable." After the words of consecration, and the elevation and adoration of the elements, he says, "We thy servants ....... offer unto thy most excellent majesty, of thy gifts and grants, a pure Host, a holy Host, an immaculate Host"; and he asks that God will look on them with "a propitious and serene countenance" and accept them as he accepted the gifts of Abel, Abraham, and Melchisedek. When the mass is ended, he offers prayer for himself - "grant that the sacrifice which I, unworthy, have offered up in the sight of thy majesty, may be acceptable to thee." It will be seen that in the central and most vital part of the mass, there is hardly a prayer that does not refer to sacrifice.

(c) The third type of service is that characteristic of the Protestant Churches. Traditions here vary a great deal, and the nature of the service very often depends very much on the minister who conducts it. It is difficult therefore to describe any service as typical. A Free Church service in England will however usually comprise some five hymns for the congregation, two periods of prayer, one or two lessons, a sermon, a collection, and the usual announcements of church activities. There may be an anthem sung by the choir, and if it is a morning service there will probably be a children's address following one of the lessons. Some of the prayers may involve responses by the congregation, but often the people have no audible part in them.
This rather bald summary of items gives little idea of the effect of the service. Conducted by one who does not understand how a service of worship should be ordered, it can become merely a collection of unassociated units, a sort of "sacred vaudeville", as it has been called, with one thing following quite haphazard after another, and therefore with no sense of purpose in the service as a whole. But in the hands of one who understands these things it can be an ascent into the heavenly places. There is scope here for all the parts of worship, and they can be made to follow one another in such a way that the next thing that is done is the very thing one most desires to do at that moment. Because of their extempore character, the prayers have a direct relation to the needs of the congregation and a sense of immediacy that is to be obtained in no other way. The hymns, which are a very important and popular part of the service, are stronger and more central than those of many other denominations, and it is very noticeable that those who are brought up in the Free Church tradition know how to use them, whereas those who are used to a more fixed form of service generally do not.

But the high peak of the service is the sermon, and it is during the sermon that the Protestant feels that the main purpose of the service is achieved. J.S. Whale says, "The Reformation laid primary emphasis on the Word as the basis of faith and worship. Protestant worship recalls the Word-Service of the Synagogue rather than the Mystery Service of the Temple and of Eastern and Western Catholicism; in it the preaching and hearing of the Word takes the central place. "To go to church" in Reformed Geneva was "aller au sermon".0

0 Cf what Wesley says about Methodist worship - "What they sing is therefore a proper continuation of the spiritual and reasonable service, being selected for that end.... by one who knows what he is about and how to connect the preceding with the following part of the service" - Letters of John Wesley, Vol III, pp. 227-8.
Farel entitled his Genevan liturgy "La manière que l'on observe en la prédication, quand le peuple est assemblé pour ouyr la parolle de Dieu", and Calvin himself speaks of participation in public worship as "fréquenter les sermons". The sermon will normally occupy more than a third of the total time spent in the service; and if one adds to this the time spent in reading lessons and giving a children's address, one can say that about half the time that is spent in a service is occupied directly in hearing and receiving the word of God. The characteristic of the Protestant service is that the worshipper goes mainly to receive, and he receives mainly from the lessons and the sermon.

(d) There is still a fourth element in Christian worship. It finds its special emphasis in a prayer meeting, or service of intercession, and consists in the making of requests. It is not used, as are the other services we have described, as the main service of worship on a Sunday, but nevertheless it must be taken into account.

It is even more difficult to describe a typical service of intercession, or a typical prayer meeting, than to describe an ordinary Protestant service; for there is even more variety here. But generally speaking it will consist of hymns, readings, perhaps a brief address, and prayers. The main point of the service, and the reason for which it exists, is to make requests of God, sometimes for one's self, but more usually for others. The subject of the prayers will depend on the circumstances of the time and the people who are taking part. It is in such worship that extempore prayer is most likely to have a large place; and the main part of a prayer meeting commonly consists of extempore prayers offered by many members of the congregation who rise one after

1 "Christian Worship", Micklem 165.
another and lead the whole company in prayer as the Spirit gives them utterance. If it is the spirit of pride that moves them to speak, or if they pray merely because they are afraid of silence and think that any kind of utterance is better than none, the result may be far enough away from worship. But if it is the spirit of God himself who prays in them, the whole company is filled with God's power.

Each of these four kinds of Christian worship stresses a different response to God — adoration, offering sacrifice, receiving God's word, and making request. We must now examine the nature of each of these four kinds of response.

3. Adoration.

Adoration is a response of our feelings. There are no doubt many feelings involved in our worship at one point or other in the service; but adoration is the characteristic religious feeling, and once we understand that, we find the others fall into place round about it. Adoration is reverence raised to its highest point, and is a complex state of mind compounded of wonder, fear, and love.

Wonder springs naturally from the mysterious and extraordinary quality of all that God is and does. It matters not where we touch the hem of his garment, the same quality is always to be found. All Nature is full of his "wondrous works", his dealings with his people can only be described as "wonders", the things which were spoken by the shepherds at Bethlehem made men to "wonder", and the work of the Spirit struck man with amazement. This sense of wonder necessarily finds expression in the worship of the Church.

1 Job xxxvii,14.  
2 Ps Ixxvii,14.  
3 Luke ii,16.  
4 Acts ii,12.
Samuel Davies puts it into the mouth of sinners on earth as they sing to the "Great God of wonders", and take his pardon "In wonder lost, with trembling joy". The Anaphora of S. John Chrysostom reminds us that it is found equally in the worship of the angels in heaven. - "They set before the judgment-seat him before whom the archangels stand in fear and trembling; they condemned him who forgiveth sins, and judged the judge of judges. They crowned with a crown of thorns him who crowneth with a diadem the Seraphim; they clothed with a scarlet robe in mockery him who putteth veils of majesty on the Cherubim. A wicked servant hardened his hand, and smote on the face him whom the hosts of angels adore with great amazement."2

When one looks upon God in this way with amazement, the result may be either praise or adoration. If it is adoration, that is because there is some element of fear in one's response. Here we must be careful. There are many reasons for which a man may be afraid of God, and not all of them are Christian. The ancient story of how Zipporah, the wife of Moses, thought God was trying to kill her husband, and therefore appeased him by taking a flint and circumcising her child, is a good enough example of one who was afraid of the tyranny of God; but we do not expect God to be thought of thus by Christians. A slightly different kind of fear is found in the Byzantine Office of preparation for Communion, which contains the prayer "I tremble, taking fire; 0 let me not be burnt, like wax, like grass," and the warning, "Draw near with fear, that thou be not consumed; it is fire." This is not fear of tyranny, but it is not reverence; it is more a feeling of terror before something wonderfully dangerous which might easily get out of control.

1 The hymn "Great God of wonders".
2 "The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy" p.90.
3 Exodus iv, 24-5.
Different again is the dread of the eerie. Cyril of Jerusalem, who is the first to use the language of fear about the eucharist, describes the consecrated element as "phrikodestatos", that which makes one's hair stand on end. Otto of course believes that the distinctive element in religious feeling is such a sense of eeriness; but Professor John Baillie and others are surely right in holding that he is mistaken. 1

Christian fear is none of these things, but seems to be compounded of a creaturely sense of frailty in the presence of that which is too great for us, a feeling of unworthiness in the presence of that which is holy, and a fear of intruding on that which is perfect, lest we should mar it - if only by motion or sound. Thus our fear before God is

The speechless awe that dares not move  
And all the silent heaven of love. 2

That takes us to the third element in adoration. Christian fear is not incompatible with love, and in adoration they are found together. He who is too great for us, too pure for us, complete and perfect, is entirely good, and draws out all our affections in homage. There may have been at the beginning an impulse to cry "Depart", but that was before we entered into full adoration. Adoration desires no departure; it is content to remain for ever. The controlling force of this complex feeling of adoration is not fear, or even wonder, but love. "If love means the belief of a man in his supreme good, adoration is this belief at its highest point of intensity, the culmination of love. The adoring person steadily contemplates his ideal object; he is filled with inspiration, admiration, rapture, yearning; all other thoughts and wishes have vanished; he belongs only to one object, loses himself in it, and in it

1 See J. Baillie - "Our Knowledge of God" pp. 241-2; and "The Interpretation of Religion" pp. 246-255.
2 Wesley's hymn - "O come, ye sinners, to your Lord."
dissolves away. Adoration is the contemplative surrender to a supreme good. In adoration we see the greatness and perfection of God's nature and work, and although we cannot but feel the infinity of the distance between us, yet our hearts go out to him in loving regard. Adoration is at the same time a consciousness of our difference from God, and a uniting of ourselves in affection with him, but the first is all the time being swallowed up in the second.

It is easy to see that all the other feelings involved in worship lead towards this same result of union with God. The feeling of grief that accompanies penitence is due to the fact that there has been separation between us and God, and looks forward to restored unity; the feeling of joy that accompanies forgiveness is joy in this unity now accomplished; and the feelings of trust that accompany fully Christian prayer, and of wonder and love that accompany praise, are wholly feelings of union with God. In so far as worship is a response of our feelings, it is therefore a uniting of ourselves with God. We may describe it as a uniting of ourselves with him in heart.

4. Offering.

Our second response to God is the offering of a sacrifice. Worship seems at all times to have been associated with the making of a gift. It may be true, as Robertson Smith argued, that the predominant idea in ancient sacrifice was communion and not gift; but Buchanan Gray has shown that, whatever may have been the origin of Hebrew sacrifice, in historical times the idea of gift was never absent. In the Old Testament, underlying all the regulations about worship is the steady assumption that the method of man's approach to God and the vehicle of his worship is sacrifice; and not in Old

1 Hoiler - "Prayer", p.360.
2 Gray - "Sacrifice in the Old Testament" passim.
Testament religion only, but in all religion, including the Christian religion, the essential act of worship is the bringing of a gift.

In Christianity the element of giving to God is most specifically associated with the eucharist, and always has been so. The tradition at Rome right back to the first century was to look upon the eucharist as a sacrifice. There is no continuous series of documents by which we can thus trace all the other local traditions back to their sources through a continuous development; but "every one of these local traditions at the earliest point at which extant documents permit us to interrogate it, reveals the same general understanding of the eucharist as an 'oblation', or 'sacrifice' - something offered to God." Those who took part in the service were indeed called not the communicants, but the offerers.

There are three possible reasons for making a gift to God. One is propitiation, that is the desire to appease an angry God, or to keep on the right side of one who might become angry. This has by no means always been absent from Christian worship. But God is not to be worked upon in this way, and we must reject this motive for making a gift to him as being unchristian.

---

1 The Lutheran service is an exception here, and contains no great oblation. In the Swedish High Mass, for example, although Christ is spoken of as "our Paschal Lamb which was offered for us", there is no mention of any present sacrifice or offering that is made.

2 Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy" p.112.

3 An example is to be seen in 1 Samuel xxvi,19.

4 S. Cyril of Jerusalem, for example, in his Catechetical Lectures (v.2), interprets the eucharistic offering by saying that if a king had banished men who had offended him, and then their friends were to offer him a crown on behalf of those that were being punished, he would grant them some relaxation of punishment. "In the same way we too, offering to God our supplications for the dead though they be sinners, do not weave a crown, but we offer Christ sacrificed for our sins, propitiating our merciful God on their behalf as well as on our own". And, as we have seen, the same conception is to be found in the Roman Mass.
The second reason is expiation, that is, the attempt to make up for a lack of service or obedience by offering a gift which is to take its place. Here again we have an idea that has not always been absent from Christian worship, and a certain number of masses have been thought to wipe out a certain quantity of sin. But nothing can take the place of obedience, and the only thing we can offer that is of value when we have failed to render it is not sacrifice or burnt offering, but a broken and a contrite heart. The third reason is to signify one's goodwill towards God, one's gratitude or love. When one loves people one delights to make them gifts. They may not need them, and the gift itself may not seem worth offering, but nevertheless one must give. If this is so in the ordinary human relationships of life, it applies even more in religion. When a man begins to apprehend something of what God in his grace and mercy has done for him, he cannot help but say "What shall I render unto the Lord?" The desire to offer a gift is inescapable. This is the Christian motive for sacrifice.

If one asks what is offered, there are various possible answers. The most obvious offering that is made in many services today is the money that is placed in the collection box. But we speak also of offering a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, of offering ourselves, the Church, or even Christ himself.

It is clear that when a gift is made, the important thing is not the material of the gift itself, but what is signified by it. We are accustomed, for instance, to make token gifts, and to offer a part of something as

1 Psalm 11, 16-17.
signifying the whole. We offer God so much money in token that all our possessions are his, and we present the fruits of our labour in token that all our labour is wrought for his sake. When we offer aright we are like the poor widow of Mark xii, 42-44, and cast into the treasury all our living; for whatever we give, it represents all we possess.

But the representative nature of a gift goes further than that; we give matter to represent spirit. Our gifts, even though they be costly ones, may be made from right motives or wrong ones. They may signify an effort to bribe the receiver, or to control his affairs, or to win public approval, or perhaps merely to fulfil a recognised social obligation. But the only kind of gift worth receiving is one that signifies some degree of care. A man, we say, must put himself into his giving. That is why the financial value of the gift itself has very little to do with its real worth. One cannot assess the value of a gift by weighing an offering of gold and silver against that of the two mites; the value lies in the degree of self-giving that is signified by each.

Thus whether we offer bread and wine, or money, or praise and thanksgiving, or a broken and a contrite heart, or our work, it is ourselves that they must signify.

"There you are upon the table," says S. Augustine to his newly confirmed communicants when they made their offering of bread and wine, "there you are in the chalice." 2

The self is indeed the only thing we have to offer, and all that God

1 Professor O.G. Quick says indeed that the distinguishing feature of those realities which we call sacraments is "that in them the outward consists of one member of a class or one part of a whole, which is severed and differentiated from the other members or parts, in order both to represent the true relation of the whole to God and to be means whereby this relation is more effectively realised." ("The Christian Sacraments" p.105) He instances Sunday as separated from the other days of the week in order to represent to us the meaning and purpose of all days, and to be the means whereby the purpose is fulfilled in all.

2 Sermon 229 quoted in Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy". p.118.
desires. Quoting the words of S. Paul, we therefore in our services "offer and present" unto God "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice." ¹

This offering of ourselves to God is pre-eminently the practical offering of the will; and in this our perfect pattern is no other than Christ, who offered himself at all times to be the instrument for God's use. When all was ready for his incarnation he said "Lo, I am come to do Thy will", ² and he took flesh and blood to that end. In that flesh and blood he lived and worked, saying still, "I am come down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." ³ Later, when the time came to lay down that flesh and blood, he did so saying, "Thy will be done"; ⁴

Our work is to offer our will as he does. The best expression of it is found perhaps in the Methodist Covenant prayer - "I am no longer my own, but Thine. Put me to what Thou wilt, rank me with whom Thou wilt; put me to doing, put me to suffering; let me be employed for Thee or laid aside for Thee, exalted for Thee or brought low for Thee; let me be full, let me be empty; let me have all things, let me have nothing; I freely and heartily yield all things to Thy pleasure and disposal." ⁵

It is clear that if sacrifice is the offering of the will, we can only sacrifice ourselves. We can say, "Lo I am come to do thy will," but we cannot offer the will of another. The Reformed Strasbourg rite of 1537 puts it well: "Dearly beloved, let us beseech God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who is given unto death for the salvation of our souls, that he will send upon

¹ Book of Common Prayer.
² Hebrews X, 7.
³ John vi, 38.
⁴ Matthew xxvi, 42.
⁵ "The order of service for such as would enter into or renew their covenant with God." - Methodist Book of Offices.
us the Holy Ghost, to teach us to offer, not Christ who himself hath offered himself for us and cannot be offered by any one, but the only true offering well-pleasing unto God, that of a contrite spirit and broken heart; and that we may render our body as a sacrifice, living, holy, and well-pleasing unto him, which is our only reasonable service, in which we offer to God honour, thanks, and praise.\(^1\)

It is true, however, that when we meet together we can make a corporate offering; we can speak on behalf of the whole body, and knowing that the mind of each is to offer himself, we can say not merely, "I offer myself", but "we offer ourselves." We can go further than that; for knowing in this matter the mind of the whole Church of God in heaven and on earth, we can speak on behalf of all, and say not only of the local Church, but of the Holy Catholic Church, "we offer ourselves as one body." We can add even to that; for inasmuch as Christ is the Head of the Church, and never ceases to offer himself in heaven to his Father and ours, we can speak of him as well as ourselves, and say that we the Body and he the Head offer ourselves together. But it is ourselves for whom we are responsible, and we may therefore say that in so far as worship is a sacrifice, it is the uniting of ourselves with God in will.

7. Receiving.

Our third response in worship is to receive, and we have seen that in Protestant worship this is expected to take place mainly through lessons and sermon. The most obvious thing one would expect to receive in this part of the service is instruction. Hislop speaks of it as "the reception of Divine Truth".\(^2\)

We shall see later on that this is a very incomplete account of what is received


\(^2\) "Our Heritage in Public Worship." p.11.
through these means; but it is nevertheless true and important as far as it goes. Instruction in Divine Truth has always been considered an essential part of worship, and in stressing lessons and sermon, the Reformers were only re-asserting an ancient tradition.

The reading of lessons was taken over by the Christian Church from the Synagogue. From the beginning, the reading and exposition of Scripture formed part of the synagogue service, and was indeed its chief purpose. First there was the reading of the law, and then later a lesson from the prophets was added. No doubt this reading of two lessons continued in the Church for some time (they are both there in the Apostolic Constitutions), but eventually one of the Old Testament readings dropped out. Meanwhile New Testament lessons were added. St. Paul ordered his letters to be read, on occasion, in the Churches under his care, the gospels would naturally be added as soon as they were felt to be authoritative, and in some places the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles were regularly read. The Syrian Jacobite liturgy on certain days has readings also from the "writings", making six lessons, the Roman Breviary on festivals still has nine, and on Good Friday eve, at the service of Matins, the Russian Orthodox Church reads twelve.

This reading was very impressive. The high moment in the synagogue service is still the reading of the lessons, and in Orthodox Synagogues a procession is made to carry the rolls of the scriptures from the ark where they are kept up to the Bema where they are read. As they are carried slowly past the front seats, the old men who sit there will press their prayer shawls against them, and then kiss the tassel that has been so sanctified. The Christian Church inherited this reverence for the scriptures, and surrounded the reading of the lessons with ceremonial of one kind and another. Sometimes the
deacon first demanded silence before the reading as in the Mozarabic rite; sometimes there would be a procession down the nave and a long exhortation sung before the reading, as in the Nestorian service; and frequently there were (and still are) prayers and responses for the congregation before or after the reading.\(^1\) The Gospel is of particular importance, and is an occasion for special ceremonial. We have already seen that in the Eastern Churches there is a solemn bringing in of the gospel known as the Little Entrance, and that this is thought of as typifying the coming of Jesus himself to teach his people. In many rites the people stand to hear the Gospel, and the reading is often preceded by prayer that the reader may be worthy of his great office, and that the people may be worthy to hear what is read.\(^2\) In the Roman rite, after the Gospel the celebrant is censed and kisses the text. In the present Ethiopic Liturgy the rubric says that the people shall kiss the gospel by their several ranks when the priest shall read it,\(^3\) and at Sunday matins in the Russian Church a similar custom obtains.\(^4\)

In the synagogue the reading of scripture was followed by exposition and teaching, and in Christian worship also an important place is given to the sermon. It could hardly be otherwise in the religion of one who spent such a large part of his life in teaching, whose custom it was to attend the Jewish Synagogue, who on occasion spoke there himself, and who left with his Church the command "Go and preach". Preaching has been a part of Christian worship from the very beginning. The Last Supper included a discourse by our Lord himself, and soon afterwards we find the Apostle Paul discoursing at the breaking of

---

1 See e.g. the rite of the Coptic Jacobites: Brightman - "Liturgies Eastern and Western" p.153; and compare also the Jewish Synagogue service - Hebrew Prayer Book pp. 67-9, 143-158.

2 E.g. in the Roman Mass and the Liturgy of the Coptic Jacobites.

3 Mercer - "The Ethiopic Liturgy" p.338.

4 Zvogintzov - "Our Mother Church" p.35.
bread at Troas, and even prolonging his speech until midnight. So the sermon took its place in the early Eucharist, and, as Brilioth says, it "constituted a rational and didactic element at the threshold of the holy mysteries. Any estimate of the early church service which does not take full account of this fact is bound to be misleading."2

In Jerusalem in the 4th century it was the custom to have many sermons, and Ethera records that "of all the priests who take their seats, as many as are willing preach, and after them all the bishop preaches." She adds wistfully, "the delivery of these sermons greatly delays the dismissal from the church."3

In Africa the sermon was such an essential part of the liturgy that Augustine could say, "No sermon, no High Mass".4 In the last centuries of the ancient Latin Church, although the duty of expounding the Gospel lesson was not forgotten, preaching suffered a decline. At Rome it disappeared after Gregory the Great, and in Gaul it often seems to have consisted in a reading from the Fathers.

In the Middle Ages the sermon gains a new importance. We know of many bishops who exhorted their clergy not to neglect the explaining of the gospel and the giving of simple information about faith and morals, and a learned Dominican of Canada has catalogued no less than 150 medieval handbooks about preaching.5 It will be remembered that the friars laid great stress on the importance of preaching, many of them holding that "It is more profitable to hear God's word in preaching than to hear any Mass; and rather a man should forbear his Mass than his sermon."6 Preaching did indeed tend to lose its connection with the liturgy, but that was an unnatural divorce of two things that clearly belonged

---

1 Acts xx, 7.  
2 Brilioth - "Eucharistic Faith and Practice". p.38.  
3 "The Pilgrimage of Ethera". p.51.  
5 See Brilioth - "Landmarks in the History of Preaching". p.15.  
originally together. As Brilioth says, one of the distinctive characteristics of the real sermon is that it is liturgical, "it forms a part of divine service and is itself a mode of worship."¹

With the coming of the Reformation it was of course inevitable that preaching should revive and flourish. How many sermons a man like Luther would preach it is difficult to estimate, but no fewer than 2,300 of his sermons have been preserved. Once again there was sometimes more than one sermon in a service. In the German Mass of Strasbourg there was sometimes a sermon after each reading;² and the Anabaptist congregation at Amsterdam in 1608 would have up to five preachers, or apparently even more "as the tyme will geve leave",³ and Puritans elsewhere followed a similar custom.⁴ In our own day one sermon is usually thought sufficient for a service, but it is generally considered of great importance; and even those branches of the Church that have not recently stressed preaching very much are today placing a new emphasis upon it.⁵

The instruction that is received in both lessons and sermon is from God. Thus at Constantinople, and probably at Antioch, the prophetic lesson was introduced by the words, "Thus saith the Lord"; in the Swedish Mass the priest announces the Epistle or the prophetic reading by saying, "Hear the word of the Lord through the Apostle", or "through the prophet"; and the Coptic Jacobites pray after reading S. Paul, that they may profit by "thine holy teachings which have been read to us now through him". The Gospel is even more obviously the word of God. Before reading it, the Deacon in the Armenian Liturgy says, "Let us attend", and the Clerks reply, "It is God who speaketh."⁶ In the Ethiopian

¹ Brilioth - "Landmarks in the History of Preaching" p.2. Cf also p.39.
³ Davies - "The Worship of the English Puritans" p.89.
⁴ Ibid. p.189.
service there is a set conclusion to the reading of the Gospel, a different one for each of the four. That for the Gospel of St. Matthew clearly marks the divine origin of what is read - "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away, said the Lord to his disciples."¹

The same thing is true of the sermon also; obviously true when the sermon is an expounding and interpreting of scripture, but still true even if the preacher should take no text. "It is my office," said Bernard Manning, delivering a charge to a church at its minister's ordination, "to speak with an authority that is not my own a word that you are not to refuse."² The preacher is not setting forth merely his own ideas and speculations; he says to his congregation what the Apostle Paul said to the Corinthians - "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ."³ He is a prophet crying, "Thus saith the Lord." As Heiler says, "It is God himself who, in the words of his human messenger, speaks to the assembled congregation."⁴

We see, then, that instruction is an original and enduring part of Christian worship, and is given by means of the reading of Scripture and the preaching of sermons. Instruction is not the only purpose of these parts of the service, but it is one of their purposes; and since the instruction is of God, we may say that this element of receiving in worship is the uniting of our mind with God's mind, a thinking of God's thoughts after him.


The fourth element in worship is to make requests. This is indeed the primary meaning of "to pray", and to worship God without asking for anything at

¹ Liturgies Eastern and Western. p.222.
² "A Layman in the Ministry". p.152.
³ 2 Cor. v,20.
⁴ "Spirit of Worship". p.79.
all would be a most unnatural proceeding. All the teaching of Jesus on the subject of prayer was about petition or intercession, and his continual aim in such teaching was to persuade men to practise them. Both the Old and the New Testaments constantly assume that whatever else happens in the communion between God and man, the making of requests to God is a necessary element. Men today may find that this part of worship raises for them more intellectual difficulties than any other; but it is the part about which the Bible as a whole has most to say, and that which Christ himself seemed most anxious that men should perform.

We find accordingly that it is a constant element in all the worship of the Church. The Scriptures teach that prayer is to "be made for all men"\(^1\), and the liturgies show with what imagination and care this command was followed. We can single out four main classes of people. First, the Christian naturally prays for himself, and this he does, not only in prayer which is private, but also in that which is corporate; for, as we shall see later, when a man comes before the presence of God, he comes not only as a part of the whole body of the Church, but as an individual member of it. Second, the worshippers pray for the Church, very often thinking separately of all its various parts with their different functions and needs, and remembering even particular individuals, both among the living and the dead. Third, remembering the injunction that prayer should be offered for "kings and all that are in high place"\(^2\), the worshippers pray for their king, whether he be numbered among the "Christian kings, princes, and governors"\(^3\), or whether it be necessary to ask "that he may be peaceably disposed towards us, and towards thy holy Name"\(^4\); and they pray for "his whole Council", and for "all

---

1. 1 Timothy ii,1.
2. 1 Timothy ii,2.
3. B.C.P.
that are put in authority under him."¹ Fourth comes the only subject of
intercession that is specifically commanded by Christ himself, that is prayer
for one's enemies. It is less common than one would rightly expect to find the
Christian Church in its public worship following its Master's orders in this
matter; but nevertheless prayers for enemies do appear in the liturgies,
sometimes offered in charity², and sometimes unfortunately in rather another
spirit.³

The content of the Church's requests is all-inclusive, for the Church
obeys the apostolic injunction "in everything let your requests be made known
unto God"⁴. The Lord's Prayer gives a good summary of them. The bread that it
mentions includes all the necessities both of spirit and body. No one doubts
that it includes all spiritual need; and those who doubt whether it includes
physical needs must call to mind that God is as much the creator and sustainer
of our bodies as of our souls, that his Son was as ready to grant the requests
of those who came to him for physical healing as of those who came for
spiritual healing, that he spoke specifically of God's care for what we should
eat and drink and wherewithal we should be clothed, and that whatever else the
word "bread" was taken to mean by a company of men travelling about Palestine
not knowing where their next meal was to come from, they would hardly be likely
to exclude from it the simple meaning of food. The prayer not only includes the
needs of both body and soul, it deals with the needs of all time - past, present,
and future. The present takes the first place as being of inescapable concern.

¹ B.C.P.
² For example in The Apostolic Constitutions (Warren - "Liturgy of the Ante-Nicene
Church" p.265); Liturgia Tigurina p.47; The Litany in B.C.P.; the ancient
Anglo-Saxon litany (see Proctor and Freme "A New History of the Book of Common
Prayer" p.417); and Luther's German Litany, and Latin Litany corrected.
³ For example in the Ethiopian Anaphora of S.Athanasius (Harden - "The
Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy" pp 93-9).
⁴ Philippians iv,6.
and petition is made for the needs of "this day"; then, turning to the past, prayer is made for the only thing that can be prayed for the past, that is that sins may be forgiven; and finally, turning to the future, request is made for deliverance from evil. All this is prayed about by the Christian Church, and, generally speaking, the liturgies also use the Lord's Prayer itself.  

There are two outstanding conditions necessary for Christian prayer. One is that our requests should be for those things that God desires to do. Thus the first requests in the Lord's Prayer are for the doing of God's will; for all these first three clauses, that God's name may be hallowed, that his kingdom may come, and that his will may be done, are but three different aspects of the same desire, the desire that our Lord himself expressed in Gethsemane - "not what I will, but what thou wilt."^2 It is not every prayer that is granted; but "this is the boldness which we have towards him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us."^3 It is, therefore, subject to this primary and overriding condition that we go on to make the requests in the second half of the prayer.

The second condition is that our prayers must be made in faith. "I say unto you," said Jesus, "all things whatsoever ye pray and ask for, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them."^4 And St James echoes this teaching when he says, "If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God who giveth to all

---

1 It is curious that in the earliest liturgies the Lord's Prayer is not found. Woolley holds that in spite of its absence, it was in fact actually used. "It is hardly credible", he says, "that it should not have occurred in the liturgy, and the explanation of its apparent absence is probably the simple one that, being known to everyone and its position in the Eucharist being equally familiar, it was not considered necessary to insert it in writing." ("The Liturgy of the Primitive Church", p.131.)

2 Mark xiv,36.
3 1 John v,14.
4 Mark xi,24.
liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith nothing doubting; for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord."1

The same condition was laid down by Jesus for the granting of the requests of those who came to him during his life in the flesh. The man who desired to be healed was asked for faith, and when the healing was complete he was told it was his faith that had made him whole.2 Miracles were wrought according to a man's faith;3 and the places where no mighty works were done were those where it was made impossible "because of their unbelief".4

The faith required was not always that of the one who needed healing. There are instances in the gospels where healings were wrought by the faith of another. Thus the epileptic boy at the foot of the mount of transfiguration was healed through his father's faith,5 Jairus's daughter was raised because her father believed,6 the centurion's servant was healed because of the belief of his master,7 the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman was healed through her mother's great faith,8 and the paralytic who was let down through the roof was healed not by his own faith alone, but at any rate in part through that of his friends.9 These are examples of answers to intercession, and we may take it therefore that not only our prayers for ourselves, but also those for others, are subject to this necessity of having faith.

The miracles of Jesus, though often described as taking place through man's faith, are also described as being wrought by the finger of God.10 There

---

1 James i,5. 2 Matthew ix,22; Mark x,52; & Luke xvii,19. 3 Matthew ix,29. 4 Mark vi,5. 5 Mark ix,17-27. 6 Mark v,36. 7 Matthew viii,13. 8 Matthew v,28. 9 Mark ii,5. 10 Luke xi,20.
is of course no contradiction here; the fact is that both were at work together, and the result was due to both. God in his extraordinary mercy chooses to effect many things in this world by the joining together of his power and ours; we are invited into a partnership of co-operation with him. This co-operation is found in every part of the Christian's life and work, but it is found not least in his worship; for prayer is the joining of our faith with God's power to produce a result that neither would produce by itself. God wills that certain things should take place, and when we pray we offer to him our faith as a means through which he can work to bring them about. Both petition and intercession are therefore a co-operating with God, a uniting of ourselves with him in deed.

For full Christian worship, all the four elements we have been describing are necessary. They may be mingled together in varying proportions according to the nature of the occasion and the people taking part; but the worship of the Church is not complete without them all. To emphasise adoration at the expense of the other three is to indulge in emotional experience without moral content, and to produce not Christians but pleasure-seekers. To emphasise the sacrifice of the will and neglect the rest results in legalism, and produces not sons but only servants. To over-stress the element of instruction removes the sense of personal relationship, and makes men value the service mainly as a means of intellectual speculation. And to emphasise exclusively the making of requests is to treat God as though he exists for the purpose of being useful to us.

7. All Christian Worship is through Christ.

In Christian worship, Christ is involved all the time. The worship may indeed be addressed to him. So it was in the primitive days when Stephen prayed: "Lord Jesus receive my spirit", and when the heavenly host were seen to adore

1 Acts vii,59.
the Lamb, and when the early believers cried, "Maranatha"; and so it has continued ever since, and is found today in popular devotion, in the Agnus Dei, in the Gloria, and elsewhere. Sometimes prayer is addressed to the Spirit, though this is unusual; for although the Spirit is not infrequently invoked, as in the epiklesis, there is no instance of direct prayer to the Spirit in the New Testament, and there are very few in the liturgies. Nevertheless there are examples in the Armenian Liturgy, and the hymn "Veni, Creator Spiritus" is of course well known. But for Christians the Spirit is inseparable from Christ. He is thought of as the Spirit of Christ, as sent in response to the prayer of Christ, as revealing the things of Christ, and (in the West) as proceeding from Christ as well as from the Father. Most usually, however, worship is addressed to the Father; but it is worship offered by beings who are conscious that they have come to know him as Father only because of Christ, and, as we shall see, it is offered "through Christ". Whoever is addressed in worship, therefore, Christ is necessarily involved.

This is true of all the four elements of worship. The Christian adoration of God not only includes, but mainly consists of adoration of the work of God in Christ. The creeds may be taken as typical of the balance of Christian worship in that they spend far more time dwelling upon the redemption wrought in Christ than upon either Creation or Sanctification, which are connected in thought mainly with the Father and the Spirit.

The emphasis of the Christian sacrifice always lies on the sacrifice offered by Christ. When we offer and present ourselves, we do so because of the sacrifice once made on Calvary; we do so because the fruits of that sacrifice

---

1 Revelation 5, 12-13
2 I Corinthians xvi, 22. of Revelation xxii,20.
4 John xiv,6.
are effective in us, and we are committed to Christ as his people; and we do so along with this same Christ, who having once offered himself on the cross, now and at all times continues to offer himself to the Father in the heavenly places.

The receiving of instruction is for the Christian assembly the receiving of God's mind through Christ. The words which the Father gave to him he has given to us, and it is by the words of Christ that the message of all others who claim to speak in God's name must be tested. God has indeed spoken by the prophets "by divers portions and in divers manners", but because they were frail men they did not always interpret his mind aright. Now "at the end of these days" he has "spoken to us in a son"; and his words are truth.

Our requests are made to God for the sake of Christ, or through Christ, or in the name of Christ. To ask for a request to be granted for the sake of Christ is no doubt sometimes mistakenly an attempt (as it were) to get on the right side of God, to persuade him to relax his standards for the sake of pleasing his son who is thought of as much more merciful than he. It need hardly be said nowadays that God is not divided against himself, as though the will of the Son were different from that of the Father, or as though the Father were less merciful than the Son; neither is he to be persuaded to act against his own judgment. But the phrase "for Christ's sake" may not be used in that sense. It may simply express the confidence of the believer that what he is asking is something which will please Christ, and he therefore asks for it as one who seeks only his master's pleasure.

To ask "through Jesus Christ our Lord" is also perhaps a phrase of doubtful origin. It is regarded by anthropologists, says Professor Pratt, "as

---

1 John xvii,8.  
2 Hebrews i,1-2.  
3 Cf. the Charles Wesley couplet "My Son is in my servant's prayer, And Jesus forces me to spare" in the hymn "O wondrous power of faithful prayer".
a survival of the magical custom of using the names of powerful spirits as spells."^0

Whether this be its origin or not, the thought that lies behind it in Christian use (except where it is little more than a sign that the congregation shall respond with their Amen) is that Jesus is the mediator between God and man.

"Nowhere", says Heiler, "is the primitive belief in the mediatorialship of Jesus so clearly revealed as in public prayer .... Jesus is the intercessor who on behalf of his believing people presents their petitions to the Father."^1 Here again it is implied that the prayer we make must be such as is approved by Christ; if that were not so, we could not expect that he would present it on our behalf.

In the case of prayer "in the name of Jesus" we are on more solid ground, for we have here something that goes back to the actual words of our Lord in the way in which the other phrases do not. "If ye shall ask anything in my name, that will I do."^2 The Semitic meaning that lies behind the word "name" is almost equivalent to our word "person" or "personality". To ask in a person's name is to ask in accordance with his nature; it is to ask what he would ask. "To pray in the name of Christ is to pray with a clear understanding of what he is and what he stands for",^3 and thus to ask for what he desires. The same meaning is found in I John v,14 - "if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us", and again in John xv,7 - "If ye abide in me and my words abide in you, ask whatsoever ye will and it shall be done unto you." We have already said that in our asking we must seek first the will of God, and make all our requests subject to it. But we know the will of God because we have seen it in Christ, and it is therefore characteristic of Christian prayer that requests should be made in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. All three phrases therefore are ways of asking
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^0 Pratt - "The Religious Consciousness" p.313.
^1 "Prayer", pp 334-5.
^2 John xiv, 14.
^3 Anderson Scott - "The Church, its Worship and Sacraments". p.82.
for that which is in accordance with God's will as revealed in Christ.

When material is used in the worship of the Church that is not originally Christian, one finds that it is re-interpreted in a Christian manner. Jewish lessons read from the Old Testament do not stand alone; they become a part of the whole revelation of God which culminates in Christ, and they cannot be detached from the context of the whole service which interprets them in that way. Sometimes the Old Testament is given a new meaning, and the political enemies of Israel are looked upon as the spiritual enemies of the Christian soul, or a reference is seen to Christ where none was intended.¹ The psalms which have been so constantly used by Christians have always been re-interpreted in this way, and it is still found fitting for example to make the words "O taste and see" refer to Holy Communion. In addition, the psalms have been given a Gloria to turn them into Christian hymns, and sometimes the verses have been interspersed with other interpretative sentences. A modern example of this is found in Dornakel, where the Jubilate is followed with an antiphon or chorus after each verse - "Jesus is God".² Isaac Watts of course had a still more radical way of dealing with the psalms. In order to make them suitable for Christian worship, "it is necessary", he says, "to divest David and Asaph, etc., of every other character but that of a psalmist and a saint, and to make them always speak the common sense of a Christian." And so "where the psalmist describes religion by the fear of God, I have often joined faith and love to it. Where he speaks of the pardon of sin through the mercies of God, I have added the blood or merits of a

¹ See for example Johnstone "Learning to pray with the Church", pp. 40-44.
² Clarke - "Liturgy and Worship", p.822. For examples in the Orthodox Church, see Holloway - "A Study of the Byzantine Liturgy", pp.49-52; and in the Roman Church see Hebert "Liturgy and Society", p.74. and Swete - "Church Services and Service Books", pp.49-51. Cf. also Ps.95 as set out for Sunday Matins in the Roman Breviary, and the invitatories to this psalm in the Book of Common Prayer 1928.
Saviour; where he talks of sacrificing goats or bullocks, I rather choose to mention the sacrifice of Christ, the Lamb of God. When he attends the ark with shouting into Zion, I sing the ascension of my Saviour into Heaven, or his presence in his church on earth." In short, "I have rather expressed myself, as I may suppose David would have done, had he lived in the days of Christianity.... In all places I have kept my grand design in view; that is to teach my author to speak like a Christian." But Isaac Watts was only doing in writing what devout Christians down all the ages had done in their mind, reinterpreting the psalms to bring them into line with Christ and Christian experience.

Isaac Watts will no doubt last as long as the English language is spoken, for what he has made of the psalms is a new creation. But for many of the psalms we may doubt whether the method of relying upon the worshipper to "spiritualise" the prose version as he sings, by forcing into it a meaning that it was plainly never intended to bear, will serve us much longer. We have grown historically minded, and cannot forget what the psalmist himself desired to say. It is more than doubtful indeed whether we ought to wish to do so; for our religion is a historical religion, and what the psalmist desired to say is therefore religiously significant. But if we are to continue to use the prose psalms, some method of Christianising them must be found, for in the worship of the Church all things must be brought into relationship with Christ.

8. Worship opens the door for God to unite himself with us.

Worship, then, considered as an activity of man, is a uniting of ourselves with God in heart, will, mind and deed. All of them are necessary, and all of them are made through Christ. The union of heart springs from such a

1 Preface to "The Psalms of David imitated in the language of the New Testament, and applied to the Christian State and Worship."
contemplation of God, in all his nature and work, as produces penitence, trust, thanksgiving, praise, and, most characteristically, adoration; and in all these the worshipper is one with his God in the feelings of love. The union of will is the true sacrifice; it is not merely a delighting in God, but a desire and determination to do those things that please him. The union of mind is a waiting upon the word of God that we may know who he is, what is his will, and how it may be done; a learning of the mind of Christ. The union of deed is not only practised in our work and life during the week, but finds its place also in our worship when we make requests both for ourselves and others, and thus co-operate with God by faith in the transforming of the world.

But the secret of the Christian life is that when men thus unite themselves with God, he unites himself with them. To unite ourselves with God in any of these ways is to open a door through which he may come in and make himself one with us. To adore him is to find that we are filled with his spirit, and that the one who is transcendent is also present within us. To unite ourselves with him in will is to find ourselves "strengthened with power through his spirit in the inward man,"¹ so that we can say in making our covenant with him not only "I am thine," but "thou art mine."² To receive his word is to receive not only the Lord's commands but the Lord himself. That is why preaching is not adequately described as instruction. It is a sacrament; and to preach is, in John Wesley's phrase, "to offer Christ." Our making of requests is also an opening of the door for the entrance of God; for our fundamental request is for God himself, that he would dwell in us and transform us. His reply to all our petitions is "I am that which thou art seeking"; and when they are made in faith, the door is opened for him to answer them by giving

¹ Colossians iii,16.
² Methodist Covenant Service.
Thus God unites himself with us in a far deeper and more intimate way than we can unite ourselves with him. It is not of course identification. We retain our own personal and individual life; we are not merged in the godhead. Although "it is no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me"; yet Christ and I are distinguishable. But it is a union more close than any that takes place between human beings, for "God appears in some sort to be present on both sides of the relationship".

The Protestant, then, although perhaps he under-estimates some of the elements of religion, and does so to his peril, yet seems to be fundamentally right; the most important thing in worship is that we receive. All the elements in worship, and not instruction only, are indeed a kind of acceptance - Adoration is not so much something that we do as something that is done to us; we look at him indeed, but were it not that we accept and receive his Spirit, we should not adore that which we see. The sacrifice of ourselves is also primarily an acceptance of Christ's will, his commands, his way of life, the good deeds he has prepared for us to walk in, and his rule "prepared for us from the foundation of the world"; for "it is the Father's good pleasure to give us the Kingdom." And our making of petitions is only the stretching out of our hands in order that we may receive. But above all, in worship we receive God himself, and such a happening outweighs all things beside.

1 Galatians ii, 20.
II. Corporateness

1. The nature of the worshipping assembly.

The worshipping assembly with which we are concerned is not a mere haphazard collection of individuals, not the kind of crowd for example that might come out of interest to a football match or stop for a few minutes to listen to a meeting at a street corner. It may or may not be a good thing to try to lead in prayer a chance collection of Christians, heretics, atheists, and agnostics; but it is not the sort of worship we are to deal with. Neither does our subject include the consideration of special evangelistic meetings held for the purpose of converting non-Christians, although obviously many of the things that apply to Christian services are true of these also. Our subject is Christian worship, and what we are therefore concerned with is the worship of those who are Christians.

We have of course to reckon with the fact that even Christian worship is that of a mixed assembly. In practice there will always be some who are present, not because they are Christians, but because they have come with a friend, or because they like the music, or because they desire what they have not yet found. We welcome them, and as far as we can do so without injuring the service, we take pains to make all that is done and said intelligible to them. Nevertheless they are not the people for whom our worship is primarily designed. They cannot be expected to agree with or even understand everything. They have come, after all, into the midst of a people who have experiences that they are strangers to, and who have knowledge of things that are at present hidden from them. Their response to God is not the same as that of Christians, and many of the words of the service will not therefore express their mind. We recognise that that is so, but we do not cease to express the full Christian faith on
that account. Our Sunday services are not intended to be the kind of thing that will express everyone's mind, whatever he believes or however he lives. We do not omit the prayer of dedication because some of the congregation would not mean it, nor do we cut out the Creed because they could not subscribe to it. The service is designed for Christians, and those who are not yet Christians must put themselves into as much of it as they are able.

This does not mean of course that the service is quite unsuitable for them. A great deal of it will be intelligible and usable enough. After all, God's offer to all men is the same, whether believers or unbelievers, it is the offer of himself; and experience shows that it is very often made through the same words to both kinds of people. There are not many sermons, for example, that are suited solely to believers or solely to unbelievers. Besides, even those parts of the service that are not directly usable by the unbeliever may nevertheless be very suitable for him. It is entirely right and desirable that he should feel himself challenged by a difference between what he can say in worship and what the Christian congregation can say. To cut out of the service those parts of the faith to which he cannot subscribe would not only fail the Christian congregation, but the unbeliever as well; it would mislead him about what Christianity is.

So it comes about that the full rich worship of the Church is one of the surest and soundest evangelical agencies that God has given us. To invite the unbeliever to come to it and to join in it as far as he is able is no doubt to set him in the midst of something that he will only partly understand; but for him to hear of the gift of God, and to witness the worship of people who obviously mean all these things that he cannot mean, may prove the turning point
in his spiritual life. 1 S. Paul envisages a service in which an unbeliever finds himself convicted and judged, and feels that the secrets of his heart have been made manifest, and who therefore "will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed." 2 Such things take place when the Church manifests in its worship the fulness of its faith; but they would not be likely to do so if it tried to bring its worship down to the level and spiritual experience of the non-Christian.

Those then for whom the service is designed are the people of God, men and women who are committed to him and consciously indebted to him for their salvation, who rejoice in him, and who desire to feed on him and to offer themselves to him. But they are not merely individuals; they are a Church, a unity. They are all joined into one because they are all joined to God, as members of a family are one because of their common relationship to a common father. They are all joined into one because through a common Saviour they have entered into the same Kingdom, as servants of the same master are one when they have all been delivered from captivity by him in one great rescue, all share the common blessings of his house, and all with love obey his sole command. They are all joined into one because they are all fellow-partakers of the same Spirit, as men are one who have a common mind, a common will, a common love and a common power - though indeed this does not suggest the closeness with which they are joined, for there is no parallel in human fellowship to the Church's experience of sharing one life. They are indeed like branches of one vine in which the same identical life dwells, or like members of one body, having only one heart and one soul between them, filled with one breath, and controlled by one head.

1 Examples of this may be found in "Towards the Conversion of England" p.138; Scott - "The Church, its Worship and Sacraments" p.44; and Blackwood - "The Fine Art of Public Worship" p.212.
2 1 Corinthians xiv,25.
The worshipping Church visible to the eyes of the individual Christian as he attends a service contains men and women known to him and half-known, liked and disliked, cultured and ignorant, assembled from many different ways of life, and being at all possible stages of spiritual development. There will be children of unquestioning faith, ripe saints who are visibly like their Lord, men and women who are mature in the knowledge of the truth, and others but lately converted from sin and as yet unstable in mind and heart. Paul writing to the Corinthians says to them, "Neither the immoral, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor catamites, nor sodomites, nor thieves, nor the lustful, nor the drunken, nor the abusive, nor robbers, will inherit the Kingdom of God." And then he goes on to remind them, "And such were some of you." In these days also if a Church is doing its real work, men of like antecedents will still be numbered amongst its congregations.

But the Church does not consist only of the congregation visible to our eyes. It spans all the earth and is the Holy Church throughout all the world. It embraces men of all colours and tongues, and of all the great and small branches and divisions of Christendom; men who differ widely in temperament, environment, history, culture, modes of worship, and points of belief; yet all created by the same God, redeemed by the same Christ, sanctified by the same Spirit, and responding to the same voice in the way most natural to them.

The Church spans all ages and both worlds; for those who have left this world worship God continually in the world that is to come, along with all his heavenly creatures. Nor is their worship separate from ours; for they are where Christ is, and he is here. The worship of earth, therefore, is one with the worship of heaven, and we who worship here join with apostles, prophets, martyrs,

1 I Corinthians, vi,11.
humble believing men and women of all ages, all those who died in faith having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth, and with all the heavenly creatures who continually sing about the throne "Worthy is the Lamb". "The heavenly hosts standing with us in the midst of the sanctuary celebrate the body of the Son of God sacrificed before us," says the Syrian Jacobite liturgy, and it is with them that the believer utters his praise - "Therefore with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious name." To sum up, then, in the words of Bersier's form of Communion, published in 1874 and used today in some of the French Reformed Churches, "He wills that in being united with him we may be united also with all those who are the members of his body, with our brethren who with us serve him on earth, with those who have passed from this evil world, with all the saints who have set on him their hope, and adore him now in light and in full fruition of eternal love, with those whom Jesus Christ has redeemed by his blood out of every race, every tongue, and every nation." The worshipping assembly is no less than the whole Church of God in heaven and earth.

2. The corporate worship of the fellowship.

The corporate worship of the Church must therefore be the worship of a fellowship. Corporate prayer is not brought about by a number of people meeting at the same time and place that each may offer his own private prayers. It is the worship of those who together make a joint offering. It involves a conscious communion not only between the individual souls and God, but between the individuals themselves. It is the worship of a people not only gathered together
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1 Brightman - "Liturgies Eastern and Western" p.102.
2 B.C.P.
in one place, but being of one accord; the worship of those who are granted by God "to be of the same mind one with another according to Christ Jesus, that with one accord" they may "with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." When Paul writes to the Corinthians about abuses in their worship, he says that their cliques make it impossible for them to eat the Lord's Supper, and that anyone who does not discern the body is very gravely at fault, and "eateth and drinketh judgment unto himself." This seems to mean not that the worshippers must discern that the bread is the Lord's body, but that they must discern that they, the Church, are the Lord's body; and that their breaches in fellowship make true worship impossible. "It is not, as is commonly said, "the abuse of the Lord's Supper" which Paul is seeking to correct in I Corinthians xi. It is the practical denial of that fellowship, that brotherhood, within Christ's Church, of which the Supper provides the symbol and the expression." Those who meet together do not truly worship God unless they discern their unity in Christ and act accordingly.

If worship is to be corporate worship, the Church must be able to sing naturally, "We praise thee, O God," and to pray "Our Father which art in heaven", and to say "We believe in God the Father Almighty", and to be addressed as "Dearly beloved Brethren"; they must act together as God's "family, for which our Lord Jesus Christ was contented to be betrayed and given up into the hands of wicked men, and to suffer death upon the cross", and as those who have been
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1 Acts i,14; ii,46; iv,24.
2 Romans xv,6.
3 I Corinthians xi, 17-20.
4 ibid v.29.
5 Anderson Scott - "The Church, its Worship and Sacraments", pp.104-5.
6 See also Moffatt's Commentary on I Corinthians ad loc. p.162.
7 B.C.P. Collect for Good Friday.
given grace "with one accord" to make their "common supplications" unto him.1

The unity of the Church is expressed and made conscious in various ways. The most obvious way to express unity is to do things together; and therefore the members of the Church sing praise together, utter prayers together, and stand and kneel together. Curiously enough to keep silence together also produces a sense of corporateness, and any experienced member of the Society of Friends could tell how in silence the "sense of the meeting" develops, so that in the succeeding speech one voice is found to utter the mind of all.

The Church also uses dialogue between one part of the worshippers and another to express and strengthen the bond of unity between them. On the face of it, it would seem to emphasise their separateness, but they are only separated that they may perform different parts of the same action; and when in the dialogue they address one another, they emphasise the fact that there is a relationship between them. So the minister utters a prayer and the people respond "Amen"; or he says a sentence of a litany, and they respond "Lord have mercy"; or psalms are sung or said antiphonally; or before each division of the service the priest says "The Lord be with you", and the people respond "And with thy spirit" before they together proceed to the next part of the service. He says "Lift up your hearts", and they respond "We lift them up unto the Lord"; he goes on "Let us give thanks unto our Lord God", and they reply "It is meet and right"; and the whole purpose of this dialogue is to emphasise the fact that the eucharistic prayer which follows, though spoken by the bishop alone, is the prayer and action of the whole Church.2

To pray for men greatly strengthens one's love for them, and mutual prayer for one another is another method by which the unity of the worshipping

1 Ibid. Prayer of St. Chrysostom.
body is sometimes strengthened. In the Armenian Liturgy the congregation are asked to commit not only themselves but one another to the Lord Almighty God. Maurice Rowntree, the Quaker, used to tell how with some Friends it was the custom on going into their Meeting to look round on those who were gathered together, think of their needs one by one, and pray for them. In the early days it was customary to pray for certain classes of the congregation, such as the catechumens. Sometimes the priest asks the prayers of the congregation for himself; "Aid me, brethren, in your prayers, and pray to God for me," he says in the Mozarabic rite; and the congregation respond, "May the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost aid you." For the purpose of strengthening the unity of the congregation this has a double merit for it is a combination of mutual prayer and dialogue. The same double method is seen in the Orthodox service after the Great Entrance, where the priest and deacon exchange prayers for one another; the congregation is not here involved, but the priest and deacon themselves must be drawn more closely into one by such a dialogue and prayer as this:

     Priest: Remember me, brother and fellow-minister.
     Deacon: The Lord God remember thy priesthood in his Kingdom.
             Holy Sir, pray for me.
     Priest: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the
             Highest shall overshadow thee.
     Deacon: The same Spirit shall be fellow-minister with us all the
days of our life.
             Holy Sir, remember me.
     Priest: The Lord God remember thee in his Kingdom, always, now and
             ever, and to ages of ages.

But the greatest demonstration and cultivation of Christian unity in the congregation was in the giving of the kiss of peace. This is typical of the
eucharist, but was given on other occasions also. In the early days it was an actual kiss interchanged among the members of the congregation, men with men, and women with women. As a sign of unity it was taken very seriously, and there were due precautions that the kiss should not be given in hypocrisy or develop into a mere formality. After this kiss, the Armenian Liturgy goes on - "Christ hath been manifested amongst us; God, which is, hath seated himself here; the peace hath been proclaimed, this holy greeting hath been enjoined; the church hath become one soul, the kiss hath been given to be the bond of perfectness: enmity hath been removed, and love been spread abroad." The kiss, as S. Cyril of Jerusalem said, "is a sign that our souls are mingled together and banish all remembrance of injury." No doubt the exchanging of an actual kiss is a symbol not wholly convenient, and that is why the ceremony has been modified, though in most cases the result has been to diminish its value as a sign of unity. The Moravians have a custom that is as good a substitute as it is possible to find. After the distribution of the elements to the people the minister solemnly shakes hands with the deacons, and everyone in the congregation shakes hands with the neighbour on his left and on his right. In Manoharpur the people give one another a ceremonial handshake after communion, and also after prayers either in a church or in a private house, saying at the same time, "Jesus be your helper". This is apparently not derived from the kiss of peace, but it certainly manifests the same spirit.

Fellowship with those who are not physically present is expressed in other ways. There is the carrying of the elements of communion from the service in

1 Strawley - "The early history of the Liturgy". p.15.
2 Dix - "The Shape of Liturgy". pp.105-7.
3 Fifth Lecture on the Mysteries. par.3.
4 See The Moravian Liturgy. p.27.
5 Thompson - "Worship in other lands." p.39.
which the congregation has taken part to the bedside of him that is sick, that all may feel they are one body because they share the one loaf; a custom practised not only in the early church and by Romans and Anglo Catholics today, but also by Luther and Calvin, and by many modern Presbyterians. In Rome arose the custom of taking a morsel of bread from the bishop's mass to all the other masses that were celebrated in the city, so that it should be felt that all shared the one meal. The Catholic Apostolic Church has a service for those who could not be present at the morning communion, and in the opening address the priest calls to mind that although this later congregation were not present in the body at the early service, they were nevertheless united with those who worshipped then. "You were", he says, "hindered from approaching to His holy table in the morning", but nevertheless you "were present in your desires and in the unity of the Holy Ghost, as sheep of the fold of Jesus Christ and faithful members of his flock."^{2}

A wider fellowship is brought to mind by the prayers for the unity of the Church that are so common in the liturgies. Many of them are adaptations of the prayer in the Didache - "As this bread that is broken was scattered upon the mountains, and gathered together, and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom." This sense of unity with men of many nations is also symbolised at Easter in the Orthodox church by the reading of the gospel, both in the Liturgy and at Vespers, in several different languages.^{3}

An attempt to bring to mind the unity of the earthly worshippers with the company of heaven is made by the use of images, stained glass windows depicting
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2 The Liturgy of the Catholic Apostolic Church, p.16.
3 Venite Adoremus, p.81.
the saints, and memorial tablets to men and women of earlier generations; and in the Orthodox Church the deacon censes the icons, thus greeting in and through them "guests come to the sacramental feast." But the most universal way of suggesting this particular unity is by words. Thus Rome makes confession not only to God but to the saints, almost all liturgies incorporate the Tersanctus and expressly say that our praise and thanksgiving is with the heavenly creatures, and there is often a commemoration of the departed. The Ancient Persian rite of Addai and Mari has 434 names of those who have departed from this world; the Syrian Jacobites commemorate among the departed "particularly and by name them that are of our blood, and them that had part in the building of this temple"; and in some Scottish Kirks it is the custom to read at the Holy Table the names of the members of the Church who have died since the last Communion. Whether such commemorations are for thanksgiving, intercession, or invocation, the result is to make conscious the unity of the Church in heaven and on earth.

In many ways, therefore, the Church makes clear to observers and brings home to its own people the fact that its worship is that of a fellowship; that what is offered to God is not merely the sum of the prayers of many individuals, but the worship of a corporate body.

3. The corporate worship of the individual.

At the same time that the worship of the Church is that of a corporate body, it is also the worship of each individual. It is true that there is no corporate worship unless the worshippers are united together; but it is also true that unless the individuals each separately are united with God there is
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2 Hislop - "Our Heritage in Public Worship". p.247.
no worship at all. Corporate worship is not corporate in any sense which deletes individual worship; the corporateness is an addition, not a substitution. "The prayers of a congregation at worship are different from, and more than, the prayers of the individuals composing it; but all the time it is dependent on these. A fire is more than the live coals that compose it; but no live coals, no fire." At Pentecost it was when the tongues "sat upon each one of them" that "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit."^.

Just as it is right therefore to phrase worship in the plural, so it is also right to phrase it in the singular. It would certainly hinder the corporateness of the worship if everything were in the singular; but there is nothing amiss in an alternation of singular and plural, and indeed there is often positive gain. It is well known that the Creed appears in the liturgies in the singular as often as in the plural, but it is not always recognised how frequently other parts of worship are phrased as applying to the individual. There is indeed no part of worship that cannot, rightly be phrased in the singular. Confession is often expressed thus; the Roman confession, for example, begins, "I confess to Almighty God", and the Swedish, "I poor sinful man, who, being born in sin, have sinned against thee in many ways all the days of my life, do confess with all my heart before thee, holy and righteous God, richly loving Father, that I have not loved thee above all else, nor my neighbour as myself." Absolution also is a gift to individuals. "Loosed and freed be all thy servants and thy handmaidens by their several names", says the priest in the Ethiopian Anaphora of the Apostles;^ and Calvin's absolution for the French Church at Strasbourg runs - "Let each one of you acknowledge himself truly a sinner, humbling himself
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1 Selwyn - "Thoughts on worship and prayer." p.75. (Pat. S.P.C.K. 1916)
2 Acts ii, 3-4.
before God, and believe that the heavenly Father desires to be gracious to him in Jesus Christ; to all those who in this manner repent and seek Jesus Christ for their salvation, I declare absolution in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen."¹

Adoration may be phrased in the singular. Thus the Antiochene Anaphora of S. Gregory, after the Sanctus, continues - "Thou broughtest me forth out of nothing, in mercy and loving-kindness; Thou didst set the heavens to be my covering and establish the earth for me to tread. For me Thou didst rein in the sea; for me Thou didst create the nature of animals; Thou didst put all things under my feet, nor didst Thou omit any kindness towards me", and so on, rehearsing all the mercies of God, the people from time to time crying "Lord have mercy". Very moving is the part about Christ which culminates in the great passage - "Thou didst come as a sheep to the slaughter, and didst display Thy solicitude for me even to the Cross; thou didst bury my sin in Thy sepulchre, and didst elevate to the heavens my first fruits; thou didst signify to me the approach of Thine Advent, in which Thou shalt come again to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to every one according to his works."²

The individual quality of corporate petition can be traced in the form of prayer known as the collect. The ancient method of using it was for the presiding minister first to mention a subject for prayer, then there was silence during which the people prayed individually, and after that the collect was recited to gather together the individual prayers of the members into one corporate petition. It seems probable indeed that it derived its name from the fact that it collected the prayers of the individuals into one, though another explanation has also been suggested; but this was clearly its function whether

¹ Venite Adoremus, p.17.
² Linton - "Twenty five consecration prayers". pp. 97-99.
it was the reason for the name or not. Periods of silent prayer are once again coming more into use,¹ and prayer in silence must always have something individual about it. But it is clear that all prayers are necessarily individual to a certain extent, because they cannot mean exactly the same thing to all the people present. The language of liturgical prayers must be to some extent generalised, and each individual necessarily puts upon them his own interpretation.

Thanksgiving also must often be a matter of personal and individual meaning expressed through a generalised form. There are, however, occasions when it seems fitting that a personal thanksgiving should be publicly expressed either by the individual concerned, or by the minister on his behalf. In the Jewish Synagogue service there is a point where "persons who have been in peril of their lives, during journeys by sea or land, in captivity or sickness, upon their deliverance or recovery" say "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who vouchsaith benefits unto the undeserving, who hast also vouchsafed all good unto me", and the congregation respond, "He who hath vouchsafed all good unto thee, may he vouchsafe all good unto thee for ever."² There is also a similar, though much longer, dialogue that takes place between the congregation and a mourner:³ The Canadian revision of the Book of Common Prayer contains a thanksgiving for preservation from "the perils of the deep" to be said by the priest in public worship on behalf of "this thy servant who now desireth to offer his praises and thanksgivings unto Thee in Thy holy Church"; The Celtic Church used to leave pauses during which individual worshippers could utter personal prayers and thanksgivings that they might be taken up into the

¹ For example, in the 1942 Swedish High Mass there is a rubric which says "After Our Father silence may be kept for a space for private prayer."
³ Ibid. p.170.
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church's worship; and among the English Free Churches it is sometimes customary for the minister to voice the thanks of a woman who is attending public worship for the first time after childbirth.

We have seen already that in making sacrifice to God, the individuals may speak on behalf of the whole Church, but they can only do so because each one offers his individual sacrifice. In the early Church it was important that each should bring his own gift, and so the worshippers came to the service each with a little loaf of bread and a little wine in a flask. Even the orphans of the choir-school at Rome, who possessed nothing of their own, were not shut out from this personal offering, for they were allowed to bring the water which was to be mingled with the wine in the chalice. This custom is perpetuated today in the English Coronation Service, where the king still brings the bread and wine for his Communion.

The sermon must always be directed to individuals. "All successful preaching," says Phillips Brooks, "talks to individuals," though he goes too far in saying that the sense of the surrounding congregation must be lost; preaching is not the same as private conversation, and in any case, the sense of the congregation cannot be lost. Yet the sermon is addressed to men not merely as a congregation; each individual must feel that God is addressing him personally, demanding a response that only he can make, and offering a gift that no one else can receive for him. There must be a personal encounter here with one who calls each of his sheep by name, and who thinks of them and deals with them not only as a family but as individual members of that family.

Hymns are also rightly individual as well as corporate. There has been much criticism of the individualism of evangelical hymns. Benson, for example,
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1 Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy". p.104.
2 "Lectures on Preaching" - p.22.
says "from the liturgical point of view the hymn of experience seems to violate
the traditions and to create a new standard of Church praise. Instead of a
congregation uttering its corporate praise with a common voice, we have a
gathering of individuals conducting their private devotions in audible unison."¹

No doubt we may have that, and if we do, it is a bad thing; but that does not
mean that the hymn that says "I" instead of "we" is out of place in corporate
worship. The psalms say "I" often enough, and even though it is often to be
understood as a corporate "I", there are also individual laments and
thanksgivings.² It is often said that the early hymns of the Church are corporate
and not individual, but Christians seem to have found it quite natural to sing
then as they do today, "My soul doth magnify the Lord", and "Lord now lettest
thou thy servant depart in peace." It seems then that we are not departing from
tradition when we sing "Rock of Ages cleft for me", and "When I survey the
wondrous cross"; nor are we necessarily departing from true corporateness. No
doubt such hymns may be, and have been, misused; but Bernard Manning is
undoubtedly right when he says that the time when the men of the 18th and 19th
centuries had the greatest sense of corporateness was when they sang the most
individual hymns. "At such moments they had most communion with one another,
and most impact on the world."³ For Christians are joined together by each being
joined individually to Christ; they are a part of the Body primarily because
they are controlled by the Head, and they come together when they come to him.
Christian unity is in very large measure a by-product; one can do something to
seek it directly, but the primary necessity is the uniting of each individual
member with God.

¹ Benson - "The English Hymn", p.250.
² See Casterley - "The Psalms", vol. 1, pp.5-8, and also Robinson - "The Poetry
³ "Essays in Orthodox Dissent", p.84.
The worship of the Church must therefore combine both the individual and the corporate. It is possible to over-emphasise either, and a Christian Service must maintain the right balance between them. They are worthily combined in a translation by Heiler of a Moravian hymn. The last two lines are indeed a mistranslation, but a mistranslation that is inspired, and one that would no doubt have pleased Count Zinzendorf, the author of the original.

Heart with every heart united
In God's heart its rest shall know,
And the flame of love there lighted
Toward the Saviour leap and glow.
He the Head, and we the members,
He the light by which we shine,
Brethren all, as each remembers,
All are His and He is mine. 1

---

1 Heiler - "The Spirit of Worship". p.104.
IIII. THE MEANS OF WORSHIP

1. Association and Symbolism.

Our minds have an astonishing capacity for associating things together, so that one thing continually reminds us of others. We see a cross and we think of Christ, or we go into a Church, and because of the associations of the building, our minds are put in tune with sacred things. Once an association is made in our minds, whether deliberately chosen or forced upon us by circumstances, it stays there; and thereafter, whenever one of the two associated things is present to us, the other tends to be recalled also.

The association may be with an object. Men treasure their friends' letters and gifts, or the relics of the saints; and to be in contact with these things makes them feel more closely in contact with those who are no longer present with them. Objects used in worship are considered sacred, and are preserved from ordinary use because the two sets of associations feel incongruous. No one would use a communion table to play table-tennis on; it would make no difference to the table, but it would make a difference to our minds.

The association may be with a place. Those who go to Palestine and walk upon the roads on which our Lord walked, or sail upon the very sea on which he so often sailed, or visit Jerusalem or Bethlehem or the other places where he lived, commonly feel more close to him because of the association of these sacred sites. And similarly those who enter a church commonly feel that the place is sacred because of the associations it holds; it is a place where, perhaps, they have worshipped themselves and seen God's glory, or at any rate it is a place where others worship, and where God makes himself known.

The association may be one of time. The Church observes the festivals of the Christian year, and in so doing maintains a more vivid sense of those
things that happened at Easter and Pentecost and even Christmas. It keeps a festival on the first day of the week in memory of the Resurrection. It holds a three hours service on Good Friday, and in so doing is helped by the remembrance that it was at this time of the day that Jesus died. The Canonical Hours will often recall the holy things that took place at the time of day on which they are held, and in the Byzantine Office of None, for instance, the worshippers remember that this is the time when Jesus was gracious to the thief who was dying beside him, and are therefore made more confident in asking for his grace to be shown to them.¹

Or the association may be with an action. We "do this" which our Lord did, and in performing his actions we are brought nearer to him; and the fact that this action has been done by the Church throughout all the ages of Christendom, also has the effect of uniting us more closely with all those who in times past and present are members of that Body of Christ.

Associations are clearly very important in worship. They may of course work both ways. If they are irrelevant, then they are a hindrance and spoil our concentration. If they are good associations, then they may be very helpful indeed. But it is possible for even good associations to be a hindrance. They may be so strong that the only meaning of a hymn or a prayer to reach our mind is the feeling that we had when we sang it many years ago, when it was only half understood. Perhaps it was a very good feeling, but it may make us quite unable to see that hymn or prayer as it is, and we remain at the stage of half understanding. Or the mind, on hearing certain words, may say, "I know what this means," and immediately adopt the old familiar attitude that is associated with it, quite oblivious of the fact that the attitude demanded in this

¹ Wainewright - "The Byzantine Office". p.173.
particular context is quite a different one.

Objects, actions, etc., may not only remind us of those things with which we associate them; they may actually come to represent them, and when they do so, we call them symbols. The reasons for which they become symbols are various, and according to those reasons the symbols are of different kinds. Harris (followed by Drummond) distinguishes three types—esoteric, natural and arbitrary.¹

Sometimes an object is taken as symbolic because of historical association, and it then becomes an esoteric symbol. Jesus died upon a cross, and therefore we may make the form of a cross to represent him and his sacrifice. Our cross has had no physical contact with him or with Palestine, but it nevertheless becomes a symbol of him. Similarly, to take another religious symbol from a different source, it is recorded that Buddha sat under a Bo-tree, and therefore a Bo-tree may come to be a symbol of Buddha.

Objects or actions may be symbolic because of a correspondence of ideas or feelings, and they are then natural symbols. Natural symbols are extremely common in worship: physical light is used to denote mental and spiritual light, washing the body to represent a cleansing of the soul, material eating and drinking to convey spiritual feeding, bowing or kneeling to express humility, and so on.

Arbitrary symbols depend upon an association deliberately made between things that have no natural point of contact, but which we desire to join together for some purpose; so we may, for example, let the unknown be represented by "x". Words in general are arbitrary symbols, though some of them partake of the nature of esoteric or natural symbols as well. The word "God" is

an arbitrary symbol; some other sound would do equally well, and indeed by
other nations other sounds are used. Such arbitrary symbols are necessary for
communication of thought, and are of course quite indispensable in corporate
worship.

It is most important to realise that the symbol and its meaning are two
things and not one. This is not always easy, because for symbols to be of any
use, the symbol and its meaning must be very closely knit together in our minds.
The symbolic object must be so united in our thought with that which it
represents, that we can really use the one for the other. The Roman Catholic
who kisses the crucifix, and the old Chinese woman who chooses to be martyred
by the Boxers rather than spit on the cross they have drawn on the earth with the
point of a sword, both mentally unite the symbol with Christ, so that what they
do to the symbol is meant as done to him. The martyrs who died rather than offer
a pinch of incense to the heathen gods did so because in their minds, and in the
mind of their society, the offering of incense was so closely joined to worship
that they could not perform the one act without meaning the other. The mental
unity of meaning and symbol is often so close that we draw no distinction between
them; and even a modern and educated man may be shocked (or at any rate think he
ought to be shocked) at a blasphemy spoken by a young child who obviously does
not know the meaning of the symbols he is using. The symbol and the meaning are
so closely knit in the man's mind that to him they are one. It ought to be
clear, however, that this is a primitive habit of thought, and that in actual
fact the symbol and the meaning are two and not one. A cross is not the same as
Christ, burning incense is not the same as worship, and the sounds made by the
young child are not the same thing as the spiritual sin of blasphemy.

When communication is being thought of, a symbol is sometimes called a
carrying medium; but it does not carry in the same way as a basket carries, so that the one is actually inside the other, and to drop the basket will smash the contents. It is more like a telegraph wire, a device for carrying the current that causes the instrument at the receiving end to act like that at the sending end. Communication is not usually possible without a symbol, but the symbol no more contains thought and feeling than the wire does, and the thing signified is no more injured by the destruction of the symbol than it would be by the destruction of the wire.

In Christian use, a distinction is drawn between those symbols that signify and those that work, the latter being called sacraments. But this same principle applies to both of them. The symbol that signifies may be the carved image, the stained glass window, the stencilled alpha and omega, the picture of the Agnus Dei, or the letters G-O-D. These are not carrying media in the sense that they contain God. He is not injured if they should be destroyed. They may bring us into real communion with him, but they are not he.

Sacraments, symbols that work, are used by God as means by which he acts upon us; and yet it is still true that his action is not the same as the physical thing that is done. The physical act signifies and accompanies his spiritual act, and makes us able to believe in and therefore to receive it; but it does not contain it. The actions of Jesus were sacramental; but when he healed the sick, it was not because some force of healing ran down his arm, and through contact was able to make its way into another body. The fact was that the touch of Jesus kindled the man's faith, and through his faith the healing was able to take place. Where faith was sufficiently strong, there was no need for physical contact with Jesus at all, and men like the centurion's servant were healed at a distance. But where faith was not strong, Jesus would
use any convenient instruments to produce it - not only touch, but even spittle and clay. He signified, and created faith in, the act of God that took place at that moment, not within his actions but accompanying them.

When he gave his disciples the bread and wine, saying that this was his body and blood, he could not have meant that he was actually at that moment within the elements as well as within his own body which was standing in front of them, that his physical body was to be seen not only in his flesh but also in the bread lying on the table, and that the wine in front of them was the same blood as that now flowing in his veins. Yet he was in that moment offering to them himself; and although he was not contained in the bread and wine, yet by means of the bread and wine they received him.

When men are baptised, if the necessary spiritual conditions are fulfilled, there is a real giving and receiving of the Spirit of God. That is not because the baptismal water contains that Spirit and He is physically communicated. The baptising by water makes possible and accompanies the gift which is bestowed directly into the soul.

The main abuses of symbolism are due to one form or another of the primitive idea that the symbol and the thing symbolised are really one, and that the meaning somehow lies physically within the symbol. Sometimes the symbol is treated as though it contains ourselves; that is, as though the performance of a ritual means something of itself.¹ Sometimes it is treated as though it

¹ If a rite is to be effective, we must mean something by it as well as perform it. As we shall see later, however, a rite, like any other symbol, may have more than one meaning, and it is possible to mean it in part.

A ceremony may also rightly be performed when it expresses not what we mean but what we desire to mean, when its words say the things we desire to believe, its feelings are those we desire to have, and its purpose is that we desire to intend. No doubt this is dangerous, for we may deceive ourselves into thinking that we possess real beliefs, feelings and purposes, when all we have is the desire for them. No doubt, too, it is very incomplete; but as far as it goes it is a real offering of worship.
contains God; and thus an idol is thought to be the embodiment of God, to make the sign of the cross is thought to contain power and to be a protection against evil, or the Host is thought to have supernatural properties that affect everything that comes into contact with it.  

2. The necessity of Symbols.

Symbols are not only natural to our minds; in all matters spiritual they are a necessity. We are not pure spirit, but are embodied in flesh and blood. This means that we can only express the spiritual reality of our thought and feeling by material things, and by actions in space and time; in all things spiritual we cannot help but use symbols and rites, and our spiritual life is of necessity lived in connection with times and places. It means too that God in his dealings with us also uses matter and time for his purposes, for these are the surest ways of approach to our minds. He speaks to us not merely at all times, but at special times; and not only "spirit to spirit", but also and more often through music, words, actions, events, water, bread, or wine. In fact it is his chosen way to speak to us through spirit become flesh.

There are many different traditions as to what symbols are fitting in worship as in other things. Just as men may greet each other with a bow, a hand-shake (with the other or with themselves), a salute (of one kind or another),

1 A corporal, for instance, used to be kept in Cluniac churches for the purpose of protecting them against fire. (Brilioth - "Eucharistic Faith and Practice." p.88)

2 In the whole of this section on Worship, the words "express" and "expression" are used in a general way to cover all methods by which we put our thought and feeling into material form. When we come to the section on Art we shall find it is necessary to distinguish between two ways of putting feeling into material form, and that "expression" is an aesthetic term which is given to one of them only. It would only complicate the argument to make the distinction now; but it is necessary to state in what sense we are using the terms so as to avoid confusion later.
or an embrace; so in worship different symbols seem fitting to different races and traditions. Some express their reverence by removing their hat, others by removing their shoes; some kneel to pray, others stand, and yet others prostrate themselves; some join their hands before their breast, others raise them aloft, and others place one hand on the head or one finger on the nose; some close their eyes and others raise them to heaven. We read of Jesus that he prostrated himself in prayer, lifted up his eyes to heaven, was baptised, broke bread, and lifted up his hand in blessing.

There are differences also in the quantity of symbolism it is considered fitting to use. Some occasions seem to demand more ceremonial than others, and some ages, races and temperaments are more demonstrative than others. It is entirely natural that this should show itself in the use of different quantities of symbols. Some are helped by images, candles, processions, holy water, incense, and all kinds of elaboration; while there are others who can worship best in the quiet of a plain Meeting House with none of these things.

Any of such symbols may be dispensed with, for there is no one symbol that is always and unavoidably necessary. The history of worship abounds in symbols that have largely or wholly fallen into disuse - the raising of the hands for prayer, the kiss of peace, the sufflatic, the placing of salt on the tongue of each candidate for baptism, the touching of his nose and ears with oil or spittle while the priest says "Ephphatha", the delivering to him of a lighted candle, and so on. There are some symbols that Christians believe to be obligatory, because they hold that their use was commanded by Christ; but even those are not
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1 Mark xiv, 35.
2 John xi, 41: xvii,1. Mark vi, 41:
3 Mark i, 9.
4 Mark vi, 41: vii,6: xiv,22:
5 Mark xxiv, 30.
indispensable in the sense that God cannot and does not work without them, and that there are no circumstances when they can be rightly discarded. Even the taking of bread and wine, although it is obligatory for all those who believe it to be divinely commanded, is not an observance indispensable to salvation. This is recognised both in the Reformed and the Roman traditions. Calvin points out that the penitent thief on the cross when he was converted became the brother of all believers though he never partook of the Lord's supper, and the Sarum Manual, which gives instructions for the communion of the sick, has a rubric to say that if the sick man is unable to eat and drink, the priest is to say to him, "Brother, in this case it suffices for thee to have a true faith and good will; believe only, and thou hast eaten." The Roman Church holds also of course that martyrdom renders the use of the obligatory symbols unnecessary, and that one like Alban, for example, is a saint, though he never received communion nor had he been baptised.

But although the quantity and kind of symbols used may vary immensely, and although any one symbol may be dispensed with, no one can dispense with symbols entirely. Even the Quaker uses words to communicate his mind to others, and signifies the end of a meeting by a handshake. The actions he uses to accomplish his ends symbolise his mind, the expression on his face and the tone of his voice are inevitably symbolic of the spiritual reality within, and the fact that he chooses to worship in a particular sort of building and in a particular sort of way is a very adequate symbol of the special emphasis of his character and religion. Everything we do or refrain from doing is the fruit of our inner life, and a tree is known by its fruits; it can neither bear figs nor fail to bear them without telling us something about its nature.

1 Institutes iv, 16, 31
2 Swete - "Church Services and Service Books". p.160.
3. The Uses of Symbols.

Symbols in ordinary life are used for various purposes. Sometimes we put our thoughts and feelings into words, a groan, a stamp of the foot, or into some form of art, for the purpose of expressing them. We often do it because we cannot help it; we frown, walk in a listless way, and turn pale, not because we choose to do so, but quite involuntarily. Sometimes we deliberately choose to express ourselves so as to work off a feeling and get rid of it; we may stamp our foot or possibly pick up an ornament and smash it, and feel very much better when we have done so, because something that was pent up inside us is released and got rid of. And sometimes we express ourselves in order to make clear to ourselves exactly what it is we think and feel. When we have got our ideas and feelings about a subject into concrete form and arranged them in order, we feel that it is understood and mastered, and if necessary we can pigeon-hole it and put it out of our minds.

Arising from this is another common use of symbols. Once their significance is fixed, they can be used to recall or re-create the thought or feeling which originally gave them birth. The symbols of thought are obviously used in that way. We write a word or make a symbolic sketch in a notebook so that on some future occasion we can look at the symbols, and recreate once more the thoughts we had when we put them down; they keep their association, and to recall the symbol is to recall the thought that went with it. But the same is true of symbols of feeling, and particularly so if the symbols in question are actions. When an act is the natural or habitual expression of a certain feeling, the two things become one in the mind, so that not only does the feeling almost automatically result in the action, but the action calls up the feeling. Not only does happiness result in a smile, but to smile tends to produce good humour;
not only is pain expressed in groans, but if one groans long and persistently enough, one can make one's self begin to feel very miserable. The reason is partly, no doubt, association. "The law of association holds not only of ideas but of various mental states of a more general and less sharply defined nature, including such things as feelings, will attitudes, emotions, and moods. And just as one can call up the last half of a verse of poetry better by beginning with the first half and getting a start, so to speak, than by trying to recall it without preliminary or associate, so one can induce a mood more easily by summoning first some fairly common associate in form of an act."¹ But there seems to be more to it than that. "It must be remembered," adds Pratt, "that the relation between acts and emotions is not one merely of associations; but that (if there be any truth at all in the James-Lange theory) the kinaesthetic sensations and the other psychical correlates of activity constitute an integral part of emotion."² The muscular and other feelings of these acts is therefore a part of the emotion; and the two things are joined by more than mere association.

In corporate worship this is a very useful fact. Our feelings are not under the direct control of the will, but our actions are. And if our feelings fail us, it means that to practise those acts that are their usual associates - bowing the head, kneeling, repeating sacred words, crossing one's self - will call up the feelings that go with them. In that case, kneeling, for example, may be not merely the expression of humility, but its cause. There is obvious reason therefore to believe that God answers the prayer of the Armenian priest who prays as all the congregation bow down, "Have mercy on this people which, bowed down, adore thy godhead. Keep them whole, and stamp upon their hearts the

¹ Pratt - "The Religious Consciousness". p.281.
² ibid p.281.
posture of their bodies, for the inheritance and possession of good things to come.

A third common use of symbols is for purposes of communication. No doubt there is such a thing as telepathy under certain conditions and between certain sorts of people, but the normal method of communication is by means of symbols. If we express ourselves in the presence of someone who understands the symbols we are using, then they are able to perceive the thoughts and feelings of our minds. They may look at them objectively and decide whether they are good or bad, whether they should make them their own or reject them; or if they are very receptive, they may involuntarily adopt them as their own, and accept an idea because we express it, or feel afraid because we show that we are.

It should be noticed that while symbols may communicate something that concerns each of the persons involved separately, very often they communicate the relationship between them. A kiss, a handshake, or a bow, communicate something concerning the relationship between the persons who give and receive them, and little else. But in almost any case of communication, the sense of relationship is one of the things communicated, even when it is not consciously thought of. The manner in which one man speaks to another, for example, clearly shows whether their relationship is that of superior and inferior, master and servant, pupil and teacher, or sufferer and oppressor. Whatever the subject that is being discussed, his manner and tone of voice disclose the sort of relationship in which the conversation is taking place.

Just as a symbol can be used not only to express feelings or thoughts, but also to invoke them, so it can be used not only to express a relationship, but also to kindle and nourish it. For to express our relationships to one another
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1 "The Armenian Liturgy" p.94.
does not leave them where they were; it strengthens and deepens them. To kiss a child not only expresses our love but feeds it, and to shake hands with a friend does the same. And as in our relationship with human persons, so in our relationship with God. To express our love for him is a creative act. It does not leave the relationship where it was. The bond between us is strengthened, and our fellowship is more close.

4. Symbols and the Senses.

In order to understand the effectiveness of different kinds of symbols, we must notice several facts about the senses. First, the senses are more primitive than thought. Our experience, both as a race and as individuals, begins with the senses, and we only learn to use thought much later and with greater difficulty. Our tendency is always to return to the more primitive ways of using our mind, and we are more at home in them. That is why in our dreams we think in pictures, and why the individual and particular is always more vivid to us than the general and abstract. Second, the senses are often able to grasp things immediately as a whole, whereas thought often has first to take in the parts separately and then put them together. The eye takes in a piece of machinery first as a pattern, seeing the whole; but a description of a machine that would make it clear to the understanding would have to describe it separately, piece by piece, and build up the picture of the whole gradually. Third, communication of feeling comes more directly when it is made through the senses than when thought and description are introduced as well. It increases the number of mental processes involved if a feeling is translated into a description before it is communicated; for the recipient has first to understand the description intellectually and then translate it into terms of feeling again.

"If it is possible to put the feeling into a symbol that conveys it immediately
to feeling, without having to go through the processes of thought at all, the communication is much more direct.

• These truths, working separately or together, account for the fact that the more directly symbols are connected with the senses, the more vivid they are. We can formulate the following principles.

A thing heard is more vivid than one merely described. A groan communicates a feeling of pain more vividly than a careful description of pain in words. It is more immediate; it telescopes the process of communication by leaving out the element of thought. For the purpose of argument here, we are assuming that the description is nothing more than description. Of course if it is spoken by a person who is feeling pain, it will be a good deal more. It will involve a tone of voice and a speed or hesitation of utterance that is the direct expression of feeling, and is therefore the same sort of thing as a groan. What the hearer receives in such a case is something corresponding to a groan and a description both at the same time; but of these two considered separately, the more vivid is the former.

As with a thing heard, so also with one seen; the thing seen is more vivid than one merely thought. The prophets of the Old Testament made use of this fact, as when Isaiah walked about the streets like a slave,¹ when Jeremiah broke an earthen flask as a sign that God would break the people and the city,² and when Ezekiel made a model of Jerusalem besieged, lay down beside it, and lived on the starvation diet that would be the lot of those in the city, cooking his sparse and unsavoury bread upon a fire of cow-dung.³ Jesus himself made use of it when he rode into Jerusalem upon an ass, and when he washed the disciples'

¹ Isaiah, Chapter xx.
² Jeremiah xix, ll.
³ Ezekiel, Chapter iv.
The same principle lies at the root of the use of relics, pilgrimages to Palestine, and the worship of idols. Even those who do not believe that God is a material figure, nor even that he dwells in the material figure, often find it useful to have a material figure as an aid to faith. They are like the intelligent Indian who was asked by Pratt about the image of Shiva which he was apparently worshipping. He said, "The image is not Shiva; Shiva is in heaven. But I want to worship Shiva, so I make a picture or image as like him in appearance as I can, and then I pray to Shiva in front of it because it helps me to pray."

Touch is also more vivid than speech. Jesus made use of this fact when he laid his hands upon men to heal them. It was not necessary for healing, for it could be dispensed with, and there were some whose faith needed no such aid. But in most cases Jesus evidently felt that it would be a help, and he used it; and they, when they felt his hand laid upon them, knew that something was happening, because they could not only hear his words, but actually feel his touch. Touch is used today in ordination, and those who have been ordained know the sense of immediacy that is given to the experience by the physical contact.

A thing which we do is more vivid than that which we merely think. Perhaps this is partly a matter of concentration, for action is certainly a help in concentrating the mind, and it is noticeable, for example, that one's mind is more easily fixed in private prayer when one utters the prayers with one's mouth and not only with one's mind. It is certainly in part a matter of the will; for to do something with one's body demands a more active co-operation of the will than merely to allow words to flow over one's mind. But it would seem to be true also that the sensation of performing the action, whether it is a movement of the lips or some other part of the body, makes the meaning more vivid to the mind.

In speech, the particular and concrete example is more vivid than the generalisation. That is the reason why poets use metaphors and similes, why Jesus used parables, and why preachers use illustrations and anecdotes. No doubt it is very good to say, "God will look after me", but it is much better to say, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want"; no doubt it is perfectly right to say, "Your neighbour is any man who is in need"; but it is much better to begin, "A certain man was going down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and he fell among thieves."

We can sum up in the words of Pratt - "In the last analysis nothing else matters about the sentiment of conviction quite so easily or nearly so universally as the actual presence to sense. 'To see is to believe'; and the tangible is often considered very nearly synonymous with the unmistakably real. At every remove from sense-perception, our representations enjoy less and less of reality in feeling. A memory image feels to us more real and inspires us with more questioning belief than does a mere imagination, and other things being equal imagination more easily produces belief than does conception."¹

We may also notice here that as primitive ways of thinking are more vivid our minds and more easy for us to grasp, so the more primitive ways of acting are more easy for us to use. It is very difficult for us to express our feelings in words, especially our deep feelings. A record of famous proposals of

¹The Religious Consciousness". p.197.
It is true also of art that the more direct the contact with the senses the better. A picture should produce an immediate effect through the direct result of colour, line and mass, on the feelings; if it tries to produce feelings only through ideas, it is a poor picture. Similarly, music should communicate feeling direct; the reason programme music is often unsuccessful is that it is not direct enough, and instead of making an immediate appeal to feeling, diverts its approach through thought. Poetry and prose of course work through the idea, but even there that is not enough; it is the sound that gets to work on the mind first, and if literature does not work immediately through the sensuous sound of the words, it is not adequate as art.
marriage, if it were possible to compile such a thing, would probably make very tedious reading, not because the feelings behind them were unreal, but because the speakers were not able to put into words more than a fraction of what they felt. It is very difficult even to tell a friend exactly what we feel about him, and we can often do it more easily by grasping his hand than by stammering out words. It is the same in our communion with God. It has been said that the most difficult thing a minister is ever called upon to do in worship is to express adoration in words; and this is true even though he is a person who is accustomed to use words, regularly as an instrument of expression and communication. It is easy to understand that one who is not so accustomed will find it much easier to express himself by kneeling, or crossing himself, or kissing a crucifix, than by using words.

5. Symbols and Time.

It is clear that symbols not only exist in space, but that some kinds of symbols have a specially close connection with time; namely actions as distinct from objects. All material objects, such as for example a metal cross, of course exist in time as well as in space; they belong to this temporal order, they had a beginning and will some day come to an end. But an action, like that of making the sign of the cross, has to our mind a more obvious connection with time, in that it happens not merely in an era but in a moment, and its beginning and end can both be seen and grasped at once.

Not only do our bodily actions take place in time, but the actions of our mind also. We learn things at certain times, so that we can say "yesterday I did not know this, but this morning I have learnt it." Our feelings take place in

---

1 The superiority of actions to words here is also partly due to the fact that a gesture suggests the totality of feeling, whereas in words there is an analysis of content.
time, so that at one moment we may feel miserable and at another moment happy.
Our decisions take place in time, so that at one moment we are hesitant, and at
the next we have chosen our course of action.

These changes that take place in time are sometimes so gradual, that they
cannot be labelled and dated, still less fixed as having happened in a certain
moment; nevertheless our daily life is necessarily made up of constant actions
that take place in certain definite moments, and often we fix beforehand a
moment when an action shall be made. This is true of mental actions as well as
bodily ones. We do it, for example, with marriage. A man may fall in love at
first sight and be able to name the exact place and time, or the process may be
gradual and be spread over a period; but the only satisfactory basis for
married life is a definite, mutual resolution made at a certain time. One can
even fix a date and hour of the clock beforehand when the act shall be finally
and irrevocably done. No doubt this is partly a piece of public witness for the
protection of society; but if the marriage ceremony is a live one, there is a
real mental act made in that moment; and it would be a crisis in the lives of
the bride and bridegroom, whether there were any one to witness it or not.
Thereafter in that relationship there are many other actions expressive of their
constant love which also take place in specific moments of time.

In our relationship with God it is just the same. There are certain
gradual processes that go on all the time; but there are innumerable acts, both
on his side and ours, that take place at certain moments. Thus the birth of
Jesus was the act of God for the redemption of mankind that took place at a
certain definite time that can be dated and named, and all the subsequent
historic actions of Jesus took place on definite days and at certain moments.
So also did man's crucifixion of him.
Sometimes the moment in which either God or we act is apparently quite unprepared for; we decide and act quite spontaneously, or the action of God comes upon us all unexpected. But it is quite possible to fix times when the action shall take place. We are accustomed, for example, to fix times each day when we shall both give to and receive from God in prayer at home; and other times in a morning and evening each Sunday when we shall give and receive in church; and many a Christian worshipper prays in spirit with his Jewish brethren at Divine Worship, “Our Father, our King! Let this hour be an hour of mercy and a time of favour with Thee.”

But times can be fixed more closely than that; and it is possible to say, in such a particular moment I will give, or even in such a particular moment God will give. Thus Jesus said, “Thy sins be forgiven thee”; and the forgiveness took place there and then. He was accustomed in healing men and women to lay his hands on them, that the healing power of God might be received and the miracle take place in the moment of contact. They also could do the same kind of thing. The woman who had haemorrhage herself fixed the moment when the miracle should happen, and said, “If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole”; and when she did so, “straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up.”

We are also right in fixing moments in our services when we shall act, or when God will do so himself. We fix a period during lessons and sermon when he will speak and we shall listen. We fix moments of decision and dedication when we shall say: “Here we offer and present unto thee ourselves.” We fix moments when we shall receive his gifts, as when we sing, “Come and thy sacred unction bring, And sanctify us while we sing;” and “Thou God that answerest

1 Authorised Daily Prayer Book p57.
2 Mark v, 20-29.
3 John Dryden’s “Creator Spirit”.
by fire, The Spirit of burning now impart."  

In the Service of Holy Communion many rites fix the moment of consecration. Thus in the Anaphora of St. John the Evangelist in the Ethiopic Rite the priest says "Flung wide be doors of light, and opened the gates of glory, set wide, and let Thy Living and Holy Spirit come, descend and dwell, tabernacle, rest and bring a blessing on the thanksgiving of this bread, and hallow this cup."  

Another moment commonly fixed is that of absolution, when God's forgiveness is given and accepted. The fixing of a definite point in time brings matters to a head, and helps to make sure that a man does not drift on without taking God's forgiveness at all. Thus in the service of "Public Confession" which precedes the Mass in the Swedish rite the minister says, "If this your confession of sin is sincere, and therefore you with a penitent heart desire forgiveness of your sins for Jesus Christ's sake, then it is sure and certain, in the power of God's word and promise, that God in his mercy forgiveth you all your sins: and I pronounce unto you this forgiveness of your sins by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the name of God the Father and the Son and the Holy
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1 Charles Wesley's "Brethren in Christ and well beloved." Charles Wesley's hymns are full of such fixed moments. Consider the following lines - "Be it according to thy word: This moment let it be," or "The peace thou hast given This moment impart," or the whole hymn "Come 0 my God, the promise seal". As printed in Methodist Hymn Book of 1933 it has five verses, of which four stress the present moment as that in which God shall act.

2 Book of Common Prayer.

3 Harden - "The Anaphoras of the Ethiopic Liturgy". p.83.
And in the Eastern Orthodox Church the fact that forgiveness has taken place in the moment of absolution is stressed by the priest's words at the end: "Have no further care for the sins which thou hast confessed; depart in peace."  

Benediction is a universal fixing of a moment when something is done. For a benediction is not a pious ejaculation, or a hope, or even a prayer, but an act of bestowal. The rite of Addai and Mari says it is to be "proclaimed" by the priest, "like one making an announcement." The gift of God, which is offered without ceasing, is presented through a human instrument in that moment for man's acceptance. The fixing of the moment is an attempt to make sure that both the faith of him who pronounces the words and of him who hears them is brought to the point of use, and that men co-operate with God in the bestowing and receiving of his gift in such a way that something definite happens. It is often made more obviously immediate by the word "now", but as J.H. Howlett points out, the form "be amongst you, and remain with you always" means "be amongst you now" even though the word is not used. The stretching out of the hand is another way of signifying the immediacy of the benediction. The original method was to lay the hand on the person blessed; but where a number of persons were concerned that was impossible, and the stretching out of the hand is a symbolic substitute.

This fixing of times and moments is of great usefulness in the worship of God. It is an aid to the will, a help in making sure that a decision is reached, whether it be a decision to give or a decision to accept; and by its clarity and
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1 Brilioth - "Eucharistic Faith and Practice." p.266.
3 Hislop - "Our Heritage in Public Worship." p.317.
4 Brightman - "Liturgies Eastern and Western." p.293.
5 "Instructions in reading the Liturgy." p.162.
6 Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible. Article "Blessing".
definiteness it is an aid to faith. It is often, though not always, connected with a symbolic action; for as an action is something that takes place at a certain time, there is a natural connection between the two. Thus Jesus not only laid his hands on people to heal them, but he laid his hands on children to bless them, and lifted up his hands over the disciples for the same purpose; and we also raise the hand in benediction, lay on hands in ordination, and use various other actions for various other ritual purposes. We may say of ritual action that it has this advantage over a static symbol, that it is not only vivid because it is close to the senses, but it has added definiteness because it takes place in a specific moment of time.

6. Content of Symbols.

(a) A symbol may exist for the purpose of conveying or expressing either thought or feeling, or some combination of the two. The mathematician's "x" exists for the purpose of conveying thought without feeling. Notes of music, on the other hand, generally exist for the purpose of conveying feelings without thoughts. In music there are no logical arguments, and as a rule no distinct conceptions involved; music can rouse terror without giving any idea of what the terror is about, or longing without giving any idea what the longing is for. But there are other means of expression, such as poetry, which are concerned with both thought and feeling. Poetry sometimes approaches pure music and sometimes seems to verge on pure argument; but it is never entirely the one or the other. If it really is poetry, there are always present both thought and feeling.

It follows that if a particular symbol is intended in any degree to convey thought, it will not fulfil its purpose unless it is grasped by the understanding. If a religious service is in any degree to be a uniting of the
thought of man with the thought of God, then it is quite useless to have it in a language that the congregation do not understand. Similarly, if there are pieces of ceremonial that are intended to interpret the meaning of what is done, such pieces of ceremonial cannot serve their purpose unless they are understood.

When in the early church a newly baptised convert was given at his first Communion not only bread and wine, but milk and honey, it was no doubt a very eloquent symbol, because it told him that he had now entered into the promised land. But if he had never heard of the wanderings of the Jews in the desert, their entry into Canaan, and the fact that it was a land "flowing with milk and honey", the symbol could not possibly have conveyed what was intended.

If, however, the purpose of any particular symbol is to express or convey feeling, then that can often be done without the logical faculties entering into the matter at all. The man who sings the "Hallelujah" of an Easter hymn no more needs to know the meaning of the word than he who sings "derry down derry" after a song. Nor do we need to think out our reasons every time we shake hands, bow, kneel, or burn incense. We are expressing our feelings, and that is enough. Why these particular acts should express these particular feelings need not be any concern of ours. There are indeed some symbols that have their effect without our being conscious what it is that has produced it; thus colour and space and degrees of light and darkness affect us all profoundly, even though many of us take little conscious notice of such things, and certainly could not analyse what it was that had produced such an impression. We do not understand, but we very certainly feel.

When symbols are intended to convey both feeling and understanding, then although the audience will not receive their whole meaning if it does not understand them, nevertheless they may still get a good deal from them. The
Roman Catholic to whom Latin is a mystery, and many of the Church's rites are incomprehensible, may nevertheless receive a very great deal from the service of the Mass. It is not merely that he receives the blessing of all those who make an offering to God, but the service itself communicates to him emotions, attitudes of mind, and moods, which are a most valuable part of his religious life, even though they do not satisfy the whole of it.¹

(b) The meaning of a symbol may relate to the conscious or the unconscious mind, or to both. The frequency with which it relates to the unconscious has been abundantly demonstrated by the psychiatrists, who have shown us that our dreams, for example, are full of symbols of our unconscious desires. In the ordinary way their meaning is hidden from the conscious mind, but it can nevertheless be uncovered; and when that is done, we are amazed to find reason and purpose in what had seemed to us perhaps a mere arbitrary jumble. It is no doubt the fact that our unconscious mind is being symbolised that makes some ceremonies feel entirely right, though we do not know why; they satisfy some deep and unconscious need in a way unknown to us.

Conscious and unconscious symbolism may go together, and we often choose a symbol for more reasons than one. It expresses, no doubt, that which we consciously intend; but of all the symbols that would suit our conscious purpose we choose this one, because it also satisfies something in our unconscious. For a certain type of mind, the thought of the wound made by the spear in the side of Jesus seems to hold an undue fascination; such a one longs to lie there

¹ It is possible of course for the symbol itself to be partly defective, and convey its thought better than its feelings, or vice-versa. In deciding whether to use it or not, one has to weigh up the relative importance of the two things to be conveyed, and the degree of the symbol's adequacy in each case. Moffatt's translation of the Bible may convey the sense more accurately than the Authorised Version; and yet one may often prefer to use the Authorised Version, because its dignity and reverence more than make up for shortcomings in the sense.
hidden and concealed. Now we know that, when the human mind feels the affairs and responsibilities of this world too much for it, there are two very common desires that arise, and that show themselves in ways that are open to the enquiries of the psychologists. One is the desire to be dead; and the other is the desire to be back once again in the mother's womb, the only place the human being has ever known where there is perfect safety without effort or responsibility. Knowing the commonness of this desire, one cannot help feeling that the hymn writers use this symbol of being concealed in the cleft in the side of Jesus partly because it expresses their unconscious desire to be back again in their mother's womb. George Woodcock is right when he talks about the womb symbolism of the first verse of "Rock of Ages"; and even Charles Wesley's "Concealed in the cleft of thy side" in his hymn "Thou shepherd of Israel and mine", although its primary and most important meaning is undoubtedly the longing for the closest possible kind of communion, may contain also a touch of this much less worthy desire.

(c) It is clear that symbols may mean many things at one time. In addition to being able to express both thought and feeling, the conscious and the unconscious, they have still other ways of gathering up into themselves a tremendously wide and varied significance. A part, for instance, easily becomes symbolic of the whole, as in pictures of the crucifixion a hand may stand for the figure of the Father. Any one thing may be taken to represent a whole class of similar objects or actions; and as the world is full of similarities, and one thing is always like many another, it may be made to stand not only for one such corresponding thing, but for many at the same time. Moreover a concrete object has many parts and properties, and may stand for one thing in virtue of
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one of its properties while it stands for something quite different in virtue of
another; and therefore it may adequately symbolise two totally dissimilar things
at once, or even many such things. Thus we know how a dream may gather up into
itself a whole host of meanings, and be susceptible of a number of different and
correct interpretations; and how one object in the dream may stand for several
totally different things to each of which it is similar in a different way.
It is clear that in religious use also symbols are likely to sum up a great many
things in one. Thus the symbol of the cross sums up the whole circumstances of
the death and resurrection of Jesus, the meaning both of what he did and of what
men did, and the whole principle of sacrifice, not only as applied to him but to
his followers; it includes the natural symbolism of the pre-Christian cross
which stands for extension in the four directions of space, for the tree of life,
and for the warding off of evil; and it may also suggest many other things at
the same time.

Symbols are also multiple in meaning in the sense that many of them
are sufficiently vague for us to use them to carry more meanings than one. We
know that it is often possible for men to use the same words and mean different
things by them; and even a statement like the Nicene Creed, which is intended
to be precise, is certainly not meant in the same identical sense by all who
use it. Symbols of feeling probably admit of even more variety in content.
The intensity of the feeling expressed in any symbol may vary considerably; for
example, kneeling, if sincere, always denotes reverence, but it may express
anything between a perfunctory habit of mind and a great sense of awe and self-
abasement.

Symbols which carry a multiplicity of meaning are most useful in
corporate worship. They make it more possible to express at one time something
of the richness of the nature and ways of God. By suggesting infinite significance they often produce a feeling of mystery and a sense of reaching out into the unknown which is most valuable. They enable teaching to be fitted to the capacity of many different people; for while the simple minded understand the simple application, the more penetrating can read a significance that is deeper. They make it possible for men to worship together whose experiences and needs are very different, and whose beliefs are at any rate not wholly identical. And although they may be used week after week by the same people, they bear different meanings on different occasions, and continually unfold new truths and deeper significances to the growing understanding.
IV. THE HOLY COMMUNION

1. Worship gathered into one action.

We are now ready to enquire into the meaning of the service of Holy Communion. So far we have said little about it. It is often thought of as different in kind from other forms of worship, and therefore it seemed right to treat it separately. If it is really different from the rest, then our analysis of worship so far may be fundamentally inadequate, and what we shall have to say about the use of art in ordinary worship may not apply to this at all.

To find exactly what it is we have to interpret, we must go back to the Last Supper. Many things were done there, but not all of them were of special significance. Some of them perhaps were connected with the fact that this was some special Jewish ritual meal; but it is clear that the significance of our Christian service does not depend upon what sort of meal it was, because Jesus says no stress upon that whatever. It has been thought that this was a Passover meal, and it is clear that the writers of the synoptic gospels believed it to be so; yet not only is there no new interpretation of the old Passover ritual, but there is no mention of it. Another theory is that the meal was a Kiddush, the upper that was held on the evening before a Sabbath or a Feast for the sanctification of the holy day that lay ahead; yet if it were it could hardly be very significant, because there is no mention of the fact, and no thought expressed that is in any way connected with the sanctification of the following day. The third theory about the meal, and the most likely one, is that it was a Chaburah supper. The Chaburoth were small groups of Jewish friends formed for pious and charitable purposes. They were particularly concerned with exact obedience to the law and religious tradition, and one of their principal observances was a weekly common meal, partly social and partly religious.²

Jesus and his disciples may have held this supper as a chaburah meal, though the aim of their fellowship was very different from that of the orthodox chaburah. But there is no special mention of the functions for which these chaburoth existed, and the supposition does not help us at all in our interpretation. The fact is that we do not know for certain what sort of a meal the Last Supper was; but that does not matter very greatly because its meaning evidently does not lie there.

In what way, then, does this differ from an ordinary meal? Let us ask what was done at an ordinary meal, and see if there are any differences either in the things done, or in the particular stress on any of them. Dom Gregory Dix has set out for us the Jewish customs at meals. It is true that he thinks of them particularly in connection with the suppers of the chaburoth, but he makes it clear that they were not confined to them, but were the ordinary meal-time customs of the day. All Jewish meals began with the grace, said by the head of the household, or host, or leader of the chaburah, who took bread and broke it, saying, "Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, eternal King, who bringest forth bread from the earth." Then he ate a fragment himself and gave a piece to each person at the table. After the meal came another grace. It was a long prayer said by the same person, and was of strict obligation on all male Jews after any food "not less than the size of an olive" or "of an egg". On any important family occasion, and at the chaburah supper in particular, a little solemnity was added by its being recited over a special cup of wine which was known as "the cup of the blessing". The cup was then sipped by him who had uttered the thanksgiving, and passed round to each of those present. The Last Supper, then, in most ways followed the Jewish meal customs of the day. There was nothing unusual in
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1 "The Shape of the Liturgy", pp. 50-54.
breaking and distributing bread and giving thanks at the beginning of the meal, indeed it would have been unthinkable not to do so; and, if it were any kind of special occasion, there was nothing unusual in distributing a cup of blessing at the end.

Jesus departed from the usual custom only in giving a certain interpretation to this eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. When he distributed the bread he astonished the disciples by saying, "This is my body which is for you; this do in remembrance of me." And when he passed round the cup he perplexed them still further by saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

How many of the things done in the upper room were intended to bear a special Christian significance and to be repeated? Dix says the New Testament accounts of the supper give us what may be called a "seven-action scheme of the rite then inaugurated." "Our Lord (1) took bread: (2) 'gave thanks' over it: (3) broke it: (4) distributed it: saying certain words: later he (5) took a cup: (6) 'gave thanks' over that: (7) handed it to his disciples, saying certain words." He points out that "with absolute unanimity, the liturgical tradition reproduces these seven actions as four: (1) The offertory: bread and wine are 'taken' and placed on the table together. (2) The prayer: the president

1 I Corinthians xi, 24. Or "Take ye, this is my body," Mark xiv, 22: or "This is my body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me." Luke xxii,19. or "Take eat, this is my body." Matthew xxvi,26.

2 I Corinthians xi, 25; or "This is my blood of the (new) covenant which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God." Mark xiv,24; or "This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you". Luke xxii,20; or "Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the (new) covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." Matthew xxvi,27-9.

3 "The Shape of the Liturgy", p.48.
gives thanks to God over bread and wine together. (3) The fraction: the bread is broken. (4) The communion: the bread and wine are distributed together."

But this account would seem to leave out the particular emphasis of Jesus. No doubt he went through all the usual ritual accompaniments whether it was a chaburah supper or some other kind of meal. But he did not draw attention to them all. No doubt he "took bread"; but it seems unwarranted to turn that action into an offertory, and make it the principal thing that is done. No doubt he "gave thanks"; but he did not draw special attention to it, or interpret it as anything other than the usual grace before meat, though it would have been very easy for him to have done so; and it would seem therefore to be a misplaced emphasis if we turn the service primarily into a eucharist. No doubt he broke the bread; but there is no sign that his doing so was any more than the usual necessary preliminary to its distribution.¹ And no doubt he did many other things as well at that same meal, and one of them, namely the foot-washing, he even gave "as an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you".² Nevertheless, none of these was the principal thing. The thing that he made to stand out, and to which he drew special attention, was the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine; it was "this" that they had to "do". And when they did it, they had to find in it not only whatever natural meaning it contained, but also and particularly a special meaning that he gave them. We must, therefore, surely base the meaning of our service upon this eating and drinking and the interpretation that Jesus put upon them; and to emphasise the other things as though they were equally important is to misconceive the meaning and purpose of what was done.

There is no harm in reading symbolic meaning into the fraction, or into any other action connected with the supper, such as the mingling of water with the wine;

¹ The word "broken" in some of the MSS of I Corinthians xi,24, is an early gloss.
² John xiii,15.
it may indeed be a very useful thing to do. It is certainly good to offer a prayer of thanksgiving, and to let that prayer have points of contact with the prayer that Jesus offered on the night on which he was betrayed; to say, "Let us give thanks" as he did, to respond "It is meet and right" with the disciples, and to frame the order of our prayer in some sort on that of the Jewish prayer that Jesus uttered. But these things must be kept subsidiary to his main emphasis, the common eating and drinking of bread and wine with the interpretation he put upon it.

2. Remembrance.

The record of the Last Supper in I Corinthians xi states that when Jesus gave his disciples the bread, and also later when he gave them the cup, he said, "this do in remembrance of me". Luke also records the words, but after the giving of the bread only.

It has been suggested that we have here a technical reference to a particular Jewish custom, that of making a memorial before God. Thus Evelyn Underhill says "the memorial offering, or 'azkāra, was a familiar feature of the temple worship. It was a representative or token sacrifice, calling the total sacrifice to mind. Thus at every meal-offering, a handful of flour was burnt upon the altar as a 'memorial' which represented before God the whole sacrifice, the total gift; and when the loaves of Shew-bread were placed on their table 'before the Lord', frankincense was put with every row, to serve as its 'azkāra. The meal-offering, with which the 'azkāra was connected, always accompanied every burnt offering or total sacrifice, and every peace-offering with its communion meal. . . . Though we need not suppose that any precise identification was intended, yet there was a sense in which, for Jewish
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1 verses 24-5.
Christians nourished on sacrificial ideas, each Eucharist was an 'askāra, a token of the total sacrifice of Calvary, and the self-giving of the Church in and with its Lord."¹ If this is the reference that Jesus intended, then by saying "do this in remembrance of me", he was not particularly requiring that we ourselves should remember anything, but that we should perform an action which should cause God to remember. As Evelyn Underhill says, the act would be made, 'like its Hebrew prototype, to the glory of God, not for the information of men'. She adds that the impressive value of the memorial upon us would indeed be another reason for observing it, and "has its importance", but that this is certainly "secondary".²

But is this the reference that Jesus had in mind? What he gave as a remembrance was an action, something to be done; but the 'askāra was not an action but a thing, a quantity of flour or frankincense. Even if we say that this is being too precise, and that what was meant was that the bread and the wine were the 'askāra, there is still a difficulty in drawing a parallel, because although part of the ancient sacrifice was eaten by the priests, the 'askāra was always burnt; it was in fact precisely that part of the meal offering which was not eaten, although all the rest was. Not only, therefore, do we fail to find "any precise identification" between the Eucharist and the 'askāra, but we find a contradiction that makes it evident that, when Jesus spoke of a remembrance, the 'askāra was not what he had in mind.

Others also have attempted to re-interpret the word anamnesis. Dix argues that it means "recalling' or re-presenting' before God an event in the past so that it becomes here and now operative in its effects", and says that in the Old Testament it concerns a recalling of a thing not to man's remembrance but to

¹ E. Underhill - "Worship", p.144.
² E. Underhill - "Worship", p.145.
God's. A.C. Hebert states that "the commemoration of Christ's saving work is not a subjective and personal act of remembering, but an objective remembering by means of a ritual." And again, that "it is not a subjective remembering, lest we should forget, but a concrete and objective bringing-back from the past into the present."

All this is based on the words for "memorial" and "remember" in the OT and NT. But an examination of the passages in which they are used does not bear out the theory. In the OT there are three words used for memorial. One of them, azkara, we have dealt with already, and of that we need say no more. The other two are zaker and zikkaron, and there is also a verb zakar meaning remember. These three words are used not only of the recalling of things to God's mind, but also to man's mind (that is, they are used of "man's subjective and personal act of remembering")5; and in fact a counting of the passages shows that each one of
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1 Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy" p.161.
2 "Liturgy and Society" p.65.
3 Hebert - "The Parish Communion" p.9.
4 H.N. Bate says that he can find "no philological support for it at all." (Bate and Eeles - "Thoughts on the Shape of the Liturgy" p.23.)
5 The word "zaker" is used for example to tell us that God's name is his memorial, that by which he is remembered, unto all generations (Ex iii,15); that the "days of Purim shall not fail from among the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed" (Esther iii,15); that "the remembrance of Amalek" is to be utterly blotted out "from under heaven" (Ex. xvii,14; Cf Deut xxv,19); that God has it in mind to make the "remembrance" of his people "to cease from among men" (Deut xxxii,26); that the "remembrance" of the wicked man shall perish "from the earth" (Job xviii,17); and that in death there is no "remembrance" of God (Ps vi,5). The word zikkaron is used among other things of the brazen censers beaten out into a covering on the altar "to be a memorial unto the children of Israel that no stranger .... come near to burn incense before the Lord" (Num. xvi,40); of the twelve stones taken out of the Jordan and set up "for a memorial unto the children of Israel for ever" (Josh. iv,7); and of the record of the defeat of Amalek written down "for a memorial, in a book" (Ex xviii,14). And the verb zakar is used not only about God who remembers his people; but about the butler who failed to remember Joseph (Gen Lx,23), about remembering the Sabbath day to keep it holy (Ex. xxviii,8), remembering the good food of Egypt (Num xi,5), remembering what God did to Pharaoh (Deut. vii,18), remembering Egyptian bondage (Deut. v,15; xv,15; xvi,12; xxiv,18,22), and remembering the Lord (Judges viii,34; 2 Chron.xxiv,22).
ham is used more often of man's remembering than of God's. Where it is the 

bringing of something to the mind of God that is spoken of, it is by no means 

always "the recalling or re-presenting before God of an event in the past"; very 

often it is just the bringing to God's notice of a man's situation in the present. 

Where it is the bringing of something to the mind of God that is spoken of, it is 

by no means "the recalling or re-presenting before God of an event in the past"; very 

often it is just the bringing to God's notice of a man's situation in the present. 

For it is not the event that becomes operative, but God; and in primitive thought he becomes operative because he has 

been reminded of that which was not previously in his mind. 

If we examine the use of the NT words anamnesis and anamminesco we get a 

similar result. They are used not only of remembrance by God, but also of 

remembrance by man, and indeed are used more often of the latter. 

When, therefore, we try to interpret the phrase "in remembrance of me" we 

find quite clearly that there is nothing in the word anamnesis to suggest that it 

cannot mean "a subjective and personal act of remembering" on our part. The 

recalling of a past event to the mind of God is indeed a possible meaning for the 

For example Gen. viii,1; xxx,22; Judges xvi,28; I Sam. i,11; Ps. civ,4; etc. 

This is quite clear in such passages as Ex. xxix,16, and xxxi,24. 

Apart from the references to the institution of the eucharist, the word 
anamnesis is used in the NT only in Heb. x,3, where the reference is to a 

remembrance by man. It is used in the LXX only in the titles of Ps 37 (38) and 

Ps 69 (70), where it stands for Zakar and means no more than that these psalms 

were sung while the azkara was being burnt (See Casterley's commentary on The 

Psalms, p.15); in Lev.xxiv,7, where it stands for azkara; in Num. x,10, where 

it stands for zikkaron and refers to God's remembering of his people; and in 

Wisdom xvi,6, where the reference is to men's remembering of God's commandment. 

Anamminesco is used in the NT in six places (1 Cor iv,17; 2 Tim. i,6; Mk xi,21, 

and xiv,72; 2 Cor VII,15; and Heb x,32.); on every occasion the meaning is 

quite simply that someone remembers or is caused to remember, and in every 

case it is man who does the remembering and not God. In LXX, it is used an 
equal number of times for God's remembering and man's.
word, but it is not the most usual one, and if we adopted it there would have to be some special reason for doing so. There seems to be no such special reason for it, and indeed there are reasons against it.

Taken at its face value, it implies the primitive idea that God forgets and stands in need of being reminded. No doubt it can be said that when Jesus used the word he was not concerned with saying why God should act when this objective ritual took place, but only that he did so. But nevertheless the implication is relevant. This "remembrance" is presented before God so that something shall happen, and that happening will take place through some combination of the mind of God and the faith of his worshippers. If we are not bringing to his remembrance something that was not present in his mind before, then it is not his mind that is being changed. If it is not his mind that is being changed, then it must be the faith of the worshippers that is being affected. It is difficult to see how that happens if there is no "subjective and personal act of remembering" on their part, but it is very easy to see how it happens if there is.

A second objection is that if we say that what matters is "objective remembrance by means of a ritual", and that the remembrance of the worshippers matters nothing, we are saying that it is quite sufficient to utter the words of the anamnesis without any idea of what they mean, and to perform the acts of communion without any thought of Christ whatever. It is not credible that Christ meant that.

Still another objection is that the circumstances of the Last Supper make the usual interpretation seem particularly fitting. Although in all probability the Last Supper was not the Passover Meal, yet it took place when men were gathered in Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, and during the supper itself
Jesus had that Feast in mind. Although, as we have said, the Passover ritual contributed nothing to the meaning of the Eucharist, it would seem to be very probable that in the word anamnesis we have a side reference to the Feast.

For the Passover was a meal whose purpose was to help the Jews to remember their great deliverance. It was given to them "for a memorial" (LXX - mnemosunon), and by that it was meant that they (not God) were to "remember (LXX - mnemonaeu) this day". So that it should always be remembered by each generation, they were to teach the meaning of it to their children. For each one it was to be "a sign unto thee" (not unto God) "upon thine hand", and "a memorial (LXX - mnemosunon) between thine eyes". And it was to be thus fastened to their minds so "that the Law of the Lord may be in thy mouth." There is nothing here about this "memorial" reminding God, but a great deal about its reminding men; nothing about an effect on God, but a strong statement about its effects on the people who by its means remembered God's great act of salvation. What more natural than that Jesus, having in his mind this ancient feast, should say "I also give you a feast, and the purpose of my feast also is that you should remember God's salvation, seen this time in me."

It seems clear that we must reject that interpretation of anamnesis which says that it is a purely objective remembrance by means of a ritual. The proper interpretation is the natural one: anamnesis means a remembering by men. Its effect is to quicken our faith and lay us open to all the redemptive activity which God is putting forth through the meal of which he has called us to partake. That this should be the meaning is only what we might expect. We have already

---

1 Lk. xxii,15
2 Ex. xii,14.
3 Ex. xiii,3.
4 Ex. xiii,8.
5 Ex. xiii,9.
6 Ex. xiii,9.
seen that Christian worship in all its parts is full of the remembrance of God's nature and work, and it would be most strange if this element were not an important part of that act of worship which was ordained by Christ.

The thing remembered at a Communion Service, is, of course, in part what Jesus did at the Last Supper. "In a perfectly real sense we remember that on the night in which he was betrayed the Lord did this and said that."¹ But we do much more than remember the supper; we remember what the supper signified. It is quite clear that it had special reference to Christ's death. The disciples would hardly mistake such a reference in the words "This is my body"; they certainly could not mistake it when he gave to them the wine and said, "This is my blood", and when he added that it was "shed for many",² or "poured out for you."³ S. Paul in his account of the supper does not give any such additional phrase, but he makes it clear that he also understands the rite in this sense when he goes on to say, "for as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."⁴ The supper was an anticipation, and it was filled with richer and fuller meaning after the events of the following day. We remember, therefore, in our repetitions of the rite, not only the events of the night on which he was betrayed, but those of the day that followed. It is done "in remembrance of his death and passion", "to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us."⁵ Because in a real sense the work of Christ is one, our remembering spreads out from this point in both directions, and we recall also the ministry and the birth in one direction, and the

² Mark xiv. 24, and Matthew xxvi, 28.
⁴ I Corinthians, xi, 26.
⁵ Book of Common Prayer.
resurrection and ascension and parousia in the other. Because in an equally real sense the work of Redemption, Creation and Sanctification are one, our remembrance spreads still wider, and the bread and the wine very naturally represent for us the fruits of the earth which are supplied by God's providence, and the eating of them signifies his entering in his Spirit into our souls.

3. Fellowship

The sharing of common food and drink is one of the universal and natural symbols of fellowship. In Palestine this was felt so strongly that it was understood that if you had eaten with a man you were (at any rate for a certain time afterwards) bound to protect him against his enemies; and if you should find out after a meal that he himself was an enemy, you were nevertheless compelled to befriend him. Rihbany, himself a Syrian, says that in the days of his youth in the rural districts of Palestine, it was still the custom, as it had been when Abraham's servant visited Laban's tent to secure a wife for Isaac, for any messenger on an important mission to declare his business before eating at his host's table; for the messenger might bring news that would proclaim him his host's enemy, and the host would be taken at a disadvantage if he ate with him first. In the West there are no such rules as that, but there is nevertheless a common feeling that to share food or drink is to express and create a bond of fellowship; and a natural way of expressing fellowship with a man is to invite him to a meal, or to offer him a drink.

The bond in such cases is primarily that between host and guest. One part of the truth of the communion service is that Christ is the host, and presides over and dispenses his own sacrament. Thus in the Mozarabic Missal the priest prays, "Be present, be present, O Jesus, thou good Priest, in our midst, as thou

---

wast in the midst of thy disciples."¹ Brilioth says, "It is tempting to see in
this prayer a relic of ancient tradition. The Lord is present at every eucharist
as at the first eucharist of all; he it is who through the priest's lips speaks
the sacred words and consecrates afresh the holy gifts to be an effectual symbol
of his sacrifice."² In more modern times the presence of Christ as host is
referred to in Wesley's "Hymns on the Lord's Supper". For example, in hymn 8 we
find

Come to the supper, come,
Sinners, there still is room;
Every soul may be his guest,
Jesus gives the general word;
Share the monumental Feast,
Eat the Supper of your Lord.

and in hymn 29

O Thou, who this mysterious Bread
Didst in Emmaus break,
Return herewith our souls to feed,
And to thy followers speak.

As D.H. Hislop says, "This attitude is valuable and original, for it belongs to
the Synoptic tradition."³ To eat and drink at Christ's table is therefore to be
bound to him as guest to host.

The same obligation of fellowship exists also between fellow guests. At
the Last Supper, the disciples not only shared in common the meal provided by
their host, but in that part of the meal which is continued in our Communion
Services they all ate of one loaf and drank of one cup. It is clear that we
have here a natural symbol of corporateness.⁴ "We who are many are one loaf,

¹ Quoted in Duschesne - "Christian Worship", p.216. Duschesne says in a note that
it cannot be primitive; but Heiler, "Der Katholizismus", p.401, regards it as
very ancient.
² "Eucharistic Faith and Practice", p.63.
³ "Cur Heritage in Public Worship", p.236.
⁴ Compare the Jewish marriage service, in which the bride and groom drink out of
one glass to symbolise their union together (Oesterley and Box - "The Religious
Worship of the Synagogue", p.494), and the marriage service of the Orthodox Church,
where the same custom is followed for the same purpose (Zvogintzov - "Our
Mother Church" p.117.)
one body", says the Apostle Paul, "for we all partake of the one loaf." So in the Liturgy of S. Basil in the Byzantine rite the priest prays "That Thou wouldest unite all of us who are partakers of the One Bread and of the chalice to one another into the fellowship of One Holy Spirit."2

There can be no doubt that Jesus intended this to be, among other things, a meal of fellowship, and wished to signify that those who are joined to him are joined to one another. If, as seems probable, it were a Chaburah supper, the fact of fellowship would by that fact receive additional emphasis. But even if it were not, the symbolism is so evident that it is quite impossible it should not have been understood, particularly since Christ showed himself on that night specially concerned about the unity of his followers. Over this very table he gave them his new commandment that they should love one another,3 and repeated it over and again;4 he told them that they were branches of one vine;5 and he prayed for their unity.6

At the last supper, there were present in the mind of Jesus not only those who were in the Upper Room with him, but also future disciples, "them also that believe on me through their word";7 and his mind turned also to the new wine of that Kingdom in Heaven8 which he was accustomed to think of as a great banquet.9 He was thinking indeed of the whole Church of God, and it is natural that we should do the same. The bread and the wine are a symbol of our unity with all the people of God; for we are all sustained by the same spiritual food, whether we are of the east or the west, whether we dwell on earth or in heaven.

1 Corinthians, x, 17.  
2 Linton, p. 63, "Twenty-five Consolation Prayers."  
3 John xiii, 34.  
4 John xv, 12-17.  
5 John xv, 3.  
6 John xvii, 11.  
7 John xvii, 20.  
8 Mark xiv, 25.  
9 Matthew viii, 11.
Yet here in this symbol is preserved not only the corporateness, but also the individualism of our worship. Eating and drinking may be done corporately, but it is essentially an individual act; each has to consume the food and wine for himself. So in the West, as the elements are delivered to the worshippers, the words of administration are spoken in the singular — "given for thee," and "preserve thy body and soul"; and in the Orthodox Liturgy the priest addresses each separately by name, saying "The servant of God, N., is made partaker of the precious and holy Body and Blood of our Lord, and God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, for the remission of his sins and life everlasting."^ 2

4. Covenant Meal

The interpretation given by Jesus to the drinking of the wine is, "this cup is the new covenant in my blood," or "this is my blood of the covenant which is shed for many."^ 4 A covenant is an agreement between two persons. Thus Isaac and Abimelech made a covenant together which consisted in swearing an oath that they would do one another no hurt; and Laban and Jacob made a covenant, Jacob swearing that he would not afflict Laban's daughters nor take any wives beside, and each of them swearing that he would not with hostile intent towards the other pass a certain heap of stones that they threw up as a landmark. We use the word in the same sense today in the prayer in the marriage service of the Church of England which asks that "these persons may surely perform and keep the vow and covenant betwixt them made."

^ 1 Book of Common Prayer. The Roman Mass has, "May the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul to life everlasting."
^ 2 "The Orthodox Liturgy" p.91.
^ 4 Mark xiv,24, and Matthew xvi,28.
^ 5 Genesis xxvi, 27-31.
^ 6 Genesis xxxi, 44-55.
The two concerned in a covenant may not be man and man, but man and God. In that case it is not so much a mutual compact as a dispensation of God, depending on his initiative and issuing from his gracious will. Nevertheless there is an agreement which has two sides to it; man undertakes to obey, and God to provide. There are several occasions when such a covenant is made in the Old Testament, but the supreme one is that of the giving of the Law on Mount Sinai. The terms of the transaction are that the Israelites are to be God's people, and he is to be their God. "Being their God" means providing for them by doing such things as bringing them out of the land of Egypt; and "being His people" means keeping the Decalogue.1

The weakness of this Old Covenant was that men were not able to keep it. Jeremiah therefore prophesies of a day when God will make a new covenant. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt (which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord). But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their heart will I write it; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."2 The terms of this new covenant are the same as those of the old: "I will be their God and they shall be my people". The new thing about it (apart from the reference to the future) is that it will be written, not in stone, but in the heart, and therefore unlike the old, it can be kept.

---

1 Exodus xx. "The words 'I am the Lord thy God' form no part of the Decalogue; they rather express the one side of the covenant, the Decalogue proper, expressing the other side. In brief, the covenant is, 'I am the Lord thy God, and you are my people', and the Decalogue is the expression or analysis of what this means." (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible. Article "Covenant" p.512s)
2 Jeremiah xxxi, 31-33.
There were various ways of making a covenant. The man who made a covenant with God might cause a fire to pass between the divided bodies of sacrificed animals, or the covenanting people might be sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice. But with the Jews, as with other ancient peoples, a covenant is often associated with a meal. Thus when Isaac and Abimelech made their covenant together, the swearing of the oath was preceded by a meal which took place the night before, and the covenant between Laban and Jacob was both preceded and followed by a meal. The account of the covenant at Sinai also works up to the climax that "they beheld God, and did eat and drink." The narrative is a composite one, Exodus xxiv, verses 1-2, 9-11, being from J, and verses 3-8 from E; and the eating and drinking has therefore in fact probably nothing to do with the making of the covenant. But in the days of Christ the narrative would be read as one whole, and it would be understood that the eating and drinking formed a covenant meal.

In associating a covenant with a meal there would seem to be some natural symbolism. To enter into an agreement by eating and drinking together seems to be a special form of symbolising fellowship by sharing a meal. It has been a common custom among many races, and even to this day in our own land it is not unusual to ratify an agreement with a drink.

At the last supper Jesus claimed to be inaugurating the New Covenant spoken of by Jeremiah. Like the old covenant it was ratified with blood, but Jesus himself was the sacrificial victim. The two ideas of ratifying the

---

1 Genesis 15.
2 Exodus xxiv, 8.
4 Genesis xxxi, 44-55. The meal that followed the covenant was eaten by Jacob and his brethren, and there is no direct statement that Laban shared in it; though he was evidently still there, because he did not leave until the following morning.
5 For examples see Article "Covenant" in the "Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics".
covenant by sharing a meal (as the Exodus narrative says the people did at Sinai), and by making men partakers of the blood of the sacrifice (as the Exodus narrative says was done by sprinkling it upon them), are combined by Jesus when he gives the disciples the blood to drink; as they drink it they are both taking a covenant meal and being made recipients of the covenant blood like their forefathers at Sinai.

There is one other idea involved in the New Covenant that has not so far been mentioned. Just as the Old Covenant at Sinai was not a covenant between God and a number of individual men, but between God and a people, so the New Covenant of Jeremiah is to be "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah".\(^1\) If it were written in the human heart it would have to be made individually, but nevertheless it was a covenant made with men who were joined together in one body. The disciples of Jesus, therefore, were not being thought of merely as twelve individual men; they were the new "house of Israel and the house of Judah".\(^2\) It seems clear that in speaking of a covenant Jesus had in mind both the uniting of men with God, and the unity of the people of God with one another.

5. Union with Christ.

In our dealings with one another we use various symbols of our unity.

---

2. There is another piece of evidence which suggests the same thing. A few moments later Jesus says the disciples are to "sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke xxii,30). T.K. Glasson says, "It is noteworthy that the phrase 'the twelve tribes of Israel' occurs in the chapter to which the words of Jesus take us back" (that is, this chapter that speaks of the sprinkling of the blood and the eating and drinking of the people at the inauguration of the Sinai Covenant). 'Moses... built an altar under the mount, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel' (Exodus xxiv,4). The phrase is found nowhere else in the Old Testament, except in Genesis xlix,28, and the reference cannot have been to that passage. This is a striking confirmation of the view...that in Luke xxii,30 Jesus was speaking of the New Israel." (T.K. Glasson - "The Second Advent" p.145. pub. Epworth Press 1945.)
As a sign that we are one in friendship we shake hands, that is, we join our hands as a sign that our spirits are joined. Or if the friendship is specially close we may embrace; that is, we tie our bodies together as a sign that our spirits are bound into one.

Symbols of unity are of course especially used in marriage. In our marriage services the bride and groom join hands as a sign that they are joined in spirit. In Indian marriage ceremonies it is common for the man's scarf and the girl's sari to be tied into a knot with the same significance:\(^1\) and in the West, marriage is frequently likened in speech to the tying of a knot. Marital intercourse itself is similarly a joining of bodies that signifies a joining of souls.

But perhaps the most adequate symbol of the closest possible kind of union is that of eating. That which is eaten really and truly becomes a part of one's self, enters into one's system and becomes an actual part of one's body, so that our bodies and that which they consume become inseparably joined. The use of this symbol also is common in human love between men and women. They may even say in so many words that they could eat one another, and that is the very thing that they do in symbol with a kiss.

This is the most important part of the symbolism of Holy Communion. Jesus said that the bread and the wine represented himself, his body and his blood, and he gave them to his disciples to eat and drink. Their eating and drinking is an inescapable symbol of their closest possible union with him. We said that Christian worship was the uniting of ourselves with God through Christ. The place where this is made most obvious and clear is in the eating and drinking of that which represents Christ.

\(^1\) Thompson - "Worship in Other Lands", p. 47.
a) It is a union with him in heart. To unite one's self by eating is primarily to unite one's self in affection. It is easy to see how this has arisen. The first person whom we learn to love is our mother. The obvious way in which our love for her is stirred and nourished is that quite literally she gives us herself to eat, and as we feed at her breast both her love and ours are satisfied. Hereafter we never get away from the feeling that the right thing to do with those whom we love is to eat them, and as we have said our kisses are a symbol of this already symbolic action.

As we should expect, Christ draws our nature to him right from its roots. If, indeed, he is to possess us whole he must take to himself not only our conscious mind but our unconscious, not only the well-trained and polite levels of our being, but their most elemental and primitive depths. He did so when a woman of the city, a sinner, was moved to kiss his feet; and again when he gave his disciples his flesh to eat. So it is entirely in place that at a Eucharist the Armenian priest "takes the body in his hand and kisses it with tears"; and that in the Office of Preparation for Holy Communion in the Byzantine Church, one of the prayers of St. John Chrysostom should join together the kiss of the harlot and the eating of the communicant.

b) It is union with Christ in will. This union with Christ is union with him in a particular act of his. We have seen that the Last Supper had a special reference to his death. To unite with Christ by eating the bread and drinking the cup is therefore to unite ourselves with him in his death.

This has a double significance. We are concerned with one part of it here, and with the other in the section that follows. Here we note that the death

---

Brightman - "Liturgies Eastern and Western," p.449. "As thou didst not abhor that her defiled and unclean mouth should kiss thee, neither do thou abhor this more defiled and unclean mouth of mine, nor my filthy and unclean lips, my most defiled and unclean tongue." ("The Orthodox Liturgy" p.10).
of Jesus was his supreme act of sacrifice to the Father, the giving of himself in all completeness. In the whole of his earthly life he offered himself to be the instrument for the fulfilling of the Father's purpose, and in heaven he still makes the same offering now. But the offering was complete when, knowing that the Father's will was that he should accept the death men had prepared for him, and turn it into the means of their salvation, he offered life itself.

When we join ourselves with him, we unite ourselves with that offering which Christ makes to the Father eternally, and therefore makes now; but we have in mind mainly the hour of his death, when the sacrifice was total and complete. To unite ourselves with him through the bread and wine is therefore to give ourselves to God as the instruments for the fulfilling of his purposes, to accept his will, in a way that is complete.

c) It is union with Christ in mind. Here we come to the second thing that is meant by union with Christ in his death. Christ in his dying is teaching us, showing to us the divine mind that we may make it ours also.

On the cross Christ reveals to us that the divine way is to love men while they are still enemies, and to shrink from no sacrifice for their good. The love of God is there commended to us in the fact that Christ died for us while we were yet sinners. But this divine way is the way that God desires to become the human way; for the cross not only reveals to us what God is like, it reveals to us what we are to be like. It is an instruction about the Christian way of life, so that our offering of ourselves to do God's will shall have a specific content. Doing his will means loving and working for men as Christ did on the cross. Newman's words at the end of "Praise to the Holiest in the height" have often been decried:

1 Romans v.8.
And in the Garden secretly,
And on the cross on high,
Should teach his brethren and inspire
To suffer and to die.

Bernard Manning calls them "humanitarian tinkling," but they remind us of one of the essential meanings of the cross all the same. One of the staggering things about the New Testament is indeed the way in which it says so often that we are to be like Christ. He is unique and does a unique work, and yet we are to live like him. He is the image to which we are to be conformed, our pioneer, our example, and our pattern of love. And this applies to his cross as to the rest of his life. Christ himself warns us that if we are to follow him worthily we must take up a cross; St. Peter reminds us that "He suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps;" and St. Paul knows that we are called to share the "fellowship of his sufferings." The cross is not only a unique act of God on our behalf; it is a way of life for us to follow.

To join one's self to the bread and wine which represent Christ's crucified body is therefore to join our minds to his mind. It is to learn that God's way with us was to send his only begotten son to die for us while we were yet sinners; and that this way of love, of seeking men's good even though they be our enemies, and persisting in service even though it result in our death, is the way of life intended by God for us.

d) It is a union with Christ in deed, a co-operating with him in the purpose which he has in mind for us. His purpose is to transform each of us into his own likeness, and to make all of us into one body. This is to be done as we work together with him in prayer, adding our little contribution of faith to his power. But prayer is not the only way in which it is done in worship; it is

1 "Hymns of Wesley and Watts", p.42.
2 Romans vii,29.
3 Hebrews xii,2.
4 I Peter,ii.21.
5 John xv.12.
6 Matthew x,38.
7 I Peter ii,21.
8 Philippians iii,10.
done also by the faithful eating of the bread and drinking of the wine.

Our share is to "feed on him in our heart by faith". His share is to provide for us the food; and that he does, for the bread and wine which are food for our physical bodies represent that spiritual food which is given to us for our souls. And just as the physical food enables our bodies to live and grow, so when we take this spiritual food we "feed on it to our nourishment and growth in grace", and it becomes a means by which God transforms us into the sort of people he wills us to become.

To partake of this common food and drink with our fellow-believers is also to co-operate with God in one of his ways of making us into one body. For this symbol which signifies our unity, like all such symbols, also nourishes it, and we are bound more closely into one because our unity has been expressed.

Thus the result of Communion is that those who eat and drink are "fulfilled with Thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with Thy Son Jesus Christ," because they have joined with him in working to that end.

e) We have said that when man thus unites himself with them. This unifying of God with man is the most obvious part of the symbolism of partaking of the bread and the wine; we eat and drink that which represents our Lord, not only "that we may evermore dwell in him", but also that "he" may dwell "in us", and "thus", says S.Cyril of Jerusalem, "we become Christ-bearers." The elements become an actual part of the physical structure of our lives; and the partaking of them is a means by which Christ himself enters into our spirits in such a way that our life and his life in us become one.

---

1 Book of Common Prayer.
2 Savoy Liturgy.
3 First Prayer Book of Ed. vi.
4 Book of Common Prayer.
5 Fourth Lecture on the Mysteries. Par. 3.
So the last word in this form of worship as in all others is reception, the reception of God in Christ.


We may summarise the meaning of Holy Communion as follows -

Communion is a summing up of the whole of worship in one action, that of eating bread and drinking wine together.

That action is a means of remembering both God's work and his nature. It sums up for us his threefold work: of creation, because the elements represent the fruits of the earth; of redemption, because they represent still more the life of Jesus given on the cross; and of sanctification, because the consuming of them represents the coming of God to dwell within us. It brings home to us, in a way that is remarkable for any one symbol, something of the richness and paradox of God's nature; combining the homeliness that we associate with a meal made up of the common things of earth with a sense of the mystery and infinity of God's dealings with us, a feeling that is inevitably brought home to us by a symbol that reaches out into such a multiplicity of rich meanings.

Every one of these meanings is an aspect of a uniting of ourselves with God, whether we think of the fellowship of a guest with his host or the making of a covenant, or the uniting of ourselves with that which we eat. "We pray," says the priest in the Coptic liturgy, "that Thou wouldest join us unto Thyself through the communion of Thine holy mysteries."¹ That uniting of ourselves with God is a fourfold one of heart, will, mind and deed. It is perfected in the uniting of God with us, so that he himself enters into us.

All takes place through Christ. The remembrance is primarily a remembrance of Christ, the fellowship is with him, the covenant is made through him, and the

¹ Coptic Liturgy, p.119.
union with that which is eaten and drunk is a union with God in him.

It is corporate, an act of communion with the fellow-guests at a meal, and a covenant made as one of a corporate body. That communion is not only with the congregation present, but with the whole people of God, and it is not only with those who eat on earth, but with those who banquet in heaven. At the same time it is individual, food and wine eaten by one's self, and a covenant written on the individual heart.

It is full of rich associations, and brings with it memories not only of the presence and action of Christ and the fellowship of the first disciples in an upper room, but of the whole history of the Christian Church, in all ages and countries, of all races and tongues, both in days of peace and in days when men hid for fear and gathered to worship by stealth.

It partakes of all the nature of symbols. It expresses and re-creates thought and feeling, and relationship with both God and man. It is very close to the senses, being concerned not merely with the hearing of words, but with sight and touch and taste and smell; and it is therefore very vivid. It is an act in time and is therefore definite. And it is a multiple symbol, expressing both thought and feeling, conscious and unconscious, and reaching out into many significances. It therefore has peculiar power and gives deep satisfaction.

It is not surprising that the people of God find in it a special richness and efficacy. There is no need to seek the explanation of this in some peculiar grace given in Communion that is not given elsewhere, and we have found no trace of any such thing. It was not likely that we should, for we saw earlier that the partaking of the elements was something that could, on occasion, be dispensed with; and that could not be so if there were some special grace to be received in communion that is not anywhere else available. What is received is the gift of
God himself, and, as we have seen, we receive him in all forms of worship. This sacrament is not different from the other forms; rather in it they are summed up and perfected.
I. THE EFFECTS OF ART

We must now turn from worship and enquire into the nature of art. Theories of art have been innumerable, and the conflicts between them extraordinary. We will begin by enumerating some of the main points of general agreement in answer to the question "What effect does a work of art have upon us?"; for these will be the facts that have to be accounted for in any theory of its nature.

First, it is generally agreed that art is produced by, and results in, feeling. It is variously described; we may call it life, emotion, passion, fire, or movement. But whatever name we prefer, we know that we must find it in any true work of art; it is one of the essentials. If it is there, many shortcomings may be forgiven; if it is absent, nothing can take its place.

The accuracy with which certain facts are stated may be a very important element in a work of art; but facts by themselves are not enough. A diagram in a medical text-book is not a work of art, nor is a theorem in Euclid, nor a botanical description of a flower, nor a bare statement of philosophic principle; and the reason is that there is no feeling in these things. Pattern is very important in art; but mere pattern, pattern in which there is no feeling, is not art. Anyone can take a pair of compasses and a ruler and produce a perfect pattern by mechanical rule, but that does not make him an artist. Again, fitness for purpose may be a very important element in a work of art, but mere purpose, mere usefulness, is not by itself sufficient; the fact that a brick is obviously fit for the purpose of building houses does not make it artistic; nor can we claim, merely on the basis of purposefulness, that macintoshes, tar boilers, mousetraps, or Acts of Parliament are works of art. They may be made so; but if they are, it will be because feeling enters into them.
Second, it is generally agreed that one of the characteristics of a work of art is repose; and that the result of experiencing such a work is that the mind is brought to peace. This sense of peace may either pervade the whole work, so that from beginning to end it breathes tranquility; or it may be finally arrived at with great labour, and only after much stress and tumult. It is found not only when the subject is pleasant and the treatment leisurely, but even more deeply when the work deals with the tragic and the terrible. Various explanations are given of it. Coleridge, for example, thinks it is due to the calming power which all distinct images exert on the human soul,\(^1\) Schiller to the fact that we are freed by art from the passions,\(^2\) Schopenhauer to our delivery from the will,\(^3\) and Richards to the balancing of our impulses;\(^4\) but of the fact itself there is no question. No work of art is perfect that does not produce it, and no theory of art will be satisfactory that does not account for it.

Third, art produces in the mind a consciousness of value. This consciousness of value can be variously described. Grensted, for example, says that "the essence of art lies in the direct intuition of values",\(^5\) Richards that art prevents "an acceptance of the mediocre in ordinary life", and "a very widespread loss of value",\(^6\) Leon that no great art "can be produced or appreciated except by men who are sensitive to good and evil".\(^7\) Shelley and many more have held that art promotes morality, and Matthew Arnold and others have looked to it as a substitute for religion.\(^8\) These are claims that must be

---

1. Coleridge - "On Poesy or Art" (1818)
5. Grensted - "This Business of Living", p.87.
7. Leon - "Aesthetic Knowledge". (Printed in Carritt -"Philosophies of Religion"
examined, and some of them we shall be compelled to reject; but they all imply that no account of art will be complete which does not recognise that it has close and special connection with value.

Fourth, a work of art produces upon us a sense of significance and purpose. The design of art is indeed something designed. Every phrase of music seems to be going somewhere; every line of a picture seems deliberately directed; every action in a drama and every epithet in a poem is there of set purpose, although one may be quite unable to say what that purpose is, and is felt to be deeply significant, although one may not be able to say what it signifies. "Within the action there must be nothing irrational", 1 and even coincidences must "have an air of design", and "seem not to be due to mere chance." 2 The work of course may also serve some practical use, but it produces this feeling of purpose altogether apart from any such actual use for which it may be intended; it has what Kant calls "purposiveness without purpose." 3 As Roger Fry says, "this recognition of purpose is... an essential part of the aesthetic judgment proper"; and "the perception of purposeful order and variety in an object" is at any rate partly responsible for "that feeling which we express by saying that it is beautiful." 4

Fifth, it is agreed that art has some close connection with truth. In art criticism one constantly finds such statements as that "nothing can atone for want of truth", 5 that "beauty... is only truth seen from another side", 6 that "a poem is the very image of life expressed in its eternal truth", 7 that

1 Aristotle - "Poetics" p. 37.
3 Kant - "Kritik of Judgment" 1. 1. 10. p. 68.
4 Fry - "Vision and Design", p. 34.
5 Ruskin - "Modern Painters", i, 51.
6 Arnold - "Essays", i.xi.
7 Shelley - "Defence of Poetry"
"That the imagination seizes as beauty must be truth",¹ or that "Of course it is obvious and has long been recognised in the case of scientific discovery that truth alone must be followed, but truth is followed in the same degree in all great art".² It is recognised that if it can rightly be said of any work of art that it is "lacking in truth", a most serious and fundamental criticism has been made.

It is of course clear that some further definition is here required. It is not immediately obvious what can be meant by truth in architecture, and still less what can be meant by truth in music. It is evident, too, that not only are art and truth closely allied, but also art and fiction, and it is easier to name offhand a dozen works of art which are fictitious than a dozen which are faithful records of actual fact; there is point in Aristotle's remark that Homer has taught other poets "the art of telling lies skilfully".³ Moreover there is a sense in which "imagination is indifferent to the distinction between the real and the unreal".⁴

Nevertheless, when all this has been said, and a great deal more as well, there remains the conviction that art and truth are in some way essentially connected; and it is interesting to notice that in the same book in which Collingwood makes the above statement about imagination, he also says "Art is not indifferent to truth; it is essentially the pursuit of truth."⁵

Sixth, it is generally agreed that art produces a sense of contact with ultimate reality. In great works of art, although the impression that the work makes comes to us through the senses, we feel that we are in touch with something

¹ Keats - Letters, i.46. (Ed. H.B. Forman 1901)
³ Aristotle - "Poetics", p.95.
⁵ Ibid. p.288.
more and other than the things of sense; we have got through appearance or
sound to that which lies beyond, we have penetrated to the essence of a thing,
and beyond the essence of that one thing to the reality that lies behind and
within all things. We feel that the very heart and meaning of life has been
revealed to us. "Art" says Bergson, "is certainly only a more direct vision of
reality". Clive Bell finds that a work of art makes us "aware of the God in
everything, of the universal in the particular, of the all-pervading rhythm".
And Richards, although he holds that this is not in actual fact what it seems,
evertheless agrees that "The sense of immediate revelation..... is certainly
characteristic of the greater kinds of art."^1

We have put last the most obvious characteristic of all. "The poet",
says Wordsworth, "writes under one restriction only, that of giving an immediate
pleasure to a human being."^2 That is an exaggeration, but a pardonable one,
because it is indeed a necessity of all works of art that the feeling they
produce should be pleasurable. The word "pleasurable", however, must be used in
a wide sense. There are many works of art which are not pleasant in the usual
sense of the word, not happy, easy, care-free, obviously attractive; but stern,
harsh, and difficult. It is no easy feeling of superficial pleasure that we get
from them, but something deeper for which the word "satisfying" is perhaps more
adequate. Nevertheless, as long as "pleasure" is interpreted so as to include
such satisfactions, it is a convenient enough word, and having made this
qualification we shall continue to use it.

Pleasure in this sense is so necessary an effect of art that it has
sometimes been put in opposition to truth,^3 and it has always been one of the

---
1 Bergson - "Laughter" p.207.
2 Bell - "Art" p.69.
3 Richards - "Principles of Literary
   Criticism" p.259.
4 Wordsworth - "Preface to the Lyrical
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5 e.g. Lessing - "Laocoon" pp 13-4, and Coleridge -"Biographia Literaria" p164.
grounds on which art has been criticised by the moralists. It may be contended by some, like Sir Philip Sidney, that the pleasure poetry gives is what makes it so effective for instructing the reader in virtue, for when the poet gives such instruction "he doth not only shew the way, but giveth so sweet a prospect into the way as will entice any man to enter into it." But nevertheless there are many others who look upon art as trivial and frivolous because of its necessity of giving pleasure.

1 Sidney - "Apology for Poetry".
II. EXPRESSION AND COMMUNICATION IN ART

1. Feeling expressed

The point at which to begin in formulating a theory of the nature of art is with the fact that art is essentially concerned with feeling. So far we have used the word "feeling" in a general sense, but now we must distinguish between the various things to which it is applied. For our purpose there are three that are of major importance - intuitions, emotional excitement, and attitudes.

By intuition we mean, as W.T. Stace puts it, "a direct awareness of reality as distinguished from the indirect, discursive, and inferential way in which ordinary thought is aware of its objects." For example, many men are aware of God as an inference from experience; they know in an intellectual way that he exists and is present. But the religious man not only knows intellectually that God exists, but from time to time he directly experiences contact with him; he not only knows God is here, but he feels he is here. This direct experience is intuition. But of course the divine is not the only realm in which one may have intuitions. Such direct apprehension may occur in any realm of experience, and any object or truth may be known not only with the intellect but with the feelings.

The artist is one who experiences the world in this way, and, as we have already said, he does not present us merely with ideas or reasonings or accurate observation, but with things that are felt. We can feel the movement of the sea in his picture, and the roughness of the stone, and the softness of the drapery; he does not merely tell us that these qualities are there, but he gives us the experience of direct contact with them.

---

1 Stace - "The Meaning of Beauty" p.250.
That some degree of emotional excitement is an important element in a work of art also seems very clear, and sometimes it may be so intense that we are made physically uncomfortable. There is, however, no necessity for art to be powerful or highly wrought. There is no great intensity about Jane Austen, Chaucer's "Prologue", the buildings of Downing College, Cambridge, or even Bach's "Jesu joy of man's desiring"; and yet these works are thoroughly satisfying. If the subject is a highly important, or a difficult and controversial one, there is, of course, likely to be a good deal of excitement; but one can have an entirely good attitude even to such subjects as these without being at all times very intense about them. Pater is therefore mistaken when he says that our aim must be to get "as many pulsations as possible into the given time,"¹ and Dr I.A. Richards is undoubtedly right when he says "it is not the intensity of the conscious experience, its thrill, its pleasure or its poignancy which gives it value... There are plenty of ecstatic instants which are valueless."² Nevertheless, although quantity of excitement is not necessarily a standard of artistic judgment, a work of art in which it is completely absent is unthinkable; and its quality and fitness are part of the essential value of the work.

The most important kinds of feeling with which works of art are concerned are, however, the attitudes. Just as a man adopts certain bodily attitudes, so he adopts certain mental ones. He may not only bow his head in a physical attitude of submission, but may by doing so express a submissive attitude of mind; he may not only raise his fists in a physical attitude of aggression, but may have such an aggressive attitude of mind that everything he does and says bears the mark of it. It is difficult to take up more than one bodily attitude at

¹ Pater - "The Renaissance", Conclusion.
² Richards - "Principles of Literary Criticism" p.132.
Once, but if he is in the presence of a number of persons, there is no
difficulty about his having, in one moment a mental attitude of respect for one,
contempt for another, and tolerance towards a third. Such feelings as these
are clearly the essence of art and are constantly spoken of and assessed in
art criticism of all kinds. Thus Clutton Brook says that "Art is the
expression of a certain attitude towards reality," and de Selincourt that
what a work of art is concerned with "is our attitude of mind, or way of looking
at things." These are the feelings that art is concerned with, and it will generally
be agreed that what is done by the artist is to express them; that is to say,
he makes them into a work of art by putting them into objective form. Beauty,

I.A. Richards more than anyone else speaks of attitudes in art, and although
he seems to think of them in a more specialised way than we do here, some
notice ought to be taken of his account of them. He points out how we
constantly overlook the extent to which we are always getting ready to act in
one way or another, and quotes an experience of his own. "Reading Captain
Slocum's account of the centipede which bit him on the head when alone in the
middle of the Atlantic, the writer has been caused to leap right out of his
chair by a leaf which fell upon his face from a tree." ("Principles of
Literary Criticism" p.107). And he goes on, "Only occasionally does some such
accident show how extensive are the motor adjustments made in what appear to
be the most unmuscular occupations." He cites the work done by Lipps, Groos,
and others on Einfühlung, or empathy, and says that however we may prefer to
re-state their results, it "shows that when we perceive spatial or musical
form we commonly accompany our perception with closely connected motor
activity." (Ibid. p.112) In a situation which demands action, as when the
leaf was mistaken for a centipede, the action is taken; but when we know that
the situation does not demand action, the preparation for it in motor
adjustments takes its place. "These imaginal and incipient activities or
tendencies to action" are what he calls attitudes. (Ibid. p.112) They are
"the impulses towards one kind of behaviour or another which are set ready by
the response." ("Science and Poetry" p.19)

Obviously art produces a succession of attitudes in this sense of the word
used by Dr Richards; but the word has the other less specialised, but equally
important meaning that is usually intended when people speak of attitudes of
mind, and mean such things as respect, humility, or suspicion. These also are
preparations for action, though not such immediate, almost muscular
preparations as seem to be intended by Richards. It is these more ordinarily
recognised attitudes that we have in mind.

Brook - "Essays on Art" p.6.
de Selincourt - "Art and Morality" p.105.
says Croce, is expression "gives to feeling a theoretical form and converts it into words, song and outward shape."  

In speaking of symbols, we used the word "express" in a general sense to cover all the ways in which thought and feeling were put into objective form. But in the realm of feeling there are two ways in which this may be done, and it is important now to distinguish them. Symbols may express feeling in the full genuine manner of art, or they may only indicate it. To write "I am angry" is to use those symbols which we call words in such a way that our feelings are indicated; but to talk in a loud and excited manner is to use words, motions and sounds in such a way that our feelings are expressed. An unsatisfactory poet is often a man who uses his symbols in the first way but not in the second; that is to say he merely indicates or describes what he feels, but he does not in the aesthetic sense express it.

When talking about various types of symbol it is easy to overlook this distinction, because symbols of feeling are commonly both indicative and expressive at the same time. How, for example, should one classify a handshake? The answer is that it all depends on how it takes place. The symbolic gesture of shaking hands is in itself indicative of feeling. It can be used quite coldly and awkwardly, and do no more than signify the feeling for which it stands, as though the two persons concerned were to write down on a piece of paper "The statement is hereby made that A.B. and C.D. entertain friendly feelings the one to the other." But shaking hands very seldom takes place like that; and when we grip a man's hand, particularly if we are feeling deeply, we do more than indicate, we genuinely express ourselves. Similarly, a man does not usually say "I am angry" in a merely indicative way; the words themselves may be only

1 Croce - "Aesthetic" p.79.
2 Croce in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th Ed. Article - "Aesthetics".
indicative, but the way in which they are spoken makes the whole action expressive.

The artist, then, in producing a work of art sets to work to express himself, and as he does so his experience develops. A painter, for instance, puts into his picture not only his feelings about the scene in front of him; but all he feels about the art of painting it as well - "his felt gestures as he manipulates his brush, the seen shapes and paint patches that these gestures leave on his canvas; in short, the total sensuous (or rather, sensuous-emotional) experience of a man at work before his easel." In fact he records in his picture, as Collingwood says, "not the experience of looking at the subject without painting it, but the far richer and in some ways very different experience of looking at it and painting it together."

One result of such expression upon the artist is that he knows more clearly what his feelings actually are, for expression clarifies the feelings, makes them more fully conscious, and enables them to be seen as quite unique and individual. Again it is Collingwood who puts this most clearly. - "The anger which I feel here and now, with a certain person, for a certain cause, is no doubt an instance of anger, and in describing it as anger one is telling the truth about it; but it is much more than mere anger; it is a peculiar anger, not quite like any anger that I ever felt before, and probably not quite like any anger I shall ever feel again." When an artist expresses that anger, he becomes fully conscious of it, and "to become fully conscious of it means becoming conscious of it not merely as an instance of anger, but as this quite peculiar anger."

2 Ibid. p.307.
3 Ibid. p.308.
2. Feeling communicated.

The production of art is not a deliberate attempt to rouse other people's feelings. As Maritain says, if art "aims at emotion, at affecting or rousing the passions, it becomes adulterate and another element of deceit thereby enters into it." Nevertheless the result of art upon a suitable audience is that their feelings are roused. When they contemplate what the artist sets before them, the thoughts and feelings that have belonged to the artist arise in them also, and they go through an experience similar to his. Exactly how this communication takes place is something of a mystery; but that it does take place is common experience.

Nevertheless, although this seems so clear that it is usually taken for granted, there are those who deny that the artist does actually communicate his own personal experience, and who say that what happens is that through the work of art the beholder is able to make conscious to himself, not the experience of the artist, but a past experience of his own. This is for example Collingwood's contention. The beholder, he says, has had various emotions during his life, and these have left traces lingering in his mind. "A fit of anger, passing away, leaves a fading trace of itself in our actual feeling, progressively swamped beneath feelings of other kinds, for an indeterminable length of time." Some of these emotions have been unexpressed, and therefore still exist in the beholder's mind as unidentified perturbations. So long as any trace of them remains, attention can single it out; and as the beholder looks at the work of art he finds that it expresses these feelings for him. Thus "whatever value we set on a poem is due to its expressing not the poet - what is Shakespeare to us, or we to Shakespeare? - but ourselves." The artist is "the spokesman of his

1 Maritain - "Art and Scholastician" p.65.
2 Collingwood - "The Principles of Art" pp.210-211.
3 Ibid. p.316.
community, the secrets he must utter are theirs."¹ He makes their own emotions conscious to them, and "the reason why they need him is that no community altogether knows its own heart".² So Collingwood holds that art has nothing to do with communicating emotion to the beholder; that, for him, is mere entertainment or magic.³ Real art, he says, is only the expression of what the beholder already feels,⁴ and, "granted that works of art in certain conditions do stimulate certain reactions in their audience," yet they do so "because of something other than their nature as works of art."⁵ He holds, and apparently thinks that Pope wrote, that the poet's business is to say "what all have felt but none so well express'd."⁶

Croce's position is similar to this, though not identical with it. He insists that intuition is the same as expression, and contends that we cannot intuit anything whatever except as it expresses our own feelings. "Intuition is only intuition in so far as it is, in that very act, expression."⁷ To become distinctly aware of any individual sensible object is thus the same thing as to become distinctly aware of our own feelings. It makes no difference whether the object of which we become aware is shape, colour, or sound, nor whether it is real or imagined, the intuition that it gives us is an intuition of our own state of mind. This is true not only of natural but also of aesthetic objects; and it follows, therefore, that we intuit no more in a work of art than the expression of feelings that we already possess. It is possible, of course, that the artist has himself expressed in the object many feelings which are not in

¹ Ibid p.336.
² Ibid. p.336.
³ Ibid.p.108.
⁴ Ibid.p.312.
⁵ Ibid.pp.35-6.
⁶ Ibid p.119.
⁷ Encyclopaedia Britannica. 14th ed. Article - "Aesthetics".
our possession at all. Whether that is so or not we shall never know, because there is no means by which we can intuit them. All we can do with his work of art is to use it to make conscious to ourselves feelings that already exist within us. What art does is to reveal to us ourselves.¹

But if this is so it is quite impossible to understand how it is that any work of art should seem to us new and difficult. One would expect it to strike us straight away as the solution that we have been looking for. Pope suggests that this is indeed what happens in the case of wit, though it is not the feeling that he thinks we recognise but the thought -

True Wit is Nature to advantage dressed,
What oft was thought, but ne'er so well expressed;
Something, whose truth convinc'd at sight we find,
That give us back the image of our mind.²

This may, at any rate sometimes, be true enough of what the 18th century called Wit, but the fact is that a beholder is rarely "convinced at sight" by a new work of art. He does not usually find there words for a familiar feeling; he more often finds something new and frequently even something difficult. That is why artists are so often misunderstood and unappreciated by their contemporaries; it takes some time before the ordinary man can understand this new way of looking at things.

Further, if the artist's feeling is so individual, "not quite like any that he has ever felt before, and probably not quite like any he will ever feel again", how can his work of art express for me my peculiar feeling that is also very individual, and must be very different from his? It is impossible that the peculiar feelings the artist expresses should have pre-existed in me, and that his work only makes clear to me what I have already felt. To have had Donne's peculiar feelings in the past, I must have had Donne's thoughts in the past,

² Pope - "Essay on Criticism" ll. 297-300.
because his feelings are feelings arising from those thoughts; but most of us
know very well that we have not had Donne’s thoughts before. Or, to use
Collingwood’s own example, to have a painter’s peculiar feelings, I must have
had “not the experience of looking at the subject without painting it, but the
far richer and in some ways very different experience of looking at it and
painting it together”; but most of us have neither looked at his subject
before nor ever painted a picture of any subject. How then can we possibly have
already lingering in our minds the individual and peculiar feelings of the
painter?

However we explain it, we must say that a work of art does more than
express and clarify for us our previously existing feelings; it gives us new
feelings, not merely ”because of something other than its nature as a work of
art”, but as an essential part of its aesthetic purpose. They may sometimes be
new feelings about something that “oft was thought”, but even then it is the
thoughts that have previously been experienced, not the feelings.

There are, of course, occasions when the artist deals with situations and
experiences that we ourselves have previously undergone. There is then bound to
be something in common between our past feelings and the present ones produced
by the artist; we may say to ourselves “This is exactly how I felt when my
friend died,” or “when I sailed up the river.” When that is so, we utter our
feelings, as it were, through his work, and find that he expresses for us what
perhaps we have been unable to express ourselves. Nevertheless, even then, his
feelings and ours will not be exactly the same. The fact that the artist sets
down the experience of looking and painting together must alter the feelings
expressed. And a greater alteration still will be due to the fact that his was

\[1 \text{ Ibid p.308.}\]
a different personality undergoing that experience. So that even when our feelings about an experience are similar to those of the artist, he will still give us new feelings.

What the artist primarily does to us, therefore, is to communicate to us his experience, though the fact that we can also express our own experiences through his work may sometimes also be of considerable importance.

3. The effects of expression and communication

If the fact that art may express the beholder's feelings is only of subsidiary importance, one would not expect it to account for all the effects of art. But it has so often been suggested that expression of one kind or another does account for them, that we must give that view some consideration.

When Plato in his "Republic" condemned poetry because, he said, it rouses and waters feelings that ought to be allowed to wither with drought, Aristotle retorted that Poetry did not make our emotions grow, but gave them a vent and so helped us to dispose of them. Through pity and fear, he said, tragedy effected "the proper purgation of these emotions." The result of this purging is what Milton was later to call "calm of mind, all passion spent." It does not, however, follow at all that a man who reads poetry thereby gets rid of his superfluous feelings; he may be like an angry man who thumps the table and feels better after it, or like one who makes himself more angry the more he thumps. Certainly, as Carritt says, pity and fear are not "deposits of which the more we spend the less we have, but rather, as Plato knew,

1 Aristotle - "Poetics" p.23. There have been many interpretations of this famous statement. Fortunately we need not involve ourselves in philological discussion, and we can accept Professor Bywater's conclusion that Aristotle thought tragedy benefited us by giving a harmless vent to feelings with which we shall then be less heavily weighted in our active life. (See Bywater - "Rhetoric" p. 161.)

faculties which are strengthened by exercise; we should not fortify a man against a night-watch with a dismal treatise nor steel him against pity with a tale of tears. In any case, if art is a matter of communication, he will probably find his old feelings deepened and some new ones added to them.

Purgation is also the idea embodied in the theory of art as play. The origin of it seems to have been a saying of Kant that "art compared with labour may be considered as play." It was taken up by Schiller in his letters "The Aesthetic Education of Man", and adopted by Herbert Spencer in his "Principles of Psychology". Play, says Herbert Spencer, is "an artificial exercise of powers which, in default of their natural exercise, become so ready to discharge that they relieve themselves by simulated actions in place of real actions." But we now know very well that play is not merely a means of expending superfluous energy, but is a preparation for life; a means of developing our faculties, not of diminishing them.

A more modern view which has points of contact with the purgation theory supposes that a work of art is explained when it is shown to be a substitute gratification, a wish-fulfilment. Thus Freud interprets the work of Leonardo da Vinci as a revelation of the history of the artist's childhood, and supposes that the tenderness of his figures of John and Bacchus represents "the wish-fulfilment of the boy infatuated with his mother." Or, with a good deal more inherent probability, we may suppose that the unmarried governess used to like reading "Jane Eyre" because she could put herself in the place of the heroine and imagine herself married to her employer, and that the man with the famous complex finds satisfaction in "King Oedipus" because it expresses

1 Carritt - "The Theory of Beauty" p.57.
2 Spencer - "Principles of Psychology" ix,9.
his desires for him. But this does not take us very far, because appreciation of a work of art by a good sensitive mind seems independent of whether the plot fits unsatisfied desires or not. It is not only unsatisfied unmarried women who enjoy "Jane Eyre"; it appears to be just as much relished by happily married men. Nor is it only men with an Oedipus complex who appreciate Sophocles's play; normal women also feel its force.

Croce holds that the effects of art are due to the fact that the contemplation of feeling is a way of mastering it. "By elaborating his impressions," he says, "a man frees himself from them. By objectifying them, he removes them from him and makes himself their superior." Collingwood elaborates this somewhat. According to him, the artist begins with a vague, undefined feeling. He "has no idea what the experience is which demands expression"; "all he can say about his emotion is 'I feel .... I don't know what I feel'". What he is doing in making a work of art "is trying to find out what these emotions are." When he has made the work, and thus found out what they are, he experiences a sense of release. "As unexpressed, he feels it (that is, the emotion) in what we have called, a helpless and oppressed way; as expressed, he feels it in a way from which this sense of oppression has vanished. His mind is somehow lightened and eased." It is like the feeling of relief that comes when we have solved a problem. If the emotion is anger, for instance, and we express it by putting it into hot and bitter words, then "instead of the sense of oppression which accompanies an emotion of anger not yet recognised as such, we have that sense of alleviation which comes when we are conscious of our own emotion as anger, instead of being conscious of it only

1 Croce - "Aesthetics" p.21.  
2 Collingwood - "The Principles of Art" p.29.  
3 Ibid. p.109.  
5 Ibid p.110.  
6 Ibid p.117.
as an unidentified perturbation." If we are not artists but only art lovers, then we express our emotions through the work of other people; but by doing so, we in turn solve the problem of what our feelings were, and so we achieve the same sense of freedom that came to the artist.

We cannot at all agree with Collingwood's reiterated statement that the artist "has no idea what the experience is which demands expression." That would mean that he had no idea he was angry until he started to put his feelings into words, and might even find on trying to do so that it was not anger he felt at all, but tolerant amusement; or that a poet setting out to write a tragedy might discover that he had produced a limerick instead. No doubt however his feelings will be clarified by expression, and when the expression is complete, he will feel, though only in a limited kind of way, as a man does when he has solved a problem. But it by no means necessarily follows that he will be content with the solution he finds, and that the result will be pleasure and peace of mind. The result may be that he will discover the extent of his lust and be horrified by it, or that he will only see clearly the quality of his fear because he has expressed it in a nightmare.

While it is true that art is the expression of the artist's feeling, we can see that that fact by itself does not explain any of the effects that art has upon us. If we add, as we have done, that the work in which the artist expresses his feelings is able to communicate those feelings to the beholder, we have accounted for the first of them. If we admit, as we are glad to do, that the beholder can in some way, and to some extent, use the artist's work for the purpose of expressing feelings that are his own, we have suggested a very partial explanation of the second. But the rest remain untouched. The position is, in

\footnote{Ibid p.110.}
fact, as follows -

(i) A work of art is an expression of feelings, and has power to communicate those feelings to the beholder. This accounts for the fact that the contemplation of art by an understanding mind results in feeling.

(ii) The beholder can often find in a work of art feelings very similar to those he has had himself, and when that happens the work of art will express those feelings for him. The expression of them will no doubt often bring a certain sense of release. He may feel like a man who has got rid of his temper by banging the table, or like one who has solved the problem of exactly what his feelings were, or like one whose desires have been satisfied for a time by some substitute gratification. These things, however, will not happen with every work of art, and even where they do, they are far from adequate as an explanation of the depth of tranquillity that really great art gives.

(iii) We have as yet no contact with any sense of value. Art may be genuinely expressive and yet worthless. Feelings, and strong ones, are to be found very adequately expressed in some kinds of bad art as well as in good art, and the plot which is the fulfilment of our wishes is even commoner in the novellette at fourpence a week than it is in high literature. Dreams are expression, and probably very adequate expression, and Professor Gentile says "if a dream could be written down it would be poetry"; but we must add that they resemble bad poetry as often as they resemble good.

(iv) We are as far as ever from accounting for the sense of purpose, truth, and ultimate reality which a work of art produces.

1 See, for example, criticisms in Dearmer - "Art and Religion" pp. 4-5; Hadley - "Music" pp. 20-21; and Richards - "The Principles of Literary Criticism" p. 201.

2 Gentile - "The Philosophy of Art" I. 1. 6.
III. INTEGRATION IN ART.

1. The integration of the work of art.

If we ask what more is required in a work of art than the expression and communication of feeling, part of the answer is integration. The work of art must be a unity. Professor Baldwin Brown, indeed, calls this "the first essential".1

This means, first of all, that everything must contribute to one end, and there must be nothing irrelevant. This applies equally to all the arts. Of music, Mr Brian Wibberly says, "In unity we recognise the first principle in musical art. This is fundamental; its idea must express itself harmoniously in the whole structure. Melodies, groups and figures must all contribute to the unity of the whole."2 Of drama, Aristotle says that the plot "must imitate one action and that a whole, the structural union of the parts being such that if any one of them is displaced or removed, the whole will be disjoined and disturbed. For a thing whose presence or absence makes no visible difference, is not an organic part of the whole."3 In poetry there is "a necessity of there being an agreement of the parts among themselves, that one uniform whole may be produced."4 In painting the various subordinate actions "should merely make a part of that whole which would be imperfect without them."5 In architecture, one wing of a building should make us ask, "Where is the other?" For architecture "abhors a duality which has not in some measure been modified so that it may partake of the character of unity."6 And so with every other art

---

3 Aristotle - "Poetics" p.35.
4 Reynolds - "Discourses on Art" p.195.
5 Ibid. p.37.
6 Edwards - "Style and Composition in Architecture". p.34.
also, the parts must all be related together and joined into one.1

The great instrument of this unity is rhythm, that arrangement and repetition of lines, masses, colours, sounds, or other elements of the work of art, which both arouses expectancy and satisfies it. Rhythm binds the parts together in a sort of question and answer; this responding to that and completing it; that in turn preparing for something else and being satisfied by it; and all being therefore united into a whole.

Though everything must be related, yet the relationships may be of many kinds, - of colour, shape, sound, logic, use, consequence, or anything else. The particular relationship needed at any one moment will be settled by the circumstances of that moment and the medium in which the artist is working; but all kinds of relationships are available for him, and he is at liberty to use those that suit his purpose best.2

As the relationship may be of any kind, so, according to the need of the moment, it may be in any degree. There is no one set proportion that is always right. This deserves a little more elaboration because it has been suggested from time to time that there is special virtue in particular proportions, especially in the visual arts. It is reported, for example, that Michael Angelo

1 The artist may, of course, for special purposes emphasize relationship by, for the moment, deliberately forsaking or ignoring it. For just as the regular rhythm of music may be emphasized by syncopation, so the fact of relationship may be emphasized by incongruity.

2 It is not meant of course that all kinds of relationship are of equal importance in all the arts. For each art there are certain sorts of relationship that must exist, and others that may exist if the artist chooses. In visual art there must be visual relationships, in aural art aural ones, and so on. If the artist chooses to add to these some other relationships of thought and sense, well and good. These latter may be used; but the former must be used. Thus a picture is not made into a good work of art because the things it represents are merely related together in thought, but because they are related visually by such things as line, shape, colour, or mass. If they are also related in thought, that is so much the better, but the primary thing is the visual relation, and nothing else can make up for the lack of it.
upon a time gave this observation to the painter Marcus de Sciena his scholler, that he should alwaies make a figure pyramidal, serpentlike, and multiplied by one, two and three.\(^1\) This obscure saying is evidently intended to favour a particular pattern, though it is difficult to say what that pattern is. Hogarth also thinks that some rules can be laid down, and favours a certain serpentine line as "the line of beauty", and another as "the line of grace".\(^2\) More favour has been found for what is called the Golden Section,\(^3\) which has been known since the time of Pythagoras and was experimented upon notably by Fechner.

But there is no proportion or shape which is satisfying at all times and in all circumstances, and we may say with confidence that no universal rule will ever be found. Indeed if beauty were as simple as that, everyone could be an artist with no more capacity than a rudimentary knowledge of mathematics. Nevertheless, Fechner found the Golden Section to be involved in very many instances,\(^4\) and Tovey finds that the same proportions are often found in music.\(^5\) The explanation seems to be that if the relation between the parts of a work of art is too obvious it will not be very interesting, and if it is too distant it will not be perceptible.\(^6\) The Golden Section, or a close approach to it, seems to be an acceptable mean between the two extremes. But certainly what matters is that parts should be related; not that they should always be related in the same proportion.

The other aspect of unity in a work of art is the necessity for the work to be complete. If a work is incomplete, then it will be less than a unity;

\(^1\) Hogarth - "The Analysis of Beauty" p. iv.
\(^2\) Ibid pp. 68-71 and 107.
\(^3\) The proportion \(A:B = A + B:A\) (\(\mu:\nu:\xi\)).
\(^4\) See Langfield in Encyclopaedia Britannica - "Aesthetics, experimental" for the general subject.
\(^6\) A similar explanation seems to apply to beauty of tone in music and harmony of colour in painting.
there will be parts in it that cry out for a relationship to something that is not there, expectations aroused which are not satisfied, and pieces that do not fit because that part which would make a right connection is absent. "Tragedy", says Aristotle, "is an imitation of an action that is complete, and whole, and of a certain magnitude." Then, after a comment on magnitude, he goes on, "A whole is that which has a beginning, a middle, and an end. A beginning is that which does not itself follow anything by causal necessity, but after which something naturally is or comes to be. An end, on the contrary, is that which itself naturally follows some other thing, either by necessity, or as a rule, but has nothing following it. A middle is that which follows something as some other thing follows it. A well constructed plot, therefore, must neither begin nor end at haphazard, but conform to these principles." Similarly, Aquinas gives as the first of the three requirements for beauty: "a certain wholeness or perfection; for whatever is incomplete is, so far, ugly." But we hardly need philosophers to tell us these things. Every lover of the arts knows the difference between a work which just stops and one which duly comes to an end; he expects a tragedy to end with a death, a romance with a marriage, and a comedy with the unravelling of a tangle. Similarly he expects his music normally to end on the chord of the tonic, and he takes pleasure in the way its end will sometimes recall its beginning, so that the experience is brought round full circle and can be surveyed as a whole. He expects the lines of his pictures to lead inwards, so that the picture shall be a whole within its frame. He expects his buildings to have their boundaries marked and emphasised by cornice, plinth, quoin, battlement, parapet, or some other means, so that they shall be felt not to have merely stopped, but to have been deliberately

---

1 Aristotle - "Poetics" p.31.
2 Aquinas - "Summa Theologica" I,xxxix,8.
brought to a conclusion.

This wholeness is one of the elements of that detachment which is so often spoken of as characteristic of a work of art; the work is detached from life in the sense that it is complete in itself. It is also one of the elements of the perfection which is sometimes claimed for works of art; for a work of art is perfect in the sense that it is complete, and that everything has been said that needs to be said.

2. The Integration of the Mind.

All kinds of patterns are found in works of art - shapes like pyramids or triangles; repetition, whether of musical phrases, beats, rhythms, or whole sections; relationships between the vibrations of light or sound, or between sections, golden or otherwise; and divisions of poetry into stanzas, lines, feet, arranged in a regular way. But elements arranged in a pattern, even if the pattern is a unity, do not necessarily make a work of art; as we have said, they do not make a work of art unless they express feeling. And even when elements that express feeling are arranged in a unified visual or audible pattern, they do not necessarily make a work of art; for art is not an expression of feeling to which is also added an integration of lengths, weights, logic, or frequency of vibrations. Just as the various elements of a work of art must express feeling, so their integration must express the integration of feeling. Therefore the important thing about the unity of a work of art is that it is a unity of feelings; that the feelings expressed are combined together and form one whole; and that what is communicated is not merely an integrated object, but an integrated state of mind. The fact is that the unity of the work of art is much more a unity within our minds, than a unity outside us that is subject to measurement and calculation.
We often attribute qualities to an object when what we are really describing is the effect the object has upon us. We speak of it as being novel, meaning that it produces new feelings in us. In a year's time it will no longer be novel, because although it is the same object in every way and has exactly the same qualities, we are not the same people; our frequent seeing of it has changed us, and we are no longer capable of feeling the same things in its presence. So also we speak of things as being pleasant or wonderful, when we mean that they are capable of making us feel and behave in certain ways.

We do exactly this kind of thing in our criticism of works of art, often attributing to the object the things that it makes us feel. We speak, for instance, of the rhythm of verse, when it is not the sound of the words we are really speaking of, but the pattern of feeling in our minds which they produce.

I. A. Richards invites us "to imagine ourselves reciting verses into the ear of an instrument designed to record (by curves drawn on squared paper) all the physical characteristics of the sequences of sounds emitted, their strength, pitch, durations, and any other features we choose to examine. (This is not a fantastic suggestion, for such instruments can be arranged, and begin to be part of the furniture of good phonetic laboratories). The shape of our curves will give us a transcription of all the physical rhythms of the verses." If rhythm were something in the physical sounds, then we should expect to find "that verses which are good poetry would show some peculiarity in their curves which bad poetry would not show." But it is fairly obvious that actually it would not do so; and, says Richards, it is really "most unpleasurably" ever to have suggested that it would. He goes on - "How, then, are we to explain this apparent superiority in the sound of good poetry if we admit that on the recording?

1 Richards - "Practical Criticism" p.228.
The drum its curves might be indistinguishable from those of rubbish. The answer is that the rhythm we admire, which we seem to detect actually in the sounds, and which we seem to respond to, is something which we only ascribe to them, and is actually a rhythm of the mental activity through which we apprehend not only the sound of the words but their sense and feeling. The mysterious glory which seems to inhere in the sound of certain lines is a projection of the thought and emotion they evoke, and the sound of certain lines is a projection of the thought and emotion they evoke, and the peculiar satisfaction they seem to give to the ear is a reflection of the adjustment of our feelings which has been momentarily achieved.¹ If this is true, and we believe that it is, then it follows that we shall never understand the rhythm of poetry "so long as we ask, 'Why does temporal pattern so excite us?' and fail to realise that the pattern itself is a vast cyclic agitation spreading all over the body, a tide of excitement pouring through the channels of the mind."²

If we think of the other arts we may remind ourselves that the volumes, weights, and proportions we feel in our minds are often very different from those that actually exist in the object, and that in architecture and sculpture, for example, forms are frequently made to look narrower or wider, lighter or heavier, than in actual fact they are.³ In painting we speak of figures balancing one another, though in actual fact if they were made solid and actually weighed they would often fail to do so; but they give us a feeling of balance, and that is what we require. Similarly, the music of a piano concerto which we

¹ Ibid. p.229.
² Richards - Principles of Literary Criticism" p.140.
³ For example, the stylobate of the Parthenon curves upwards towards its centre so that it shall appear straight, the columns lean inwards so that they shall appear vertical, the angle columns are made stouter than the rest so that when seen against the sky they shall appear to be of the same thickness, and are set nearer to their neighbours so that they shall not appear to be further away. (See Bennister Fletcher - "A History of Architecture" pp 75, 89, and 106.)
enjoy is not the same as that we hear. We know that in fact we must hear every note of the piano begin with a sforzando and gradually fade away during the whole time it sounds, but our mind enables us to feel the result as a perfect legato.

Just as the unity of a work of art is mainly a unity within our minds, so also with its completeness. A work is complete not merely because the tale which it tells is ended, but because the expectations that were aroused at the beginning have been satisfied in the end. The mere completion of the tale helps in producing that result, but of itself it would not be sufficient; for one can end a tale and yet leave a sense of something unfinished, just as one can end a complete spoken sentence on a rising note that leaves one's hearer feeling that there ought to be something more. In telling a tale it is not only the logic that must be complete, but the balance of feelings. On the other hand a picture may feel complete when the objects that form its boundaries are only half shown, and a work of sculpture may feel complete when it is only a torso or a bust.

What matters most, therefore, about the integration of a work of art is the integration of our mind. The unity that we find in it is mostly something that we attribute to it, and is really a unity of our feelings; its completeness is a completeness of our feelings; its rhythm is a rhythm of our own being; and its pattern is a pattern within ourselves.

3. The integration of the self with its world.

There is still a third kind of integration with which we are concerned; for the mind is not something that stands alone, and it cannot be integrated all by itself. It is only integrated within itself when it is integrated with its environment, and the artist must therefore be at one with life. What he produces
must be decoration in the sense that it is filled with decorum or suitableness; his attitudes must fit the world in which he lives, or, as we more usually put it, they must be fitting. "Art is man's effort", says Herbert Read, "to achieve integration with the universe." ¹

The world with which the artist has to deal is made up of various elements, and so in his work there will be attitudes to many things. There will be an attitude to the subject matter of his poem, drama, picture or sculpture, in all its details; there will be an attitude to the material which he uses, his paint and canvas, stone, words, musical instruments; there will be an attitude to himself, his own nature, instincts, experiences, emotions; there will be an attitude to his audience; where his work has a definite purpose there will be an attitude towards that purpose; and above all there will be a general attitude to life and existence as a whole, and that will colour everything he does. If his work is to be a great work of art, all these attitudes must be fitting.

We will now pass on to describe the most important of them. It is impossible to separate them by clear and distinct lines so that they do not overlap, but we will define them as clearly as possible.

1) Interest

One of the fitting attitudes to life is that of interest, and so we demand of an artist that he shall express interest in the things he portrays. If he is not interested, his work will lack "life". It matters not how clever he is or how hard he tries to produce something good; art is not to be produced by mere cleverness or by will power. Correct dullness is not living art but only a corpse, and we rightly leave it alone. Many a sin can be forgiven a work

Read - "Education through Art" p.110.
that is alive,

But in such lays as neither ebb, nor flow,
Correctly cold, and regularly low,
That straining faults one quiet tenor keep;
We cannot blame indeed — but we may sleep.

What it is, that arouses interest in the artist does not really matter; anything will do, large or small. It may be a strange pattern, an accident, an abstract idea, a tune whistled in the street, the sequence of sounds produced by the notes B.A.C.H., the principles of "divine perspective", or the mechanical problems of building. Interest may have its origin in the subject, in the purpose for which the work is to be used, or in some problem of technique; but once roused it must spread itself over the whole, and become for the time being a certain way of looking at life.

It is because artists must be interested that they are always pressing on to something new; for as a rule it is something unusual, unexpected, or strange, that most readily holds a man's attention. In painting, "only by setting himself new problems can the artist raise his powers to the white heat of creation." In literature general decadence lies "in having nothing more to say, and in repeating and exaggerating motives already discovered." In music, that which is "lacking in vitality is generally found ..... to be a diluted extract of that of some other composer, or perhaps of so many other composers that no one composer can be named." In architecture imitation Gothic is poor stuff because it is no longer experimental; the original was made by people who were "really solving the structural problems of their time" and "has the thrill in it of people making discoveries", but once the discoveries are made

2 Bell - "Art" p.216.
3 Croce - "Aesthetic" p.136.
5 Clutton Brock - "Essays on Art" p.92.
and the answers to all the structural problems are well known, the interest has gone out of it. So fashions change, and the things that stimulate one generation cease to interest its successor.

Sometimes new stimulus is found in a change of subject matter, as when the Romantics re-discovered Nature. It is true, of course, that Wordsworth did not write about things that in themselves were unusual; he was content with the common places of everyday life. He did not pine for exotic and rare flowers; a celandine or a daisy would stir him. He did not cultivate the fantastic dream imagery of Coleridge; he was content with a rainbow or the springs of Dove. And there are others like Crabbe, the Dutch masters, and many more, who are deeply interested by everyday life. It is a most valuable gift. But we must remember that if these things were not new and rare in experience, they were certainly new and rare as subjects for art, and these men were genuine experimenters.

But for the most part, subject matter cannot change very much. In drama and the novel one's perpetual subject must be men and women, though they may indeed be high or low, individuals or symbols, and interest may move from their actions to their minds; in painting one must go on producing portraits, groups, scenery, buildings, and still life, though one may also add to this paintings of machinery, or even the attempt to paint the sub-conscious mind; in architecture one must continually design houses and churches, though one may forsake the forms of the ancient castle, and make civic buildings and railway stations instead. This familiarity of subject matter may make things difficult for artists of all kinds. "The occasional poet", laments Dr. Johnson, "is circumscribed by the narrowness of his subject. Whatever can happen to man has
happened so often that little remains for fancy or invention."^1

What has to change most often, therefore, is not the subject matter of
art, but the method by which it is presented. So down the ages the painter has
continually been seeking to present his subject in different ways, and
experimenting in such things as how to portray depth by means of perspective, how
to portray anatomical truth, how to make a formal composition, how to suggest
informality and spontaneity, how to paint light, how to use chiaroscuro, how to
suggest volume by the use of colour, or how to express the relationship of the
subject to cubes, cones, and cylinders. The architect has experimented with
stone vaulting, with various methods of combining one width of vault with another,
with the use of buttresses, and with various styles of window tracery. And when
all the problems of one style were solved, all possible experiments had been
tried, and there was nothing new that could be done with it, then he embarked
on a different style, with horizontal lines and new decorative motifs and a
different feeling about it. Later still there came new building materials, and
he was given new interest and enthusiasm as he experimented with what could be
done with steel, concrete, and glass. The musician was thrilled when he first
discovered the possibility of singing a tune on two different levels at the same
time. But that could not interest him for ever, and so he experimented with
combining two tunes, then he added more, and then he had a further thrill when he
found it was possible to think vertically in terms of harmony. He experimented
with that as well, and found it possible to make chords that were more and more
elaborate; and meanwhile he experimented also with rhythm and tone colour.
Every art indeed at its best is continually experimenting with new methods,
because it is only by seeking to master some new thing that the artist can maintain

^1 Johnson - Life of Dryden.
his interest.

b) Sensibility

Another fitting attitude to life, and therefore one that we expect to find in the artist, is that of sensibility or awareness. "Art", says Gentile, "is an activity of the spirit when it is most awake and clear-sighted."1 This is not incompatible with the fact that the rhythms of art often have something of a hypnotic effect and that there are some correspondences between art and dreams. One can be most awake and alive to some parts of life when other distracting parts are, as it were, sealed off; problems are not infrequently solved in sleep, and "in fact all creative thinkers are dreamers."2 The state when one is partly "laid asleep" may be the one when one is most completely become "a living soul".3

The artist's sensibility shows itself in his ability to bind a variety of experience into one whole. Symbol, metaphor, parable, and illustration are his almost inevitable devices. They serve him in many ways, making his work vivid and clear, and enriching it by bringing more of life within a single view, and engaging more of the personality in the aesthetic response. Most people find themselves using such things when they are deeply moved. A really angry man will find the most astonishing variety of things to which to liken his opponent, a lover will find that his beloved has some likeness to every beautiful thing in the world, and one who is excited and in good spirits will naturally connect one thing with another if it is only to make jokes which depend for their humour on incongruity. The artist, too, finds that strong feeling has the same effect on him, and that is why, although it is not a necessity in art, it is so often associated with it. But even in work where there is no strong excitement, there

1 Gentile - "The Philosophy of Art" I, i, 6.  
2 Wordsworth - "Tintern Abbey.  
is still a joining together of many realms of experience; and it is due to the fact that the artist's awareness of life is more than ordinarily keen.

The artist's sensitiveness shows itself also in the fact that he is an acute observer. The ordinary man may not know that ash buds are black in March, but Tennyson is very familiar with it; the rest of humanity may think that shadows are grey, but the Impressionists can tell them that they are full of colour; and Debussy can recognise the beauty and fitness of the upper harmonics in bugles and bells when most people cannot hear them at all. A similar clarity of vision is seen in the fact that the artist is often the most far-sighted of his generation. Thus Tennyson's "In Memoriam" was written before "The Origin of Species"; the Futurists were glorifying war and anticipating the regime of the dictators as early as 1909; and Wyndham Lewis's early paintings are clearly prophetic of the mechanised world which was to come.

It is characteristic of the artist that he is sensitive to everything that is relevant in the situation with which he is dealing, and does not react to merely one part of it. He has not one stock response to all situations of a certain kind and to every mention of a given subject, but takes account of the particular situation, and the context of every subject. He is able to avoid the sentimentality of inappropriate feeling, because he sees life steadily and whole. As he avoids a ready-made response, so he avoids ready-made forms of expression. Because he sees that every particular situation is different from all the rest, he feels differently about it; and because he feels differently, he must express himself differently. That is why the cliché will not do for him, whether in words, paint, or sound. Or if he does use it, that is because even a cliché can be used in a new way, perhaps with amusement or irony.

---

1 The date of the first Futurist manifesto, signed by Marinetti, the leader of the movement.
Where a work of art is intended for use, the artist is sensitive to that use, takes account of it, and therefore makes his work fit for it. Thus we find that one part of a thing's beauty is often its suitability for its purpose. Eric Gill says, "It is possible to ask, 'What is a beautiful building?' but it is not possible to answer. It is like asking 'What is a beautiful animal, or what is a beautiful colour, or what is a beautiful shape?' It is necessary first to know what the thing is. When we say, for example, 'The Post Office at X is a beautiful building, we mean it is a beautifully built Post Office. Knowledge of what the thing is is taken for granted." This, of course, is an exaggeration. It is not always necessary to know exactly what a thing is before being able to pronounce it beautiful, but some knowledge is often necessary; and if the artist has not been sensitive to its purpose, its beauty will suffer accordingly. If the Post Office has doors so small that a man could only go through them on his hands and knees, and openings for letters set ten feet above the ground, then it would be not only utilitarian nonsense, but aesthetic

1 Kant, of course, will not allow that the actual purpose to be served by a work of art should have any effect on our aesthetic judgment. Beauty, he says, "is the form of the purposiveness of an object, so far as this is perceived in it without any representation of a purpose." ("Kritik of Judgment" - 1.1.17. p.90.) He therefore excludes from consideration not only all works that have actual use, but all that are representational, for he says that even they have the purpose of resembling what they represent. A judgment of taste in respect of such objects "can only be pure if either the person judging has no concept of this purpose or else abstracts it from his judgment" (Ibid. 1.1.16. p.83.). But we cannot consent to omit from the realm of art all the useful and representational, to leave out York Minster because we cannot enter it without being aware that it is intended for worship, and Mona Lisa because we cannot help seeing that she looks like a woman; nor can we agree to take as our standard of perfect beauty merely such things as sea-shells and arabesques on wall-paper (Ibid. 1.1.16. p.81).

The sensibility of the artist is not directed only towards the world outside; it is directed also towards himself. He is more aware than most men of his own ideas and emotions. He is not deceived or confused about them, and no nuance of his feeling or thought escapes his observation.

The artist's sensitiveness may, of course, be limited in certain directions. There is, as T.S. Eliot points out, "a kind of poetry which is the product of a special religious awareness, which may exist without the general awareness which we expect of the major poet." Similarly, there is a wide general awareness which does not include religious awareness, an attitude which we find for example in the work of Thomas Hardy. Such limitations are a drawback which has to be put on the debit side in any aesthetic criticism. Nevertheless, even when they are present, and even when their presence is a serious disability, it remains true that the artist is very much alive to his world, and sees more than the generality of men.

c) Respect

Another attitude necessary in the artist is that of respect. The good artist sees things as of worth in themselves and for their own sake. He has a sense that life does not exist merely to minister to him and his needs, but has independent qualities and values of its own.

1 A belief has sometimes been expressed that utility and beauty are the same, and it is therefore necessary to emphasize that we are very far from suggesting any such thing. Many objects, such as pictures and statues, are beautiful that are not in the least useful in any ordinary sense. In works that do exist for a specific purpose there is much that contributes to their beauty that does not contribute to their use; as for example the mouldings in Gothic architecture, which are essential to aesthetic effect but seldom necessary to the construction. And there are also many things that are useful and necessary that are not in the least beautiful: Burke, for example, cites "the stomach, the lungs, and the liver" as being "very far from having any beauty" although "incomparably well-adapted to their purpose." (A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas on the Sublime and the Beautiful." p.36.)

This is seen in the way he treats his materials, and accepts and appreciates
their qualities. Carving, for instance, "should be a collaboration between the
sculptor and the substance;"¹ it is the duty of the sculptor "to cut stone...
into shapes that achieve an even greater degree of stoniness than that which
has been shaped by the wash of the water or earthquake or volcano".² It is a
merit when marble, being semi-transparent, is used to give a look of softness
to a rounded surface;³ but on the other hand it is a mistake to portray in it
such fragile things as shawls.⁴ It is a thing to be praised when the dark hue
of bronze is exploited for effects of silhouette⁵, and when, in a figure made
of iron, there is "a curiously satisfactory understanding of the possibilities
inherent in the material in which it is made."⁶ The artist should so use glass
as to make the most of its transparency⁷; if he cuts it, he must do so in such
a way as to display its lustre; and he must always bear in mind that its
fragility demands a certain simplicity of form.⁸ Similarly, a musical composer
should respect the characteristic qualities and capacities of his instruments.
The best trumpet tune is that which sounds as if it were intended to be played
on a trumpet; the best organ music exploits the characteristics of the organ,
and does not try to make it sound like an imitation orchestra; and the best
vocal music relishes the capacities and tones of the voice.

Exceptions can be found to all these things, for an artist will sometimes
attempt a tour de force and make a success of it. Nevertheless, the artist who

² Miss Harris in an article on the work of John B. Flanagan in "The Studio" July
⁴ Holmes - "A Grammar of the Arts" p. 18.
⁵ Brown - "The Fine Arts" p. 337.
⁶ Rice - "The Background of Art" p. 51.
⁷ Appendix to "The Stones of Venice" Vol. 2, (Ruskin).
⁸ Read - "Art and Industry" p. 73.
does not respect his material in this way starts off with a disadvantage, and he has to be very brilliant if he would persuade the spectator to overlook his initial fault.

It follows that methods of using materials will be very various, because what suits the qualities of one is unlikely to suit the different qualities of another. So pottery should not imitate metal work,¹ and plastics should not imitate the forms of glass or wood². The arranging of music for an instrument other than that for which it was written generally involves much more than the transferring of the notes from the one medium to the other, because the arranger has to make it fit the characteristic qualities of the new instrument. He has, in fact, to consider how the composer would have written it had that instrument been the original one. The transferring of a design from one visual medium to another similarly involves adaptation, and without it will be unsuccessful. The literal copying of the chiaroscuro of a painting by Reynolds in stained glass at New College Oxford, for example, is a failure. Again, the beard of Michelangelo's "Moses" which is designed in stone, and that of Dürer's "Hieronymus Holzschuher" which is designed in paint, could not be literally transferred to each other's medium without appearing obviously wrong.

There are, of course, cases where the transfer can be made without difficulty because the qualities of the two materials are sufficiently alike to make it possible; and there are innumerable cases where, for the same reason, style and technique can be taken over in part. Bach's "48" can be played on a piano, although they were intended for a "well-tempered Clavier". Renoir's paintings in oils show clear traces of his early training as a painter in porcelain.

¹ Read - "Art and Industry" p.38.
² Ibid p.58.
though they are very far from being imitations of porcelain painting. The Greek temple is magnificent in stone, although the style is derived from construction in wood. The columns were originally trunks of trees, the flutings take the place of channels of bark, the triglyphs represent the ends of the beams that made the roof, and the drops below them are the stone counterparts of the heads of the wooden pegs that fastened them together; in fact, the Greek temple may be described as a sort of log hut carried out in marble. Nevertheless, even this is not just a copy but an adaptation. In timber construction the supports are placed far apart and joined by lengthy horizontals; in stone the proportions are made quite different, and in the fully developed Doric style the columns are made much thicker, and are placed so close together that the space between them is less than twice their lower diameter. By the time that other modifications are made as well, the result is a building whose form, although it originated in wood, has been so adapted that it shows off the characteristics of stone.

But perhaps respect is seen most characteristically in the artist's attitude towards his audience, in what Richards calls the "tone" of his work. This tone is most important, and according as it is good or bad, his work will profit or suffer. It may indeed sometimes be the most important factor of the work, and poetry, which is not very remarkable in any other way may be very good indeed because the poet's attitude to his readers is so completely fitting.\footnote{Richards cites Gray's "Elegy" as an example - "Practical Criticism" p.206.}

The artist must appreciate his audience's understanding and rights, and must not underestimate their capacity. He must recognise that they also have imagination, and invite them to use it, and he is usually wise if he does not dot every "i" and cross every "t", but assumes that they are capable of doing
that for themselves. He must be meticulously careful not to exploit their feelings, and that is why good work is often somewhat reticent. He may say very severe things to them, but he must say them as Dr. Johnson did to Lord Chesterfield, with a proper degree of respect. He must not humiliate the spectator, nor must he make him insignificant except by comparison with that which is of real greatness. As Tristan Edwards points out, a shop front, for example, is offensive when it is built on so large a scale that it seems to say, "I am Big Business, and don't you forget your subordinate station, you proletarian mouse."¹ A church, or a building that exists for some noble purpose, may indeed very well tower above the human figure, but to be humiliated before a very small-minded building, just because it has been made on a large scale, is extremely disagreeable.

There is, of course, no one tone that is invariably suitable, because a proper respect for one person in one set of circumstances is not the same as a proper respect for another in circumstances that are different. So the artist may adopt the friendly "gentle reader" sort of tone, the tone of a grown-up addressing a child, or even the didactic tone of a teacher, as long as it is suited to the circumstances, the subject, and the audience. But if one cannot name any one tone as that which manifests the necessary attitude of respect, it is easy to name some that do not; and it is quite safe to say that the audience must not be talked down to, bludgeoned, exploited, or deliberately deceived.

Respect is also seen in the way the artist treats his subject, and it becomes there a reverence for truth; but that is better considered under the heading of sincerity.

¹ Edwards - "Good and Bad Manners in Architecture" p.29.
Sincerity

In art sincerity is of the most extreme importance. If we recall that art is a realm in which we are concerned all the time with integration, and that another word for sincerity is integrity, that will suggest how fundamental this attitude is.

There are several senses in which an artist must be sincere. For instance he must be sincere in dealing with his audience. He must be honest with them, and never give them cause to feel that they have been imposed on. When he gives them his imitations he must never try to pass them off as reality. "A great painter", says Ruskin, "would never paint badly enough to deceive."¹ That is not strictly accurate, because there are great paintings that have been taken for reality - for example, Velazquez's portrait of Admiral Publico, which Philip IV thought for a moment was the man himself. The real point is not whether the audience is deceived, but whether it is intended to be; what the painter may not do is to deceive deliberately. A writer may give us fiction, as much of it as he wishes, but he must not intend to delude us. A maker of ornaments may gild his works, but he must not intend us to think they are solid gold. Wren may conceal the buttresses of St.Paul's behind an apparent second story, but only because, when we enter his building and find that there is in reality no second story, we have no sense of being taken in. But artificial flowers that are supposed to be thought real, jewels of paste, stained deal laths tacked on to the front of a house to make us think it is a timber-frame building, walls painted to deceive the spectator into thinking they are marble; all such things as these are anathema. It is not concealment that matters, nor imitation, nor the use of such things as the principles of perspective (whether

¹ Ruskin - "The Seven Lamps of Architecture" p.81. Cf also "Modern Painters" i,27.
applied to painting or to architecture), but the intention behind it and the air with which it is done.

As there must be no conscious deception in the appearance of the work of art, neither must there be any about the feeling expressed. There must be no attempt to make the spectator believe that the artist feels what in actual fact he does not feel. The moralist must not try to persuade his readers that he is deeply moved when in fact he is inwardly quite calm, and the humorist must not pass off as a joke what he himself does not feel to be amusing. Richards, speaking of this sort of sincerity, makes the point well when he says, "It may perhaps be most easily defined from the critic's point of view negatively, as the absence of any apparent attempt on the part of the artist to work effects upon the reader which do not work for himself."¹

The artist must also be sincere in speaking the truth about life. If he gives what purports to be a serious picture of life, he must show it as he knows it to be. He must observe, for instance, the law of cause and effect, and when he is dealing seriously with character and action, he must not alter or ignore their natural results just because he does not like them. When Thackeray was writing "The Newcomes", he went to stay with some friends, a certain Mr and Mrs Bray. One morning, when Mrs Bray asked him if he had slept well, he said, "How could I, with Colonel Newcome making a fool of himself as he has done?" "But why did you let him?" asked Mrs Bray. "Oh", said Thackeray, "it was in him to do it - he must." When Balzac was begged to save some wild young man or unhappy woman among his creatures he would answer, "Don't bother me. Truth above all. These people have no backbone. What happens to them is inevitable."

When the English publishers read "A Window in Thrums" they told Barrie that they

¹ Richards - "Principles of Literary Criticism" p.271.
thought it unbearably sad and warned him that the public does not like sad books; but he would not alter the ending. He said, "if I had altered the end of "A Window in Thrums", I think I should never have had any more respect for myself. It is a sadder book to me than it can ever be to anyone else. I see Jess at her window looking for the son who never came back as no other can see her, and I knew that unless I brought him back in time the book would be a pain to me all my days, but the thing had to be done." It is bad art that cannot resist the temptation to bring about an unreal, though comforting, "poetic justice", or that alters Lear so as to produce a happy ending.

It has been suggested that this kind of truth is really no more than a piece of aesthetically necessary internal coherence, and Richards seems to take this view when he defines it as acceptability. But this does not do justice to the artist's conviction. He is persuaded that he is interpreting life, and that to twist his plot and his characters in an arbitrary and unlife-like way is not merely to fail in a piece of artistic contrivance; it is to falsify the facts of existence, and to perpetrate a lie. He must have "Truth above all," and if he merely indulges his fancy he "will never have any more respect for himself".

There is one important qualification. It will be remembered that we limited our consideration of this kind of sincerity to those occasions "when an artist is dealing seriously with character and action." But very often he is not attempting to do anything of the kind. He does not and cannot deal with all the various aspects and sorts of truth at the same time. In comedy, for instance, he may deal with men's failings and foibles with such concentration that he makes his characters types rather than real people, showing only one side of them as

1 For still further examples, see Harding - "The Anatomy of Inspiration" pp 44-5.
2 Richards - "Principles of Literary Criticism" p.269.
though they had no other; and in fact sometimes dealing with ways of behaviour rather than people. That side he treats with laughter. Although he knows that it may very well be a grave affair, yet for the moment he does not take it seriously; and because he is not concerned with the truth about whole men in a whole world, he can introduce all kinds of impossible situations, un lifelike accidents, and unexpected re formations. So long as they provide an opportunity for him to deal with the particular truths he is concerned with, their unlikelihood is no hindrance. Indeed it is a positive advantage; it all contributes to the expression of his feeling that life is sometimes best laughed at.

There is yet another sense in which the artist is sincere, and it is the deepest one: he does not deceive himself. Many a man who is not consciously insincere nevertheless tries to express feelings that have no real existence because he himself is deluded about them. He deceives himself into thinking that he feels compassion when he has in reality got no further than merely wanting to feel compassion, that he is thrilled with a sunset when he only wants to be thrilled with a sunset, or that he hates vice when he only knows that he ought to hate vice. But the great work of art is produced by a man who is not even unconsciously pretending to himself, one who is aware what his real feelings are.

Collingwood indeed holds that the failure to know one's own emotions produces the only kind of bad art there is, and that "corruption of consciousness is the same thing as bad art." We cannot agree that this is the whole truth about bad art, but it is one very important part of it. The sense of being in touch with truth and reality which is given by a great work of art comes perhaps from this cause more than any other, that the artist is aware of and is

expressing his real feelings.

One obvious qualification is needed in all this. Some kinds of artist are capable of entering into the experience of their characters, and writing from their point of view; as a dramatist, for example, can put himself into the place of Oedipus or Hamlet or Dr Faustus. The feelings that he then expresses are not to be taken as his own normal feelings about life, any more than the ideas he then expresses are to be taken as his own personal judgments; they are his feelings when he imaginatively identifies himself with the person and situation of his character. But they are, nevertheless feelings really experienced, not feelings pretended or merely desired to be experienced; they are feelings that he is aware of, not feelings about which he has deceived himself.

b) Detachment from self.

The attitude of the artist to himself is always of great importance. The value of a work of art may lie very largely in the fitness of that attitude, and a work which is otherwise good may be entirely spoilt if the artist's attitude to himself is wrong. Some of the fit attitudes to self have been mentioned already, but there is yet another for which the word detachment is probably the best description. By that we mean the artist's capacity to treat himself, his skill, and his feelings, in that objective kind of way in which he treats his other material, putting himself into the picture when his presence is relevant and leaving himself out when it is not; exhibiting his skill when such exhibition will serve his purpose, and concealing it when it will not; enjoying his feelings when they arise, but freely letting them go when they die down; not thrusting forward any part of himself for its own sake, but only in so far as it is good and necessary for his purpose, and when that purpose is accomplished, letting it go again into obscurity.
There are occasions when the right attitude is that of complete self-forgetfulness, and when the artist will express himself best by ignoring himself altogether. Sometimes, as Maritain says, "Art expresses the personality of the artist to the outside world in so far as the artist forgets his personality in his object."¹ He may rightly be so taken up with what he is saying that he does not consciously think of himself at all, and he may so point us to his subject that we look at the subject all the time and forget him who speaks of it. It is often true, as Edward Young says, that "a writer must be forgotten by his audience during the representation, if for ages he would be remembered by posterity."² Oscar Wilde puts the same view more succinctly when he says, "To reveal art and conceal the artist is art's aim."³

And yet this is not always true. When Charles Lamb writes his essays, he does not conceal himself; indeed a great deal of their charm lies in the fact that he makes us think about himself. So too with the Diary of Pepys, Dryden's Preface to the Fables and many more. Absolute self-forgetfulness is a quality that is not always necessary; and in works of humour and subjects of a light nature it is often not even desirable. But it becomes more desirable as the subject becomes more serious and weighty, and when we come to deal with matters of supreme importance it is usually a necessity. The great artist is sufficiently detached from himself to know this and practice it.

His attitude to his skill is similar. His art will from time to time require all the skill and craftsmanship he possesses; he will use it in whatever way will serve best at the moment. There are occasions for a poet deliberately to display his cleverness by finding a far-fetched rhyme, and for a singer to show

¹ Maritain - "Art and Scholasticism" p.98.
² Young - "Conjectures on original composition" (Eng. Crit. Essays 16-18 Cent. p.355)
³ Wilde - "The Picture of Dorian Gray" - Preface.
off the utmost flexibility of which the human voice is capable. When that is so, they do not hesitate to delight in their skill. But in great art, although extreme skill is generally required, it more often has to be concealed than exhibited. If it is necessary to show it, the artist may say "Look at me;" but more often he leaves it to have its effect without remark. A good deal of humility is needed for this detachment from self; not the false humility that will not come into the light for fear of being seen, but the true kind that will go into either light or dark so long as it may serve.

The artist's attitude to his feelings is equally one of detachment, though in a slightly different way. He does not consider them as something to be cultivated. He takes his subject, whatever it may be, plays with it in his mind, meditates upon it, tries it this way and that, and allows his feelings to develop naturally in regard to it. If they do not come, he knows they cannot be forced. When they do come, he allows them free access; and yet he thinks not about them, but about his subject. If his purpose requires that the feelings shall be described, he will describe them; though a description of emotions is always suspicious in art, for they arise while we are looking not at them but elsewhere. But he does not luxuriate in them, deliberately feed them, or prolong the experience for their sake. When he must move on to another part of his subject he does so, and when his feelings begin to die down, he does not try to cling to them. He is sufficiently detached from them to accept them gladly when they arise, and to relinquish them without regret when they leave.

f) Proportion

An attitude that is fitting is one that embodies a due sense of proportion; the feelings are in proportion to the matter which calls them into being, and distinctions are made between the importance and value of the various parts of
the subject.

It is impossible to define the fitting kind and degree of feeling that is due to any given subject. It depends on the attendant circumstances and the person concerned. We think it reasonable to be extremely interested in our pets in our leisure hours, but not when someone's life is in danger and our help and attention are urgently needed; we do not expect an adult to be absorbed in trivialities, but we think them quite a reasonable cause of excitement for a child; and we even draw distinctions between the sexes, expecting a woman's feelings about some subjects to be different from a man's. Nevertheless, although there are very wide limits to the degree of feeling that is fitting for any subject, such limits exist, and we know they may be overstepped in either direction.

There is feeling that is excessive. We see it in the state of mind we call maudlin, in that kind of sentimentality which lavishess the amount of care on a puppy that is only proper to a child, and in the extravagant spirit which is as distressed over a spoilt holiday as over a ruined life. Feeling in art that exceeds the needs of its subject is an aesthetic fault. In "To Anna Matilda", when Robert Merry's mistress momentarily refuses to open her eyes, he thereupon exclaims:

Conjure up demons from the main,
Storms upon storms indignant heap,
Bid ocean howl, and Nature weep,
Till the Creator blush to see
How horrible his world can be:

While I will glory to blaspheme,
And make the joys of hell my theme.

Now we are conscious that this is overdoing it; this particular provocation does not warrant such intensity and the poet is convicted of misproportion.

On the other hand, the fault is just as great, and often much more amusing,
when the amount of feeling is manifestly too slight. Bulwer Lytton is guilty of this deficiency of feeling in his poem "Going back again"

I dream'd that I walk'd in Italy,
When the day was going down,
By the water that silently wander'd by,
Thro' an old dim-lighted town.

Till I came to a palace fair to see,
Wide open the windows were.
My love at the window sat, and she
Beckon'd me up the stair ....

When I came to the little rose-colour'd room,
From the curtains out flew a bat,
The window was open, and in the gloom
My love at the window sat.

She sat with her guitar on her knee,
But she was not singing a note,
For someone had drawn (ah, who could it be?)
A knife across her throat.

Hyperbole and understatement may, of course, be used consciously for special purposes, and are often marvellously effective. Thus Donne, loving a lady who is true to someone else, may pronounce himself "Blasted with sighs and surrounded with tears"; he may declare that he desires to be turned into a mandrake so that he may groan, or into a fountain so that he may weep; he may cry out

O perverse sexe, where none is true but shee,
Who's therefore true, because her truth kills mee.¹

But that kind of overstatement is a conscious exaggeration for the sake of emphasis. At the other extreme, John Woolman may say that negro slavery, with its whippings, tortures, immoralities, and all its vile ways, manifests an attitude "distinguishable from that of the pure love of one's fellow men".²

But that again is a conscious device, and is used to avoid any slightest suggestion of easy condemnation. Such contrivances are very different from the

¹ Donne - "Twicknam Garden".
² Woolman - Journal.
unconscious excesses and deficiencies we have been considering.

Another kind of disproportion is to speak of great things as though they were small, and so to be flippant; or to take seriously what should be laughed at, or to treat heavily what should be treated lightly. We can see this last fault in Colley Cibber's "Birthday Ode" of 1743 -

Of fields, or forts, and floods, unknown to fame,
That now demand of Cesar's arms a name,
Sing, Britons, tho' uncouth the sound.

Air
Tho' rough Seligenstadt
The harmony defeat,
Tho' Klein-Ostein the verse confound;
Yet, in the joyful strain,
Aschaffenburg or Dettingen
Shall charm the ears they seem to wound.

One of the most important aspects of this sense of proportion is the artist's capacity to distinguish between the relative importance of the various parts of his subject, and to lay the emphasis in the right place and in the right degree. The old painters used to emphasise the important figures by making them larger than all the rest, so that they stood out and claimed the attention. Rembrandt often secured emphasis by throwing a high light upon the principal passage in his picture and setting the rest in shadow. Sometimes it is done by placing, by the convergence of lines, by colour, or by elaborating the important feature, and usually by many methods at once. Jan Steen, for example, in "The Poultry Yard" gives us a picture in which there is a great deal of very carefully painted detail that could easily receive too much emphasis, and detract from the most important figure which is that of a little girl who is feeding the lamb. In a naturalistic picture of this kind he cannot paint her larger than life, but he succeeds in giving her emphasis by placing her in an important central position, by giving her a light coloured dress which makes her stand out, by throwing a
strong light round about her, and by making the lines of his picture converge where she is.

As an example of too great an emphasis placed upon a subsidiary part of the subject we might cite the figure of Shylock in "The Merchant of Venice". He almost breaks the play in pieces because he is too large a figure for it. He attracts so much attention and invites so much sympathy that the play as a whole suffers from the excellence with which he is portrayed; he drags it off in the wrong direction, and it is only with difficulty that at the beginning of Act 5 it is wrenched back again. In a similar kind of way, though on an altogether different scale, Burne-Jones's "King Cophetua and the Beggar Maid" fails to be a good picture because the background receives nearly as much emphasis as the main figures, and indeed is really more interesting. This is the same kind of fault as that of the architect who made the window of his scullery larger than that of his dining room, the back entrance more imposing than the front, and the garage more ornate than the house.

Acceptance

One of the most important attitudes in art is that of acceptance. The artist, contemplating life with a sensitive and honest spirit, accepts it, and when we contemplate through his eyes, we learn to accept it also. This is the truth that lies at the root of the statement that "the end of poetry is to please," for a work of art pleases us in the sense that it presents life in such a way that it is acceptable.

It is easily seen that there are varying degrees of acceptance. There is the whole-hearted acceptance which produces joy, the grudging one which is resignation, and a multitude in between. Addison preferred beauty to be "softened with an Air of Melancholy or Sorrow",¹ and there have been many others.

¹ "The Spectator" No.418.
whose taste has run in the same direction; but in fact the more whole-hearted the acceptance the better, and joy shows a fuller reconciliation with life than mere resignation.

The attitude of acceptance towards life involves everything with which the artist has to deal. He must accept himself and his feelings. If the power of evil in the world terrifies him, he must accept that terror as a fact, and not pretend to himself that it does not exist. If he is continually fighting against himself and rejecting his feelings, his work is spoilt.

He must accept the materials with which he has to work. This is one reason why it is a virtue for him to appreciate their quality and capacity, and it is closely connected with the respect for them of which we have already spoken. Thus the architect must accept the nature of stone, brick, or concrete, and the structural necessities of his building. The painter must accept, and if possible enjoy, the nature of paint; and although different masters may emphasize different capacities in it, and so use it in different ways, they must all be content to take it for what it is.¹ The poet must accept words, with their meanings, sounds, connections and associations; the musician the timbre of his various instruments and the capacities they possess; the dramatist the uses and possibilities of action by a number of characters on a stage; and every artist the qualities and capabilities of his medium. If he is fighting all the time against his materials, and trying to make them do all sorts of things they are not really fitted for, he will produce work that is fundamentally unsatisfactory.

He must accept his audience. It may be that they are not the kind of

¹ "Chardin fascinates us with the quality of his paint, which shows few brush-marks and is soft and yet scintillating, like the rind of an orange. Reynolds delighted in paint which he described as having the consistency of the pulp of a grape. Fragonard’s paint flows like cream." - "The Approach to Painting" p.53
audience that he would really have preferred, but he must nevertheless take them as they are. If he is an orator addressing a crowd of people who are not as intelligent as he hoped they would be, he must adapt himself and his material accordingly. If he refuses to adapt himself and argues in a way that is above their heads, he will not only be unintelligible to them, but there will be a wrong tone about his whole speech. If he adapts his material but is obviously impatient all the time at the necessity of doing so, then again the result will be unpleasant.

Similarly the artist must accept his subject and his purpose. Acceptance must be, indeed, his attitude to everything he touches in his work; for it is an acceptance of life that we require of him, and if he possesses that, it will show itself everywhere.

It is clear that there are varying aspects of experience to be accepted. It is easy enough to accept that which seems to us good, but the acceptance of evil is a different matter. Nevertheless evil is also one of the things that art accepts, and both comedy and tragedy deal with it in their own way. Comedy accepts the world because its evil can be laughed at. But it has limitations. Not all evil can be laughed at, and even when we succeed in laughing, we cannot laugh for ever; the best jokes grow stale, and evils that may be laughed at once or twice become an irritation and annoyance if persisted in. Comedy is best suited to dealing with the more superficial aspects of life, and is a temporary method of acceptance. Tragedy accepts the world because, with all its evil, it is noble, rich, and good. Tragedy can take all experiences into its wide arms, great events and small, good and evil, grief and joy, and reconcile us to them all. What Bradley says of the tragic masterpieces of Shakespeare is true of all great tragedy,—"it is never depressing". The representation "does
not leave us crushed, rebellious, or desperate."\(^1\) There is "a feeling of acquiescence in the catastrophe, though it neither leads us to pass judgment on the characters nor diminishes the pity, the fear, and the sense of waste, which their struggle, suffering and fall evoke."\(^2\)

This attitude of acceptance is not incompatible with a wish that some things were different, nor even with a definite intent to alter them. Bradley says of Hegel's "Aesthetic" - "When he is speaking of the kind of tragedy he most approved, his language almost suggests that our feeling at the close of the conflict is, or should be, one of complete reconciliation. This it surely neither is nor can be. Not to mention the suffering and death we have witnessed, the very existence of the conflict, even if a supreme ethical power is felt to be asserted in its close, remains a painful fact, and, in large measure, a fact not understood. For though we may be said to see, in one sense, how the opposition of spiritual powers arises, something in us, and that the best, still cries out against it."\(^3\) There are, of course, in the tragic spectacle things that we would alter; but life as a whole is nevertheless felt to be a joyful and magnificent thing, and we accept it. Comedy too may show things that we would desire to alter, it may even be written by a satirist with a zeal for reformation. But if it is good comedy it nevertheless accepts life as a whole; disillusion and bitterness, if they come in, are artistic faults.

It is this need for acceptance that condemns all kinds of escapism in art. Art is not an escape from life, unless it is bad art. To allow one's self to be carried away into a dream world is a bad thing unless in that dream world one resolves one's problems and learns to accept reality. Withdrawal from
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\(^1\) Ibid p.25.  
\(^2\) Ibid p.35.  
\(^3\) Bradley - "Oxford Lectures on Poetry" p.83.
life often takes the form of a receding into the past, and that is why in art a persistent dwelling on "the dear dead days beyond recall" is always very suspicious; art should look forward rather than backward. The good art of the past was not an escape; it was a facing of the real life of the times. The healthiness of its attitude can still be felt, and genuine antiques have a great deal to say to us. But to imitate them now, and to pretend that we are living in the past is a different matter altogether. It cannot produce good art because it lacks this essential attitude of acceptance.

These, then, are the seven attitudes through which the artist must fit into his world and be integrated with it. In a perfect work all of them must be present. Some of them, indeed, are very closely allied, and can hardly be separated. Sensibility, for example, is partly controlled by interest, integrity, and acceptance. Some of them depend for their value on the quality of others. Acceptance, for example, is not necessarily valuable by itself, for one may feel that life is very acceptable merely because one resolutely shuts one's eyes to everything in it that is uncomfortable; and therefore acceptance needs to be joined with sensibility. Similarly sensibility is not enough by itself; for one can be highly sensitive to life and yet reject it with disgust. But even those attitudes that do not so directly affect each other are necessary, and a work will suffer if it lacks any of them. It may of course have considerable value without being perfect, and there are many important works that embody some of these attitudes and not others. Thus Keats is a great and sensitive poet, although he tends to wrap himself up in his own feelings; and Wycherley is a notable playwright, although his acceptance of life is incomplete. But an imperfection in any of these attitudes is a serious matter, and if any one of them
is strongly contradicted, then the work is usually unbearable, even though all
the rest may be affirmed.

But although all these attitudes should be present, none of them needs to
be expressed in any one particular way. One architect may display all the
mechanics of his building and another may conceal them; one painter may show
his sensibility by scrupulously accurate perspective, another may sacrifice
perspective for the sake of emphasising mass, and another may sacrifice mass for
line; one poet may delight mainly in the sound of words and another mainly in
the sense; one musician may get his effects mainly by melodic line and another
by harmonic colour; one dramatist may concentrate on dialogue and another on
situation and character. It is no more necessary that everyone should use the
same methods than that all musicians should play the same instruments. What
matters is that these attitudes to life should be expressed and not denied;
exactly how they are to be expressed is for the individual artist to decide for
himself.

There are also many different emphases and balances of the various attitudes
that are possible. For example, there are two great groups in art which are
labelled classic and romantic. Romantic art stresses width of sensibility and
takes in as much of life in a single view as possible, as much feeling, as many
ideas, as great a variety as it can. Classic art starts from the other end,
with pattern, acceptance, and the resulting feeling of peace; to get these
perfect it may reduce the intensity of the passions it contemplates, and limit
the aspects of life it includes in its scope. Yet at their highest these two
ways meet; the Romantic succeeds in bringing about a complete acceptance, and
the Classic succeeds in taking into its peace the intensity and variety of the
Romantic; so that, as Croce says, if we go to the work of the greatest masters,
we "find ourselves unable to call the great portions of these works romantic or classic . . . . because they are both."1

These various kinds of integration - of the work, of the mind within itself, and of the mind with its world - can now be seen to account for many of the effects of art which we enumerated at the beginning of this section.

The connection between art and feeling was dealt with under the heading of expression, but we can now add that with an increased interest and sensibility such as the artist has, any feelings that are present will be more vivid than those of the ordinary man under ordinary circumstances.

The sense of peace that is found in art will be due partly, no doubt, to the fact that feeling has been expressed. It will also be partly due to the fact that our mind achieves a sense of mastery over a thing when it is able to arrange its constituent parts in a pattern. It will be due still more to the internal integration of our minds in an experience where everything that happens is relevant, and where no expectations are aroused that are not satisfied. But it will be due most of all to the attitude of acceptance by which we are reconciled to life and enabled to find in it our satisfaction.

The sense of value comes from the fact that such a state of mind, integrated within itself and with the world without, has great worth; and the attitudes involved in it are self-authenticating as good and right. In art we achieve for the time being a good and sound state of mind, and it cannot but be recognised as good and sound.

The sense of purpose is the direct outcome of the unity of the work of art. Kant says that the purposiveness of the object arises from our feeling that it is adapted to our minds, so that it can be known by us.2 It is, of course, true

1 Croce - "The Essence of Aesthetic" p.29.
2 See Kant - "Kritik of Judgment" Intro. par.7, p.32; 1.1.23.p.103; and 1.1.32. p.154.
that the object is adapted to our minds, and that will perhaps produce some sense of purpose. But the most important reason for this feeling of purpose is that all the parts of the object are adapted to each other, that it is a unity, with every part either preparing for another, or answering and balancing another. It is purposeful because it is the purpose of every part to be related to the rest.

The sense of truth found in a work of art is due partly to the artist's sensitiveness to life, which enables him to see truths not commonly apprehended, and to reveal things not ordinarily seen. It is due also to his respect for life, and his appreciation of its qualities; and perhaps most of all to his sincerity.

The pleasure derived from art comes to us because more impulses are brought together into one experience than is usual with us, and we live more vividly. It comes because we have found a good and rightly adjusted state of mind, and a good state is always for us a satisfying state. And it comes because we have learnt to find life acceptable; sometimes indeed only with difficulty, but often with enthusiasm.

It seems, then, that we have satisfactorily accounted for all the effects of art except one. Nothing has yet been found that has much bearing on the sense it gives us of being in contact with ultimate reality. That will involve a consideration of the intuitions.
IV. INTUITION

1. The subject matter of Art

Any intuition may rightly find a place in a work of art so long as it does not contradict the various necessary attitudes that have just been considered. If the artist's intuition is that sensitiveness, sincerity, acceptance, etc. are evil things, then he is obviously going to produce a bad work of art. But short of that direct kind of contradiction, any intuition may be incorporated into his work, and subjects are fit for his use.

The artist is not limited, for instance, to such things as are good, beautiful, or pleasant. He may very well include the bad, repulsive, ugly, unpleasant, terrible, or irritating. It has very commonly been supposed that the horrible is not a fit subject for art; but that is to deny the tradition of all the ages. Velázquez paints for us not only the beautiful figure of Venus, but hideous dwarfs; Gothic builders give us distorted and tortured gargoyles; Shakespeare gives us murderers, adulterers, pimps, bawds, mad women, an Iago who is horrible, and a Caliban who is monstrous; Picasso shows men and women half-animal and half-machine, with their spirits in prison and their nature disintegrating; Beethoven shakes us with fear; and Scriabin shocks us with discords. The great artist is indeed very likely to give us the unpleasant as well as the pleasant; for, as we have said, he is sensitive to the whole of a situation, sincere enough to face it both in its attractiveness and its grimness, and mature enough to accept both its joy and its suffering. In fact the greatest of our works of art are those that face the evil and unpleasantness of life. It is easy to see why that should be so; for it is a much greater achievement to be integrated with the things that are difficult to endure than with those that are easy, and to accept suffering than to accept pleasure.
Just as the artist in deciding upon his subject matter is under no necessity of choosing between the good and the bad, neither is he under any necessity of choosing between the general and the particular. There has been much discussion about whether art is concerned with particular or universal truth; but when we come to examine actual examples, we find that it may be concerned with either. Its representations may be as generalised as heraldic
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1 Many writers have held the former. For example, Giambattista Vico says "poetical statements ...... are formed with feelings of passion and emotion, whereas philosophical statements are formed by reflection with reasoning. Hence the latter approach truth as they rise to the universals, the former are more certain the nearer they approach the particulars." ("The New Science". The elements,53) Baumgarten holds that it is "the ideas of individuals" that "are eminently poetical" ("Philosophical thoughts on matters connected with poetry", 19,) Bergson states that except for comedy "art always aims at what is individual. What the artist fixes on his canvas is something he has seen at a certain spot, on a certain day, at a certain hour, with a colouring that will never be seen again" ("Laughter" p.161). Ruskin says that "in art, particular truths are usually more important than general ones" ("Modern Painters" i,64.), and that the "whole power" of poetry consists "in the clear expression of what is singular and particular." (Ibid. iii,9.)

But it is easy to put another point of view. "Poetry" says Aristotle, "is more philosophical and a higher thing than History; for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. By the universal I mean how a person of a certain type will on occasion speak or act, according to the law of probability or necessity." ("Poetics" p.35.) As we might expect, the 18th century expresses the same sort of principle. Reynolds belittles the "dry, Gothic, and even insipid manner" of early Raphael, "which attends to the minute accidental discriminations of particular and individual objects", and contrasts it with his later "grand style of painting which improves partial representation by the general and invariable ideas of nature." ("Discourses on Art". 1.) He says "the whole beauty and grandeur of the Art consists, in my opinion, in being able to get above all singular forms, local customs, particularities, and details of every kind." (Ibid.3.) The painter must "disregard all local and temporary ornaments, and look only on those general habits which are everywhere and always the same." (Ibid.3.) "With him the clothing is neither woollen, nor linen, nor silk, satin, or velvet: it is drapery - it is nothing more". (Ibid.4.) He would have his students imitate Nature, but "Disfigurement is not Nature, but an accidental deviation from her accustomed practice." (Ibid.7.) So also Ruskin (who so often is to be found on both sides of the argument;) "No accidental violation of Nature's principles should be represented." ("Modern Painters" p.63.) So also Wordsworth says that the object of poetry "is truth, not individual and local, but general and operative." (Preface to "Lyrical Ballads".)
animals, or as individual as the painting of all the blemishes of Ghirlandaio's "Bottle-nosed man"; its occasion may be a scene in average daylight, or a momentary impression of extraordinary weather like Constable's Salisbury Cathedral; its concern may be the "lesser celandine" or "the ways of God to man". Generally speaking the Classics stress the universal and general, and the Romantics the strange, exceptional, individual and particular.

It is, however, true that because the particular feels more interesting and real there is a universal fondness for it in art. But what is of prime importance is the fact that even when the artist is dealing with the particular, it is the particular linked up with the general; and although he may be ostensibly giving us one individual thing, yet that one thing is felt as a type or sample of the many. One would expect this to be so, because the artist wants to bring as much of life into one whole as possible, and the individual is in actual fact a sample of the general - the artist's materials are samples of all such material, his audience of all audiences, and his subject of some whole aspect of life. So when the poet, for example, portrays a particular man in a particular environment, he shows us something more than a mere individual; he shows us humanity. We do not merely say "What a piece of work is Othello, or Hamlet, or Lear!", but "What a piece of work is man!" The poet, in showing us his conception of one man, and in convincing us that this conception is true to life, inevitably reveals something about the weaknesses and capabilities of human nature. It may be only part of the truth about human nature, but it is a real part, and has to be taken into account in our dealings with men and all our thoughts about ourselves; it underlies all experience.

Carritt and others hold that the artist's characters are lifelike merely because they are coherent. The universality of Aristotle, says Carritt, when it
is analysed turns out to be "a consistent intuitability, or imaginable individuality which may be considered a truth of coherence and consistency rather than of correspondence to facts. 1

We agree that the characters of Shakespeare, for example, are not generalised types, but nevertheless they are samples of humanity, and can only be imagined as real because they share the qualities which we know to be real qualities of mankind. Of those qualities internal consistency is a very important one, but it is not the only one necessary; Iago as a character is coherent enough, but there are many who find him inhuman and unconvincing all the same, and it is easy to imagine characters quite coherent within themselves, always acting and speaking as such men would do under the given circumstances, but so unnaturally bad or unnaturally good, or in some other way false to human nature, as to be quite obviously impossible and untrue. Here coherence may make a convincing monster or devil or fairy (though even then the poet will be hard put to it not to suggest anything that is universally true of human nature), but it will not make a convincing man. A man must be a representative of humanity, and in portraying for us one individual man, the artist reveals to us something about the whole race.

He reveals indeed even more than the nature of humanity; for whether he deals with particular or general truths or with some of both, he also conveys to us the fact that he is dealing through them with the whole of life. In Matthew Arnold's phrase, art is "a criticism of life." 2 "The poet," says Bradley, "speaks to us of one thing, but in this one thing there seems to lurk the secret of all." 3 In Shakespeare, says the same writer, "we seem to have before us a

1 Carritt - "The Theory of Beauty" p.88. See also pp.54-87.
2 Arnold - "Critical Essays" ii, p.5.
The type of the mystery of the whole world, the tragic fact which extends far beyond the limits of tragedy. So art has been called "the expression of an emotion for ultimate reality;" "an expression of a man's sense of the spiritual significance of the universe," "mankind's effort to achieve integration with the basic forms of the physical universe and the organic rhythms of life." Its final concern is not Hamlet, or a nightingale, or a block of civic offices, or a musical representation of Falstaff, or even human nature, but nothing less than the universe itself.

This sense of being concerned with the whole of life is due to the fact that the attitudes which the artist expresses are, as it were, detachable. In any one of his works they are seen in a particular application, but they exist apart from this particular application, and they are not only a way of approaching this situation, but a way of approaching life. The artist's way of looking at these things is a way of looking at all things. When he communicates his attitude to us, we are not made merely sensitive, sincere, accepting, etc. about this particular situation; we achieve these attitudes in a general way, and find that sensitiveness, sincerity, acceptance, are of universal value and application. We have learnt not only a way of living now, but a way of living always.

It is in music that one probably sees most clearly how attitudes are detachable in this way, because music as a rule does not try to make an intellectual statement about anything. The composer's experience may originate in his attitude to one particular thing, but that seldom matters to the listener, and usually he does not even know what it is. Beethoven told Neare that he
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1 Bradley - "Shakespearian Tragedy" p.23.  
2 Bell - "Art" p.103.  
3 Dearmer - "Art and Religion" p.3.  
4 Read - "Education through Art" p.110.
"never worked without a picture in his mind," but we do not know what his pictures were, nor do we need to know. Many of Haydn's symphonies have a narrative programme as their basis, but in most cases the composer has left no clue to the story he had in mind. We know that one represents God speaking to a hardened sinner and beseeching him to mend his ways, and another the emigration of a poor man to America, his voyage, success, and return; but we do not know which symphonies these are. We appreciate his work without knowing his thought; and evidently he knew that that would be so, for he took no steps to reveal it. Where members of an audience supply ideas of their own as a kind of programme, they may be totally different from one another, and it is quite easy for a piece of music to suggest the ripple of a stream to one person and the rustle of a breeze to another, and yet for both to receive and understand the experience the composer had to convey. What we get from music, therefore, is not a way of approaching some particular picture that a composer may have had in his mind, but a way of approaching life, something of universal validity.

Although music does not generally convey a picture, the representative arts of course do. There the subject is usually very important, and the attitudes expressed must recognisably fit it; but, even so, they are bigger than their immediate application, and can be transferred even to other subjects. Just as to be worried about one thing tends to make one worry about all things, and to be filled with joy at one thing makes one look with brighter eyes at the whole

1 Ernest Walker - "Beethoven".
2 Percy Scholes tells how Francesco Berger once wrote a pianoforte piece and invited three brother composers to hear it and tell him what it "meant". The "meanings" suggested were (1) Daybreak as seen from the lowest gallery of a Welsh coal mine; (2) a bear hunt in Russia; (3) an enamoured couple whispering love vows. But the intention of the composer had been musically to illustrate the discovering of the infant Moses in the bulrushes! ("The Oxford Companion to Music" p.737) For other examples see the Appendix to Bosanquet's "History of Aesthetics".
of life; so to have a sense of proportion about the things with which a work of art is concerned is to develop a sense of proportion everywhere, interest in one subject overflows and becomes an interest in life, and respect for one thing for its own sake spreads into a respect for everything for its own sake.

It is this fact that makes it possible for us to recognise a man's style. Everything a great artist produces is marked with his particular way of approach, and it is in a real sense partly the same way of approach whatever the subject with which he deals. Dr. Johnson may talk about infidels, babies, Scotsmen, or blades of grass, but it is always unmistakably Dr. Johnson talking; his general attitude to life goes into everything he says. Style "is not expressive of the meaning of that particular sentence,"¹ it expresses a way of approaching life.

It is clear, then, that in art we find in one thing the secret of all; that we learn a way of living, not merely in respect of this occasion, but of all occasions; that we find certain attitudes of mind to be satisfying, not only in regard to a certain subject, but in themselves, and therefore in regard to all subjects. What art gives us is an attitude to life, and ultimately it is life itself which is its subject.

2. Particular intuitions that may be expected in art.

Although art may include intuitions about anything in the universe, yet because of its nature there are certain intuitions that we should expect to find there. Some of them are inevitable, and others are so common in great works that they are thought of as being characteristic of art.

a) First there are the intuitions that, if all we have said so far is true, are inevitable. These are intuitions about the relationship between the artist

and his world. We are now calling them intuitions about life, but they are really just another way of stating the integration of the artist and his world: for it is all one whether we say that he is interested in life, or that he finds life interesting; that he feels respect for an object, or that he feels the object worthy of respect; that he accepts the universe, or that he finds it acceptable.

The artist intuits the world as being integrated with himself, as being in some way adapted to him. "Beauty" says Santayana, "is a pledge of the possible conformity between the soul and nature."\(^1\) Wordsworth puts it more strongly. "The poet", he says," considers man and nature as essentially adapted to each other", and it is because of this that he "is prompted by a feeling of pleasure which accompanies him through the whole course of his studies."\(^2\)

But the artist sees the world not only as adapted to man and his needs, but as having value in itself. It is independent of man, has its own laws and ways, existed before man, and would continue its life and being without him. If he respects it, that is because in its own nature it is worthy of respect.

Moreover this spectacle and the experiences which it makes possible, whether taken in bulk or examined in the most minute detail, are fascinating and enthralling. He is interested in it because its very nature makes it impossible for him to be otherwise. He does not feel interest as something that he brings, but as something that is drawn out of him whether he wills it or not.

The artist also intuits the world as acceptable. At one extreme he may feel it rather grudgingly to be bearable, or at the other he may feel like Paul Claudel when he said, "Long before I was a Christian I heard a chorus from
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1 George Santayana - "The Sense of Beauty" p.67.
2 Wordsworth - "Preface to Lyrical Ballads".
Antigone and the Ninth Symphony of Beethoven, and I knew them to be celestial
documents; I knew that great and divine joy is the only reality." But in one
degree or another he intuits the world as possible of acceptance.

All these feelings go to produce a sense of the goodness of the universe.
"In art," says Carritt, "the world, although it does not satisfy all our
cravings, is good, not demonstrably for the understanding, but to the impartial
intuition." ¹ "This world's no blot for us nor blank," says Browning in "Fra
Lippo Lippi"; "it means intensely, and means good." And this is true although
it may include all kinds of wickedness, suffering, stupidity and ugliness.

b) There are other intuitions in art which are not inevitable, but which
because of the nature of art are likely to be common. They are indeed found so
frequently in the great works of art that they have often been thought to be
necessary in all. First of all, the artist is likely to intuit life itself as
integrated. In his attempt to make an integrated work of art, he is brought
face to face with a world which is itself full of actual correspondences, where
one thing is continually found to be fitting in with something else. He tries
to express the things of the spirit through the things of matter, and finds
there is a relationship between these two that makes such expression possible.
He tries to express himself in pattern, and finds himself in a world full of
already existing patterns which admirably suit his purpose. He seeks objects
through which he may express his feelings, and finds many that seem to correspond
with them already; so that he can identify himself first with one thing and
then another, "continually", as Keats says,"filling some other body"²; and in
this empathy "the distinction between the self and the object disappears"³.

³ Lipps - "Einfühlung, innere Nachahmung und Organempfindungen" Trans. in
because they are so closely adapted to one another. He wants to communicate his mind, and knows that there is something common between him and his audience that makes communication possible. In his excitement he seeks for similes and metaphors, and he finds that correspondences between things actually exist, and that a principle discovered in one place may be found in many another. These are facts which he meets in his actual work, and it would be astonishing indeed if his sensitive spirit did not feel from time to time that it was working in a world where all things were joined together into one.

In actual fact we find that he very often does feel that, especially (as we should expect) in works that are on a large scale. No doubt it is this feeling of life as a unity that gives rise to the frequent pantheism and the sense of immanence that one finds in the poets,

\[
\text{Of something far more deeply interfused,}
\text{Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,}
\text{And the round ocean and the living air,}
\text{And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;}
\text{A motion and a spirit that impels}
\text{All thinking things, all objects of all thought}
\text{And rolls through all things.}
\]

But whether doctrines of pantheism or immanence are present or not, the unity of life is very often intuited in art. What the theologian believes, and what the scientist takes as a working hypothesis, the artist feels.

c) The artist is likely to have and convey to us intuitions of the universe as being full of purpose. This is very closely connected with the foregoing; indeed it is in part another aspect of the same thing.

We have seen that a sense of purpose is one of the characteristics of a work of art, and that it is produced by all the parts having the purpose of fitting

\[1\] Wordsworth - "Tintern Abbey".
together into one whole. When the artist sets about producing a work of this kind, he finds that the world itself is composed of objects whose parts fit together to form a whole, and which therefore seem designed. The figure of a man, for example, is a balanced and whole figure, with every part aesthetically indispensable. It might have been otherwise, for it is necessary for him to have pairs of limbs of various kinds, and duality is the soul of disunion.

The only way in which pairs can be united into one whole is to make each member of the pair complementary, and this is done with hands, feet, eyes, and indeed every pair of parts. They are all inflected so that no single member is symmetrical, but each demands the other for its completion. And as with the human body, so with plants, flowers, animals, birds, fishes, insects, and indeed every living creature; for Nature will not tolerate a duality.\footnote{For the whole subject of this and the following paragraph, see Trystan Edwards - "The Things which are seen" pp. 111-175.}

The artist also finds that the things of nature produce a sense of purpose by their apparently intentional completeness. Just as his own works conclude and do not merely stop, and as he often produces this effect of completeness by emphasising their boundaries; so he finds that Nature does the same, terminating the human arm with a hand, the human finger with a nail (which itself is also punctuated at the top and bottom), the wings of a butterfly with a change of colouration, the leaf of a tree by the reversing of the curves to form a point, and so on with almost everything one can mention.

In the useful arts of course there is an actual purpose to be served, and the artist desires to emphasise the fitness of his work to fulfil it. In seeking methods by which this can be done, he finds himself once again learning from the world about him. For example, a tree suggests its firm stability by
broadening out towards the ground, and so he makes his columns broaden out, and by the same means achieves the same impression. Living growth looks as if it is designed to exercise an upward thrust, and so he makes use of its forms in his capitals, and thus suggests that his pillars are well adapted for their purpose of support. Thus here again his work brings him into contact with the sense of purposefulness that there is in natural forms.

There are in Nature and life other evidences also of relationships between the parts that produce a sense of purpose. The proportions of the Golden Section are often found in plants and natural forms; relationships in realms apparently so far distant as astronomy and chemistry and music seem alike to follow definite mathematical principles; and in every realm events work themselves out in laws of cause and effect which notoriously are very often felt as embodying purpose.

The world is in fact one in which things marvellously fit together and seem predisposed for each other's use, and a sensitive spirit necessarily feels from time to time that this cannot be all pure accident. The artist, therefore, is likely to go beyond the intuition that the parts of his immediate subject are bound together in a relationship of purpose, and to reach out to the intuition that the world itself is a purposeful world.

d) The artist is likely to have and convey to us intuitions of the Absolute. Gentile says, "a poem is a single word; a whole, infinite and absolute. It is neither part of a greater whole, nor has it parts of its own." And Leon adds, "the aesthetic object is complete, self-sufficient, isolated, a universe, and a true individual .... It is this which chiefly gives it its claim to being absolute or typical of the absolute." If a work of art is a unity, whole and
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1 Carritt - "Philosophies of Beauty" p.322. (Extasks from Gentile - "The Philosophy of Art")
2 Ibid pp. 287-8. (Extasks from Leon - "Aestheice Knowledge")
complete in itself, then it is necessarily in some way isolated from the rest of experience. It is set, as it were, in a frame—sometimes indeed set actually in a frame; its lines are directed inwards, not to that which is without; the expectations which it arouses of itself are satisfied by itself; it fulfils its own desires, its parts mutually balance one another, and not one of them is a foreign irruption from an outer world nor an incursion into it. It is not something different from life, but, even though it is made of the same stuff, it is detached from it.

Even in the useful arts the work feels complete in itself. The aesthetic experience which it gives does not involve actual use, but only the contemplation of suitability for use. The thought of the purpose for which the work is designed is a part of its aesthetic meaning, but not the putting into action of that purpose. The object is satisfying to look at, and whether it is actually going to be used or not is, for aesthetic purposes, completely irrelevant. For the time being it is detached from the progression of life.

Thus although it is not strictly accurate to say that a work of art is absolute, yet it does give to us an experience which is in a way complete in itself, and the work is therefore felt as absolute.

When the mind has come into contact with something that feels absolute, it is obvious that it will often seek to go further. It cannot rest merely in a sense of absoluteness, for ultimately there can only be one absolute. The synthesis of art, says Leon, "points to some experience where all the past, all experience, is resumed and preserved all in one in an immediate unity." And so from a sense of absoluteness the aesthetic experience often moves forward to a

1 See Richards - "Principles of Literary Criticism" pp 74-80.
sense of being in contact with the ultimate reality which is The Absolute.

(a) The artist is likely to have and convey to us intuitions of the eternal. The artist's mind is integrated, his attention concentrated and undistracted by the irrelevant, and he therefore has an experience of timelessness. This experience is not of course confined to art, but is common to all states of concentrated attention. Von Hugel, in "Eternal Life", writing about the Dionysiac ecstasy, says, "All states of trance, or indeed of rapt attention, notoriously appear to the experiencing soul, in proportion to their concentration, as timeless, i.e. as non-successive, simultaneous, hence as eternal. They appear thus to the soul, if not during, at least soon after, the experience." But although this sense of eternity may be experienced under other conditions, it is perhaps more often felt in connection with some form of art than anywhere else.

The best statement of this aspect of the artistic experience is one that has often been quoted for various purposes. It is in a letter supposed to have been written by Mozart to one of his friends. Jahn considers it to be a fabrication, but even if it be written by someone else it is a true piece of insight, and expresses very well the actual feeling that the artist has. — "When I am, as it were, completely myself, entirely alone, and of good cheer, say travelling in a carriage, or walking after a good meal, or during the night when I cannot sleep; it is on such occasions that my ideas flow best and most abundantly .... Those ideas that please me I retain in memory, and am accustomed, as I have been told, to hum them to myself. If I continue in this way, it soon occurs to me how I may furnish this or that morsel to account so

1 Von Hugel — "Eternal Life" p. 27.
as to make a good dish of it .... All this fires my soul, and provided I am
not disturbed, my subject enlarges itself, becomes methodised and defined, and
the whole, though it be long, stands almost complete and finished in my mind,
so that I can survey it, like a fine picture or a beautiful statue, at a glance.
Nor do I hear in my imagination the parts successively, but I hear them, as it
were, all at once."

To be thus absorbed in a work of art is indeed to exist in a state which is
timeless. Even where the work of art exists only by means of time, like music,
poetry, or the dance, one feels it, "if not during, at least soon after, the
experience," as "non-successive, simultaneous, hence as eternal".

This sense of eternity which is found in a work of art varies very greatly
in depth, depending probably on how much of the personality is engaged. In a
slight work, dealing with only a few impulses, and those of a nature not very
fundamental, it may not be very striking; but in a great work the impression is
commonly very deep.

1) The artist is likely to have and convey to us intuitions of powers
independent of humanity, in many ways not subject to human influence, and
sometimes, even, themselves directing and controlling man.

The artist's experience all the time he is working is of things not wholly
subject to him. His material, whether it is wood, paint, iron, sound, colour
or anything else, has its own independent existence and characteristics, and
any attempt to misuse it invites failure. It has laws of its own, and lays
down conditions about the kind of thing the artist can produce; if he wants to
make anything of value the conditions must be obeyed.

Similarly, his subject may also resist his efforts. A plot will demand to
work itself out in a certain way, and it may not be the way the artist had
intended; a character will demand to develop in accordance with its own nature, and may refuse to fit into the limits he had ordained for it; a scene may refuse to express his feelings, and he may have to alter it or abandon it altogether.

More important still, the artist finds that his feelings are not subject to the control of his will. They may be violently opposed to what he would like to feel, or they may be so dull and sluggish that they hardly seem to exist at all. But they cannot be manufactured or changed by will power; they must be taken as they are. All the artist can do is to collect his material, meditate upon it, arrange it and re-arrange it, until the thing that he wants happens; and it may never happen at all.

It is also quite common for the artist to feel that he himself is being controlled, and that his work has been in some way "given" to him. Thus Blake confessed that he wrote at times without premeditation and even against his will; Goethe was conscious that his songs had him in their power; George Eliot spoke of a "not herself" which took possession of her; Tchaikovsky felt as if he were possessed by some supernatural force; Elgar considered that he was the "all but unconscious medium" by which his works had come into being; and so on. There is often a great deal of effort both before and after the inspiration, but there is something in the coming of the idea which marks it as a mysterious gift; it has not been produced by the will but has come from somewhere else.¹

Since these are the conditions under which the artist works, one is not surprised that he often infuses into his work a sense of being in contact with power outside himself, altogether bigger than man, and even sometimes controlling him. In some kinds of art, notably the tragic and sublime, such a power is

¹ See Harding - "The Anatomy of Inspiration" for the whole subject and for many more examples.
regularly felt, sometimes left undefined, but not infrequently experienced as
finite. Bradley, expounding Hegel's theory of tragedy, points out that "the
ultimate agent in the catastrophe is emphatically not the finite power of one
side. It is beyond both and at any rate in relation to them, boundless." And
in dealing with the subject on his own account, he notes that in Shakespeare's
tragic world, "individuals, however great they may be and however decisive their
actions may appear, are so evidently not the ultimate power."^g)
The artist is likely to have and convey to us intuitions of the infinite.
It is easy to see that the intuitions we have already dealt with - the unity of
life, the absolute, the eternal, and the controlling power - will contribute to
a general sense of being in contact with that which is without limit or bound.
Thus Croce, for example, among many more, notes as one of the characteristics
of poetic expression, "infinity" - "or as it is also called, the 'universal' or
'metkosmik' character of poetry."^3

This sense of infinity is seen most clearly as part of the experience of the
sublime. Bradley shows that the sublime has a greatness which is "sometimes
measurable, but is always unmeasured;"^4 and so, he says, "we may say that all
sublimity .... is an image of infinity; for in all, through a certain check or
imitation and the overcoming of it, we reach the perception or the imaginative
idea of something which, on the one hand, has a positive nature, and on the other
is either not determined as finite or is determined as infinite."^5

This feeling of the presence of the infinite is not limited, however, to what
we call the sublime. In the essay just quoted, Bradley goes on to say that we

Encyclopaedia Britannica. Article - Aesthetics. (14th ed.)
Ibid p.61.
must not consider the sublime superior to the beautiful, "for the beautiful too, though in a different way, is an image of infinity .... and in moments when beauty fills our souls we know what Wordsworth meant when he said, 'the least of things seemed infinite,' though each thing, being one of many, must, from another point of view here suppressed, be finite. Beauty, then, we may perhaps say, is the image of the total presence of the Infinite within any limits it may choose to assume; sublimity the image of its boundlessness, and of its rejection of any pretension to independence or absoluteness on the part of its finite forms; the one the image of its immansence, the other of its transcendency."

There are those who would go still further and apply to all art what has just been stated of the sublime and the beautiful. They would say that "there is no artistic representation which does not lift the mind above that mortal world to which all particular things and men belong, by giving us a vision of something infinite." Thus Ruskin, discussing Turner, says "if we wish, without reference to beauty of composition, or any other interfering circumstances, to form a judgment of the truth of painting, perhaps the very first thing we should look for, whether in one thing or another - foliage, or clouds, or waves, - should be the expression of infinity always and everywhere, in all parts and divisions of parts. For we may be quite sure that what is not infinite cannot be true." And he goes so far as to suggest in detail how infinity is expressed. It is doubtful however whether all forms of art give some a sense of the presence of the infinite. Certainly it is much more obvious in some works than others. In Sir Thomas Browne the sense of infinity is
overwhelming, and in "Jesu, joy of man's desiring" it is unmistakable, but one could very well describe the effect of "The School for Scandal" without mentioning it.

Its presence in art seems due not only to its close association with the intuitions already mentioned, but also to the fact that it is an important part of our experience when we are feeling and thinking seriously and deeply. If this is so, then of course when the artist deals with great matters, he cannot help but feel and express it. As Roger Fry notes, these "feelings to which the name of the cosmic emotion has been somewhat unhappily given ... become of great importance in the arts," because "they seem to belong to certain very deep springs of our nature."\(^1\)

This last comment applies to all these intuitions which we have said are commonly found in art. The degree in which one is made conscious of them varies enormously, and sometimes they are hardly noticeable at all. But, as we have seen, the artist is predisposed by the conditions of his work to feel them. The result is that when they are not consciously in his mind, they often make themselves felt as accompanying undertones; and when he is deliberately and consciously dealing with some aspect of reality to which they are specially relevant, when he is descending to the "very deep springs of our nature," then they are expressed in their full power.

Of the various effects which art has on the mind as described in section I, only one remained unaccounted for at the end of the last section, namely the sense of contact with ultimate reality. We are able to see now how that arises. It does so because a work of art gives intuitions not merely about its own subject-matter, but about life in general; and in particular gives intuitions of

\(^1\) Roger Fry - "Vision and Design" p.31.
the Absolute, the Eternal, the Controlling Power, and the Infinite.
ART IN WORSHIP
I. ART AND FEELING IN WORSHIP

We have seen that Christian worship is in part a matter of feeling, and we have also seen that feeling is the essential material of art. It is clear therefore that at this point art and worship are working with the same material.

1. Art communicating feelings in worship.

One of the difficulties of worship lies in the fact that our feelings are so little under our own control. If we are dull, heavy, and lifeless, we cannot make ourselves feel, and to try to do so is fatal to all reality. Feeling is a by-product that comes and goes while we are engaged in something else. Nevertheless for full and complete worship right feeling is essential. It is a most important fact, therefore, that when our own feelings are absent or inadequate or wrong, we can have communicated to us by means of art the right and good feelings which we lack.

a) It is intended that worship should be in part an intuitive experience. God's presence should in some degree be a felt presence. If our worship is healthy, then just as we have intuitions on other subjects in other parts of our life, so we should have intuitions here. Ecstasy and trance and the more intense forms of mysticism are foreign to the experience of most people, but what Professor Pratt calls "the milder form of mystic experience" is, we believe, known to all Christian men. He defines it as "the sense of the presence of a being or reality through other means than the ordinary perceptive processes or the reason. It is the sense or feeling of this presence, not the belief in it, and it is not the result of sight or hearing or touch, nor is it a conclusion one reaches by thought; it is, instead, an immediate and intuitive experience."\(^1\)

So the Christian liturgies use quite naturally the words of mystical

---

\(^1\) Pratt - "The Religious Consciousness". p.337.
experience as the expression of the feelings of the congregation; they take it for granted that the ordinary Christian man can join in the experience of Isaiah in the temple who saw the Lord high and lifted up, and that he can join with the angels and archangels in saying, "Heaven and earth are full of thy glory."

The Christian is intended to intuit not merely God's presence, but his nature, particularly his love - to have an assurance within himself that God is love, and that He loves him. In the days of the early church this assurance filled men with such stress of emotion that they cried out aloud, "Abba, Father"; and although our ways are changed, and we are more reluctant to express emotion publicly, yet it is still true that the Spirit should bear witness with us that we are God's children. We should know it, not merely because we have apprehended it with our reason, but because we are assured of it in our feelings. "Suppose," says John Wesley, "God were now to speak to any soul, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' - he must be willing that soul should know his voice; otherwise he would speak in vain. And he is able to effect this; for, whenever he wills, to do is present with him. And he does effect: that soul is absolutely assured, 'This voice is the voice of God'." God speaks thus to all his sons; he desires them to know his voice, and if they listen they will hear. If they cannot explain it to one who has not had that experience, it is because it is not a thing made clear by reason only but by feeling. It is "an inward impression on the soul, whereby the Spirit of God immediately and directly witnesses to my spirit, that I am a child of God; that Jesus Christ hath loved me, and given himself for me; that all my sins are blotted out, and I, even I, am reconciled to God." No

---

1 Romans viii,16.
doubt the proof of the reality of such experience lies in the fruit that it bears, but the experience itself is previous to any fruit. "The Spirit itself bore witness to my spirit, that I was a child of God, gave me an evidence hereof; and I immediately cried, 'Abba, Father!'" says Wesley, "And this I did (and so did you) before I reflected on, or was conscious of, any fruit of the Spirit."¹

There are times when such intuitions come with great power; and their presence, or the memory of their presence, may be a great and even indispensable source of faith. They constitute an unforgettable, self-authenticating experience, and can no more be denied than the unmistakable evidence of one’s senses.² It is not to be expected that they should always be present in this vivid manner. The degree in which we feel things depends upon all manner of circumstances, and is likely to vary enormously. We have to learn to accept these outstanding experiences gladly when they visit us, and to be content with something less exciting when they do not. But some degree of intuitive experience should be present if our worship is to be perfect.

Not only should we intuit God’s presence and his nature, but all the content of his will for us. For we need not only to be told what is right but to feel its rightness; not only to hear about men’s need for our prayers, but to feel their need; not only to be commanded to do good but to feel the authority of that command. We need in fact to have such things "brought home" to us, as we say, and that is only another way of saying that we need to intuit them, to receive them not only into our intellect but into our feelings.

Art is obviously a means by which all this is accomplished. As we have seen already, intuitions of some aspects of the nature of God, and of some of the characteristics of his handiwork, are quite often to be found in great art even

¹ John Wesley - Sermon 45,11,6.
² John Wesley - Sermon 10,11,5 and 12. See also Pratt - "The Religious Consciousness" p.216.
when its subject is not a religious one. It is a natural vehicle for bringing home to men a sense of the Absolute, Eternal, Omnipotent, and Infinite. This falls very far short of the experience of a God who is personal, and is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; but the Christian believer, knowing there is only One who has such a nature, immediately interprets his experience as contact with God. Similarly art is a natural vehicle for bringing home to men a sense that the universe is good, adapted to their needs, and a whole in which all things ultimately work together and which is full of purpose; and the Christian believer, knowing that the universe has been made by God as the fitting home for the growth of his children, and that he is over-ruling all its actions and guiding it towards its appointed goal, feels that what is being revealed and brought home is the very working of God, and what is being felt is the touch of his fingers.

If art which is not even dealing with a religious subject can have such an effect, how much more that in which the artist of set intent expresses his Christian experience of God. He finds in art an instrument which seems specially adapted to embody intuitions of God, one which naturally lends itself to his purpose and seems to co-operate with his desire. Its basic reflection of the divine nature will take any emphasis that he wishes. Thus through Canterbury Cathedral he can bring home to us God's majesty and greatness, through the cloisters at Gloucester his rich grace, through the stained glass of St. Mark's his glory, through the Byzantine mosaics the gulf that separates his nature from ours, and through Michelangelo's sculpture of the Madonna and Child at Bruges the lovely thing that he did when he sent his son into the world as a child.

But as we have seen, any intuitions can be conveyed by art unless they are
directly contrary to its purpose, and therefore it can communicate to us not only intuitions concerning God's nature, but all the others that are needed in worship. Thus Rembrandt in "The Raising of the Cross" brings home to us not only the vastness of the thing that was done by God on Calvary, but the universality of the human passions that worked themselves out in it; the Medieval playwright who wrote the Chester play of Abraham, Melchisedek, and Isaac, makes real and living to us a man's sacrifice of his son; Bach makes us feel the awfulness of Peter's denial; The Greek Orthodox Order of Confession brings home the reality and grace of forgiveness; 1 John Brown of Haddington by preaching "as if Jesus was at his elbow", 2 and many another man by the quality of his prayers, is able to make a congregation feel the reality of Christ's presence; the Apostle Paul makes us feel the attractiveness of love and the goodness of God's commands; and the Book of Common Prayer brings home to us "the frailty of our nature", by reason of which "we cannot always stand upright", 3 and the desirability of that grace which is adequate to enable us "so to follow Thy blessed Saints in all virtuous and godly living, that we may come to those unspeakable joys which Thou hast prepared for them that unfeignedly love Thee." 4

b) It is intended that worship should involve some degree of emotional excitement. One could hardly have such intuitions as these without it. The New Testament, therefore, expects that the believer will be conscious of love, joy, and peace, 5 and that he will rejoice in the Lord 6, and be fervent in spirit. 7

The liturgies also have a similar expectation. In the Armenian rite the

---

2 See J.S. Stewart - "Heralds of God" p.38.
3 Collect for 4th Sunday after the Epiphany.
4 Collect for All Saints Day.
5 Galatians v,22.
6 Philippians iii,1.
7 Romans xii,11.
celebrant is directed to fall on his knees and pray for mercy "with a copious flow of tears",¹ he is to repeat his prayer "until confidence through upward contemplation of light be wonderfully certified and revealed,"² and he is later to offer his thanksgiving to the Father "with tears".³ No doubt the expectation of such intensity is exceptional; but in all liturgies it is expected that the worshipper will not only say his thanks, but feel thankful, not only say that he repents of his sins, but do so with a broken and a contrite heart, and not only utter words of adoration, but feel and mean them.

This pressure of feeling sometimes shows itself in a kind of storm of excitement, and has sometimes expressed itself in shouts of "Jesus is Lord" and in speakings with tongues. But such manifestations are no necessary part of it, and may indeed be quite superficial. A man may be very deeply moved without showing it in any such way as this, and the depth of the movement matters more than the amount of the commotion at the surface.

No doubt the quantity of emotional excitement varies according to temperament in different people, and according to circumstances in any one person; and no doubt we have to continue in worship whether it is present or not. But if it is not present in any degree at all, then our worship is impoverished. But there is no need for it to be thus totally absent, for when the facts of our faith fail to move us in themselves, the stirring of heart that should accompany the thought of them can be communicated to us by art. Thus El Greco stirs us strangely as he makes us meditate upon the Agony in the Garden, Handel thrills us with his Hallelujah, St John the Evangelist kindles fire in us when he comments simply "and it was night", the master builder of Northleach

¹ Brightman - "Liturgies Eastern & Western" p.417.
² Ibid. p.418.
³ Ibid. p.419.
Parish Church strikes us with delight, T.S. Eliot's Thomas Becket crying suddenly "Unbar the doors" fills us with fear and triumph, and a great preacher can by his art move men with such strength and depth of feeling as to change their lives.

Not only is there a place in worship for emotional excitement, but there is an even more necessary place for tranquillity. He who would worship with his whole being does best to begin with a mind at peace. One who is restless and full of the multitudinous business of life cannot wholeheartedly attend to the work of heaven, and does not easily enter the calm of God's presence, or see the majesty of his being, or hear his still voice, or offer the pure sacrifice, or exercise perfect trust in him, or even know his own needs. So we find Molinos saying, "It ought to be thy chief and continual exercise, to pacifie that Throne of thy Heart, that the Supreme King may rest therein"; and St. Ignatius stopping with his hand on the latch of the church door for a moment of recollection before he enters upon his worship; and the Quakers "centring down" as they enter upon their corporate silence; and a greater than all these seeking the space of a hillside at night, or the silence of a garden.

The Liturgies, too, give counsel and prayers to this end. The Ethiopic liturgy, giving instructions for the vesting of the priest, says "he shall put on the Akmam and he shall tie it up with the girdle. And he shall collect his thoughts and not let them ramble about in the things of the world, nor go out even of the door of the sanctuary, to the end that he do that which is his duty, and be vigilant in his work, 0 Lord, more than the angels of the Lord of all creation." And in the Anaphora of Saint Athanasius, the priest prays for the

1 Spiritual Guide I, 4.
2 Underhill - "Worship", p.311.
congregation, "First let us subdue our flesh and collect our thoughts from wandering at any time, that our prayer may be accepted, O Lord our God."¹

But it is not always easy to reach such peace, and there are times when for all our strength of will it is impossible to subdue our restless and disturbed minds. Here again art is prepared for our use, and if we put ourselves within its power will bring us tranquillity and peace. The preacher who used to read Sir Thomas Browne before going out to conduct a service was making use of this quality in art. He was not concerned with Browne's thoughts about religion (he was indeed just as prepared to read a passage that made no mention of religion at all); what he desired from his reading, and what he obtained, was a mind at peace within itself. Great architecture has the same effect of preparing the worshipper, so has an opening voluntary on an organ or an introit by a choir, and so has an ordered liturgy; they tranquillise the mind, and gather its scattered and restless thoughts into wholeness and peace.

The integration and ordered purposefulness of beauty is of particular use in times of great emotional stress, and that not only at the beginning of a service but throughout its whole course. Although feelings in worship may very well be powerful, they must never be allowed to have us at their mercy. Uncontrolled excitement has sometimes been thought to show God's special working, and has even been deliberately cultivated; but the things men have done in this abnormal state have been such that they were ashamed of them afterwards, and their general self-control has been lessened by their religious practices when it ought to have been strengthened.² Art is here a safeguard; for the fundamental orderliness of a work of art prevents excitement from being unregulated. It disciplines the feelings and strengthens self control. It is

¹ Harben - "The Anaphoras of the Ethiopian Liturgy", p.96.
² See Pratt - "The Religious Consciousness" Chap. ix.
this same quality of orderliness and control that helps many a mourner at a funeral service, and affects him deeply through such things as a beautiful and well-kept burial ground and a well-conducted service.

c) It is essential that the worshipper should have right mental attitudes. He may have to worship quite often without very much excitement and with very few and feeble intuitions, but he cannot worship at all without proper attitudes; they are of the first importance, and have to be there at all times.

Attitudes are different from intuition and excitement in the fact that they are in part under the control of the will. If one knows that a person is worthy of respect, one can, merely by deciding to do so, mentally adopt an attitude of respect towards him. They are also greatly influenced by action. To speak in a respectful way is one method of cultivating an attitude of respect, and to make one's body adopt a posture of humility helps one's mind to become humble.

Nevertheless we do not always attain right attitudes of mind at all easily, and sometimes we find it quite impossible. It is not every subject towards which we can adopt an attitude of interest for any long period; and it is not every occasion on which we can, either by decision or action, produce a proper attitude of trust in God. It is a great help, therefore, if we can have these right attitudes communicated to us, and art is the means by which that can be done.

We have seen that the main attitudes of mind essential to good art are interest, sensibility, respect, sincerity, detachment from self, a sense of proportion, and acceptance. It needs no argument to show that these attitudes are essential to worship also. If the worshippers are not interested, the service will be dead. If they are not sensitive, they will not be able to see that which they should adore, comprehend that which they should learn, hear the commands which they should obey, nor understand the needs either of themselves
or of those for whom they intercede. If they have not a proper respect for God and man, they will neither be able to adore the one nor love the other. If they are not sincere, the whole foundation of their worship crumbles to pieces. If they are not rightly detached from themselves, their whole vision is clouded, their judgment is warped, and they lack that humility without which they cannot go down justified from the temple of God. If they have no sense of proportion, they will never reach adoration, nor comprehend which is the Kingdom they should first seek, nor know what prayers to utter. And if they have not learnt and do not practise the attitude of acceptance, they will be lacking in the very essence of the Christian life, for that life is in every part a life of acceptance - the acceptance of God himself which we call reconciliation with him, the acceptance of ourselves and the human nature he has given us, the acceptance of the world which he has created and the particular situation in which he has placed us, the acceptance of his succour, and the acceptance of his will.

But not only can art communicate its own characteristic attitudes; it can communicate any attitudes including those others that are necessary to worship. We have said that adoration is the characteristic feeling of Christian worship, and have analysed it into wonder, fear, and love, with love in the controlling position. The attitudes involved in wonder, fear, and love, are not, like those just mentioned, artistic necessities that must be found in any good work of art. Nevertheless art moves towards them all, and it does so even in works that are not specifically religious. When we think of the intuitions that are characteristic of great art (the Absolute, the Eternal, the Controlling Power, and the Infinite), we have no difficulty in seeing that wonder and fear are likely to arise in art quite naturally, and that it is a medium well adapted for the communication of feelings of this kind. And when we think of the attitudes
that are characteristic of art, particularly the attitude of acceptance, we see
that love also is something which is in art completely at home; for love is no
other than the highest degree of acceptance. We have said that the degrees of
acceptance in art may be infinitely various, but it is nevertheless difficult to
omit love from any really great work. Even where the acceptance of life in
general is only of that degree which we call resignation, it usually includes
delight in, and love for, some particular part of existence. Thomas Hardy may
only be resigned to life as a whole; but that whole includes the people whom
he loves and the countryside in which he takes a delight. Stanley Spencer can
present to us in some of his pictures a world which, because of its sordidness,
can only be accepted as a whole with difficulty; and yet show by the way he
paints his foliage how much he loves those parts of it which are good.

To the religious mind, attitudes like these necessarily move towards God.
The Christian believer has them already associated with God in his mind, and
when he becomes conscious of them, it is therefore God towards whom they are
directed. Before whom should he bow in wonder, fear, and love, but Him? The
mystery and power with which life is filled are God's mystery and power. The
universe which is found acceptable is God's universe.

If even art that is without a specifically religious content can lead us
forward towards the worship of God, how much more that which actually speaks of
him by name, and delights not merely in his world but in himself! Art is of
itself striving towards that reverence which is the characteristic Christian
attitude in worship, and when the artist feels it in all its fullness and desires
to express it in his work, he finds in art a medium completely fitted for its
embodiment. We get then the reverence of the St Matthew Passion, of St Bernard's
Sermons on the Canticles, of Fra Angelico's Annunciations, of the great medieval
cathedrals, of Watts's and Wesley's hymns, of the Book of Common Prayer, of the
Bible itself, and of all the great works of Christian art.

One aspect of the Christian's love for God that is outstandingly important in worship is faith. It is not necessary to art, not even to great art. But nevertheless we can say that here also is something towards which art is friendly disposed. There are several reasons for this.

One lies in the sense that art gives of a universe which is very certainly acceptable or good, and through which moves a mysterious power that controls all things. This obviously produces something that falls very far short of the affectionate confidence of a child in his heavenly Father, which is what true Christian faith is; and yet it is recognisably related to Christian faith, and might be called faith in embryo. When it is felt in a religious context, as for instance by a Christian congregation when they are engaged in worshipping God, it is likely to be interpreted in a Christian way, and given a Christian content. And if this is true of art which is not specifically religious, it is easy to see what a suitable vehicle art is for the expression of full Christian faith.

Another characteristic of art that helps to produce Christian faith is its peace. About great art there is a feeling of sufficiency and poise, and it helps to produce a sense of the sufficiency of the religion in whose service it is used. It conveys the feeling that God is entirely competent to meet every need, and that all our disturbance and fear and anxiety are out of place.

Yet another of art's qualities that works to the same end is its feeling of completeness. In Christian prayer, when the faithful worshipper has laid his whole situation before God, he should be able to rise with the feeling that the task he set out to fulfil is now accomplished, that the whole matter is in the hands of God who is dealing with it, and that therefore the issue can be left with Him and there need be no further anxiety about it. His own part of the work
is for the time being finished. But we have seen that this sense of having completed something is one of the effects of art; and because prayer and art have this effect in common, the devout Christian experiencing the result of the second is helped thereby towards the faith which makes effective the first. The sense of completeness that the work of art gives him is transferred by him to his work in prayer, and his faith in God is actually kindled by it. A good example of this is found in the services of the Church of England, where Morning and Evening Prayer are concluded with the so-called prayer of St. Chrysostom:

Almighty God, who hast given us grace at this time with one accord to make our common supplications unto Thee; and dost promise that when two or three are gathered together in Thy name Thou wilt grant their requests; Fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of Thy servants, as may be most expedient for them; granting us in this world knowledge of Thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting.

At the end of the prayer one is quite content to leave all the issue with God; and that feeling is brought about not merely because the prayer is itself an expression of faith in God, but also because it completes the experience of the service, and rounds it off into an artistic whole. Art has become the begetter of faith.

2. Art expressing feelings in worship

The worshipper not only needs to possess feelings in worship; he needs to express them. This does not apply to all feelings, for it does not seem necessary for him to put his intuitions into concrete form; but it is necessary for him to express his other feelings. If his attitude is one of love, he desires in some way to say so; and if it is accompanied by intense emotion, he will feel bottled up and constricted until in some form of expression it is

1 A classic example of this may be found in 1 Samuel i.18.
Art is the means by which the expression of such feelings may take place. We have seen that it is not merely a purgation, a way of getting rid of superfluous emotion, and that to define it in that way is to leave out of account many of its most characteristic effects. Nevertheless it may be used for that purpose, and just as a man may get rid of tempestuous feelings by slamming his hand down upon the table, so he may also get rid of them by putting them into expressive, that is to say artistic, words, or by hearing someone else put them into words for him.

So in worship we are released from our feelings when they are expressed. There have been times in the history of the Church when men have created for themselves some form of expression on the spur of the moment to be the vehicle of the feelings that were overmastering them; - negro spirituals for example seem to have been originally produced in that way. Today those churches that use extempore prayer give to their ministers, and sometimes to the members of their congregations, the opportunity of spontaneously creating their own medium of expression.

But as far as the ordinary worshipper is concerned, expression usually takes place through media provided by someone else. It is true that a work of art supplied for our use by someone else gives us new feelings not exactly like those we have had before; but if those feelings are sufficiently near the ones we already possess, then it can take our feelings into itself and absorb them; and at the same time as it is expressing something more and something different, it can express that which we ourselves are feeling.

We may go to a service, for example, feeling grateful for some quite particular blessing that we have received during the previous week - let us
suppose it was a special occasion of deliverance from a particular temptation. Our feelings will not be exactly the same as those of the man who wrote the General Thanksgiving, but nevertheless we can express them through his words. There will be many things that we feel in common with him - God's mercifulness, our unworthiness, a humble and hearty thankfulness for benefits undeserved, and an honest intention of praising God in our lives. There will be others that stand out more for us than for him - we shall think less about the blessings of creation than about preservation, redemption, and means of grace. The prayer may have had a different tone for him, and represent a different strength of feeling. But nevertheless it can quite satisfyingly express our particular kind and degree of gratitude, because it is wide enough and spacious enough to be able to contain all that we pour into it.

If our feelings about God's dealings with us are very strong and fervent, we shall probably express them more completely through the singing of hymns than the saying of prayers, because we can exert more physical effort in the using of them. In so far as our expression takes place through the words, we shall find them adapted to our use in very much the same way as we found the words of the prayer. But in so far as it takes place through the music, we may often find that it seems more precise and exact. The fact is that music is more flexible for this purpose than words; and just as the same tune can express the different feelings of different verses of a hymn (and even of very different hymns), so it can gather up into itself and express the very different feelings of the composer on one occasion and the user on many another.

Not all the feelings of worship, however, are those with which we go to a service. Our feelings develop during the service itself, and new feelings continually need expression, either by ourselves or by other people on our
behalf. The form of service through which they can be unobstructedly expressed will be one which is itself, taken as a whole, a work of art; for it will be one in which the feelings cohere, one thing developing from another, each impression followed by a corresponding expression, and the whole thus connected together into a unity. They used to say of the services conducted by Temple Gairdner in Egypt, "From the moment Canon Gairdner came in, in his cassock, to give us the number of the first hymn, or explain anything that needed explaining in the service that was to follow, one felt that here was the beginning of a tremendously purposeful act of drawing nearer to God through worship. And each prayer, or versicle, or psalm, that followed seemed to be said or sung not because it was the next thing printed in the Prayer Book, but because it was the one and only thing that we wanted to say to God at the moment."

Only by such a service can men's desire to express themselves be fully met.

A good order of service therefore will observe certain sequences of thought and feeling. After adoration the feeling that demands expression is that of penitence, for the thought of the greatness of God and all his deeds naturally stirs in us the feeling of unworthiness and sin. Thus Isaiah's vision was followed by a strong expression of uncleanness, and the ancient Greek hymn that begins "Glory be to God on high" goes on to pray "Lamb of God, son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us." Penitence should be followed by absolution, for the man who has really faced the evil of his sin desires some assurance of his forgiveness. After absolution the natural feeling that demands expression is praise, and it is the fact that this sequence is observed that makes, in the English rite, such a unity of the
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1 C.S. Radwick - "Temple Gairdner of Cairo" p.284.
2 Isaiah vi,5.
3 It is a weakness of many liturgies that they do not immediately provide praise at this point.
Comfortable Words and the Sursum Corda.

A rather different kind of sequence is found in the orders of morning and evening prayer in the Church of England. Two lessons are read, one from the Old Testament and one from the New as showing the unity between the two dispensations. In Morning Prayer, the Old Testament Lesson is followed by the Te Deum which is to be thought of as an act of praise to God who has fulfilled the ancient promises in the incarnation and atonement of Christ; and the New Testament Lesson is followed by the Benedictus, which even more obviously fulfils the same function and in one edition of Edward’s First Prayer Book was described in a rubric as a “Thanksgiving for the performance of God’s promises.” The lessons of Evening Prayer are followed by similarly appropriate chants; the Old Testament Lesson by the Song of Mary which testifies to the fulfilment of “that which was promised to our forefathers”, and the New Testament Lesson by the Song of Simeon, which declares how we Gentiles, who have become inheritors of the promises to Israel, are satisfied at having seen the salvation of God in Christ.

Sometimes a link between various parts of a service is made by a repetition of words. Frere points out that “the unity of the Anaphora is preserved, especially in the preamble, by a number of links or sutures made by the repetition of catchwords”, and adds “Not infrequently the makers or modifiers of Anaphoras have disregarded them, and they have made havoc in consequence.” Thus the people’s “It is meet and right” should be immediately taken up by the celebrant in his “It is very meet, right and our bounden duty”; “Let us give thanks unto the Lord” should be echoed by “at all times and in all

---

2 "The Anaphora", p.56.
places "give thanks". When this is not done (as for instance when The Apostolic Tradition omits the former of these links, and The Apostolic Constitutions has, instead of "thanks", "meet it is...to sing praise unto Thee"), the unity is not so well maintained; and although this defect is not so serious as some, it nevertheless makes it more difficult for the people to express themselves quite so satisfyingly and completely.

Yet another bond in the service is the joining together of various parts by common subject matter. In the early days both lections and psalms were selected not because chapter 13 follows chapter 12 which was read last time, or because psalm 2 follows psalm 1, but according to their suitability. The lessons were chosen by the presiding minister who stopped the reader when he had read enough. Later graduals were used as a devotional comment on the scripture just read, to bring home its point to the minds and hearts of the hearers. In the Jerusalem church of the 4th century, Etheria found that "the hymns, the antiphons, and the lessons, as well as the prayers which the bishop says, always have suitable and fitting references, both to the day that is being celebrated and also the place where the celebration is taking place." The idea of reading through the Bible continuously, and singing the whole psalter through in order, was introduced by the monks, and the fitting together of the various parts of the service was then less easy and less obvious; nevertheless it was still attempted and often with fair success. Today it is to be regretted that such connections of thought are often difficult to discover, and where the thought does not cohere the feelings are not likely to do so either.

This binding of a service into a unity may be commended on more grounds
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1 Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy", pp.39 and 471.
2 McClure and Peltoe - "The Pilgrimage of Etheria." p.94.
3 See Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy". p.330 note.
than one, but that with which we are concerned is that it is the only way of enabling the worshippers to express the feelings that arise within them as the worship proceeds. If the parts of the service do not cohere, they are thwarted and obstructed, and they will leave the service only half satisfied. Thus we find that not only the expressiveness but also the integration of art is the means by which we are able to utter our worship.

---

1 It is not only a way of providing for the congregation to express the feelings that arise during the course of the service, but a method of helping them to concentrate, and a means of making them feel that worship is "a tremendously purposeful act."
II. ART AND INSTRUCTION IN WORSHIP

1. The compatibility of art and instruction.

a) It has often been maintained that art and instruction are incompatible. One reason given is that any representation or thought that may be present in a work of art is entirely irrelevant to its artistic meaning; and therefore in order to appreciate the work as it is meant to be appreciated, the element of conscious thought must be cut out of the mind. Art can exist without it, it is said, and therefore even where it is present it is not necessary; some arts unfortunately use media which cannot help but convey a logical sense, but that is their misfortune, and we understand their aesthetic value best when we ignore it as far as possible. Thus R.A.M. Stevenson says, "Every shade of the complicated emotion in a symphony by Beethoven depends entirely upon technique - that is to say, upon the relations established among notes which are by themselves empty of all significance. The materials of other arts are more or less embarrassed in application by some enforced dependence on life. Words, since they serve as fixed counters or symbols, cannot be wholly wrenched from a determined meaning and suggestion; architecture satisfies a need of common life as well as an aesthetic craving; and painting not only weaves a purely decorative pattern, but also pretends to imitate the appearance of the world. None of these arts tranquilly pursue the beauties intrinsic to their medium." For Stevenson, then, representation and meaning are an embarrassment. Clive Bell does not go quite so far as that, but is equally definite on the main issue. "The representative element in a work of art may or may not be harmful," he says; "always it is irrelevant." And again, "This element has nothing whatever

1 Stevenson - "Velasquez", iv.
2 Bell - "Art", p. 27.
There are several things to be said in answer to this. First, in any rate most examples of representative art, the meaning very closely conditions our feeling. "The Wave", by Hokusai, is an obvious pattern, but it is clearly not merely the pattern that rouses one's excitement, but the fact that the narrow boats are threatened by the great breaking wave that clutches at them as if it were an angry live creature seeking their destruction. If the concern of art is feeling, then it must be concerned with this feeling, and this feeling is produced as much by representation as anything else. So is the feeling of Ibsen's Ghosts, Dryden's Mac Flecknoe, and Shakespeare's tragedies.

Second, these critics agree that art is very much concerned with pattern; but it often happens that the pattern also partly depends on the meaning. In Hogarth's "The Graham Children", the eye is led inwards from the right hand side of the picture by the bright eyes of the cat as it climbs up the back of the chair towards the bird in the cage, and the look of the boy as he observes the bird's fright; and is led inwards from the left hand side by the eager look of the baby fixed on the red cherries. If we did not know the objects in the picture for what they are, and if we did not know the ways of cats with birds, and babies with cherries, we should not only miss the representation in the picture, we should miss some of its pattern, for the eye would not be led from one part of the picture to another as it should.

In poetic art, the connection between meaning and pattern may be equally clearly demonstrated. Richards, for instance, takes a verse from Hilton, recognised as a masterpiece of poetic rhythm, and composes a parallel to it with nonsense syllables. The fact that it is rather difficult to scan, shows

1 Ibid, p.225.
that even the scansion depends on the sense, syntax, and feeling of the verse; and when it is scanned, the result of course is not poetry. But if the value of poetry depends only on the pattern of sound, and not at all on the meaning, then one has to account for the curious fact that it is exactly these transformations which redeem these nonsense verses as sound, that also give them the sense and feeling we find in Milton. As Richards says, that is "a staggering coincidence, unless the meaning were highly relevant to the effect of the form."

In the novel and the drama the point is still more clear. The wedding at the end of a romance and the death at the end of a tragedy are obviously among the things that round off the pattern of the work, and produce that sense of completion which is typical of the work of art. To concentrate only on the sound of the words is to miss the pattern. If the pattern is to be grasped, the mind must take in the meaning of the words and actions as well.

b) Even when it is agreed that the thought or representation in a work of art is an important part of its total aesthetic effect, it is still often maintained that art does not and cannot teach, and that to try to make it do so is to ruin it. Thus it is said that "the idea of beautiful art which is didactic or edifying" is "contradictory", "for nothing is so inconsistent with the idea of beauty as to give the mind a definite direction"; that "didactic poetry ought not to be counted among the forms appropriate to art"; that the words "didactic poet" are a contradiction in terms, "for where he is didactic he ceases to be a poet".

There is no doubt that a desire to teach may constitute a temptation to the
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1 Richards - "Practical Criticism", p.233.
2 Schiller - "Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Mankind", xxii.
3 Hegel - "Philosophy of Art", part ii, p.43.
artist's integrity. It may lead him to force his characters into unli
lifelike situations; it may make him portray them as impossible people (like the poet praised by Sidney who shows "in Tantalus, Atreus, and such like, nothing that is not to be shunned; in Cyrus, Aeneas, Ulysses, each thing to be followed"); it may cause him to use them as more pieces of stage property; it may lead him to arrange an unnatural "poetical justice" after the manner of Victorian melodrama; it may make him adopt a totally wrong attitude to his audience, to bludgeon them, flatter them, patronise or lecture them; it may make him neglect the necessities of form in his desire to point a moral; or it may make him tack on his teaching when the work is ended, instead of using it "as part of the material with which he works".

Nevertheless there is no need for him to fall into such errors, and there are many who have held the view that instruction is one of the natural purposes of art. Thus Sir Philip Sidney believed that the end of poetry is "to teach and delight", and Ruskin held that the painter should leave his spectator "ennobled and instructed". Euripides told the Athenians who criticised his works, "I do not compose my works in order to be corrected by you, but to instruct you;" and Milton wrote Paradise Lost to "justifie the ways of God to men".

The matter is for ever settled by the facts. The truth is that instruction by means of art is a thing that has not only been done, but has been done well and often. One does not refuse the name of art to Greek Tragedy, Medieval Miracle Plays, Hogarth's paintings, Kurt Jooss's "The Green Table", or "Gulliver's Travels", because they contain teaching. Nor does one say that the teaching value of "The
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1 Sidney - "Apology for Poetry".
2 Sayers - Preface to "The Man born to be King", p.20.
3 Sidney - "Apology for Poetry".
5 Quoted by Reynolds - "Discourses on Art", I.
6 Book 1, line 25.
Serious Call", the prophecies of Isaiah, the parables of Jesus, the 8th chapter of Romans, or the 13th of I Corinthians, are injured because they are works of art. If we are allowed to call nothing art that instils ideas into men’s minds, then we shall write off some of the world’s greatest masterpieces; if we are not allowed to learn by means of works of art, we shall have to remain ignorant of some of the world’s greatest teaching. Much great art does in fact instruct, and much of it sets out quite frankly with the intention of doing so.

(c) From the point of view of a teacher, it is clear that some of the characteristics of art are most useful, indeed for good teaching some of them are indispensable. For instruction is not independent of feeling, and anything that depends upon the expression of feeling must find an ally in art.

If instruction is to be successful it must be found interesting; and arguments presented coldly like propositions in Euclid, if at all prolonged, are likely to send the ordinary listener to sleep. But to communicate interest in the argument is to turn it in some degree into a work of art. The teacher then does well to come as an artist. "He beginneth not with obscure definitions, which must blur the margent with interpretations, and load the memory with doubtfulness; but he cometh to you with words set in delightful proportion ... and with a tale forsooth he cometh unto you, with a tale which holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney corner."¹

A teacher not only sets out to place his ideas interestingly before the minds of his scholars, but like the artist to bring them home. If he speaks of men who suffer famine, he counts it a good piece of teaching if he can make the situation felt. If he desires to teach that compassion is a desirable quality, he thinks that the Parable of the Good Samaritan will make his scholars not only

¹ Sidney - "Apology for Poetry"
see the truth but feel it.

One very effective way of teaching about some things is indeed to communicate an attitude towards them. Thus, for example, to communicate an attitude of reverence towards God is to teach what sort of God he is, and to communicate an attitude of delight in Heaven is to teach what kind of a place Heaven is.

The attitudes of the teacher towards life in general and his audience and subject in particular have a great deal to do with whether his teaching is found acceptable or not. He can hardly avoid expressing attitudes of one kind or another, and if they are recognised as right, his whole case is commended; men feel that he has the secret of how to live, and they are the better prepared to give his case a fair hearing. Thus men listened to D.L. Moody partly because of the joy that went along with his preaching, for they felt that a man who has the secret of joy must have something good to say. And Gossip tells of a man who went to hear Dod's preach, and was arrested by "his obvious sincerity in language and manner". Here, he felt, was "a man who certainly believes every word he says", and this sincerity so much commended his message that the hearer went his way a Christian man.

Thus we may say that in all these respects art is a very great aid, and in some of them an indispensable one, to all those who desire to teach. In some form it is certainly a necessity in that part of worship which consists in instruction. Nevertheless, art is not primarily teaching, but the expression of feeling, and therefore its use is not in all respects without danger and difficulty as we shall now see.

2. Art and the representation of fact.

It has often been held that the business of an artist is to imitate Nature,
and that his work is satisfying because he reproduces it with excellent accuracy and truth to fact. Hamlet is made to say that the purpose of "playing" is "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to Nature"; and the man-in-the-street today would say he expected a picture to imitate some natural object, and that the more life-like the imitation, the better the picture.

There is some justification for this belief: poetry, drama, the novel, often painting and the dance, and even occasionally music, are representative arts; and one cannot fully understand such art unless one recognises what it is that is represented. So the imitation contributes to the total effect. Moreover, as we have already seen, the artist is sensitive to fact and sees more and better than the ordinary man, and often sets down his observations with an accuracy that startles us. But obviously there is a great deal more to be said than that.

It is important to realise that in artistic imitation it is impossible to tell the whole truth. The artist is continually faced with the necessity of deciding what to put in and what to leave out, which truth to express and which to suppress. For example, a painter may portray his object either as he knows it to be, or as it appears to his eye, or as it would feel to his touch, or as it would weigh in his hand, or as its character is understood by his mind; but it is quite impossible for him to do all these at once. If he paints a distant object as he knows it to be, it will have sharp edges and be vivid in colour; but if he paints it as he sees it, then because of the distance the edges will be blurred and the colour much less intense. If, like Cézanne, he wants to portray its solidity, then he is quite likely to have to alter the shape in order to do so. If, like Velasquez, he wants to suggest the softness of Venus's

1 Hamlet, Act 3, Sc.2.
flesh, he will slightly blur the outline of her body, although in fact it is quite sharp and precise. If, like Blake, he wants to suggest that "the sightless couriers of the air" are moving rapidly forward, he will make their bodies longer than he knows them to be. If, like many a portrait painter, he wants to paint his sitter's character, he will exaggerate this feature and suppress that. It is quite right to do any of these things, but obviously he cannot do them all at once. "To paint mist rightly, space rightly, and light rightly," says Ruskin, "it may often be necessary to paint nothing else rightly," and the same principle applies to anything the painter wants to represent.

Even in a non-representative art like architecture all the truths about the building cannot be told at once. An architect may emphasise the stresses and tensions of his building, its methods of structure, its buttresses, pinnacles, or chimneys. Or he may be more concerned about other masses and lines and proportions that are also a part of the truth about his building, and in order to make those clear he may have to hide his chimneys or buttresses behind a parapet, just as plumbing is concealed in the bathroom, and the intestines in the human body.

Not only is it impossible to give the whole truth about an object that one is imitating, it is generally impossible to give the literal truth about any part of it, because the materials the artist has to work with are not capable of it. The very existence of representative art depends on the acceptance of limitations and conventions. If we wish to draw with a pencil, we must accept the convention that an object is represented when we have drawn a black line to indicate its shape; though objects in nature have no black lines round them. If we paint in colours we can do away with the need for black lines, but we have to
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1 Ruskin - "Modern Painters", i,89.
submit to other limitations instead. Paint cannot be made to shine like the sun or glow like a fire. Neither will it imitate the perfect deadness of a void space; because whereas a void does not reflect any light at all, black paint will always reflect some light however cleverly we use it. And since we cannot paint the extremes of light and dark, it follows also that all our tones have to be altered so that the relationship between them may not be too far astray. If we are a dramatist we ask our audience to accept the convention that the stage in London is a village inn, or a Victorian drawing room, or a Viennese garden, or possibly all three, one after another; and that one of the four walls is removed so that they can see what is going on inside. That is not the truth, but we are bound to use conventions; we can do no other.

How much convention an audience will swallow depends largely on the fashion of the day. Today we do not object to figures in drawing and painting that are very much less than life size, or to a certain number of captions in films, or to curtains in a theatre instead of scenery, or to actors bursting into song in musical comedy, or even to a whole opera in song in which men offer each other drinks in recitative and express grief or joy in an aria. In olden days men accepted even more conventions: the Greeks made their actors speak through masks, and the Elizabethans were content that a character should be reckoned invisible if he wore a black cap, and that information should be given to an audience through soliloquy. In representative art the question is not whether convention shall be used, but how much convention shall be used. Some there must be or the art cannot exist. As Hegel says, in the matter of imitation, "art cannot maintain a rivalry with nature, and, if it tries, must look like a worm trying to crawl after an elephant."¹

¹ Hegel - "Philosophy of Art" Introduction, p.118.
But even if it were possible for the artist to tell the whole truth about his subject, and to tell it literally, the result would not be art, for Truth and Beauty are not identical, in spite of Keats. The fact is that the most accurate imitations do not come within the bounds of art at all. Waxworks are usually more realistic than sculpture, but they are not commonly looked upon as great works of art; photographs in their way are reasonably accurate imitations, but we do not compare our snapshots as works of art with the masterpieces of painting. The ordinary conversation of a family at breakfast might be reproduced on the stage with something like literal accuracy, but the result would not be great drama. We may agree with Aristotle that imitation is something "lying deep in our nature", that through imitation "man learns his earliest lessons", and that there is therefore a "universal pleasure felt in things imitated." But the pleasure of recognising a thing as a clever imitation is very small and short-lived, and has very little connection with the pleasure of art.

In his imitations, in fact, the artist is attempting not merely to represent the truth, but to represent his attitude towards the truth, and he cannot do that merely by stating it. Therefore no artist reproduces chunks of life haphazard; he selects from the whole of his experience that which seems to him significant. Thus a landscape painter will partly manufacture his scene. He may put into it objects that are actually in separate places, move existing parts about, paint his mill as though it were seen from the back, his rocks as though he were standing on the other side of the river, and his castle as it actually appears from a quarter of a mile away. Or if he decides to paint

1 Aristotle - "Poetics" p.15.
2 Ruskin gives an interesting example of Turner’s procedure of this kind in "Modern Painters", v,189.
what he sees in front of him, he promptly omits large parts of it, selects for specially detailed treatment those parts that seem to him important, chooses from the colours he can see those that will blend, and arranges the whole on his canvas to form a coherent design. He cannot convey his feeling about the world without some such process.  

As well as selecting and arranging his material, the painter may find it necessary to distort it so as to convey his true feeling. If we are terrified of a wild animal, our mind will so concentrate on its teeth and claws that they will seem larger to us than they actually are in fact. If we try to paint such an experience we shall only paint the truth of our feelings by actually making them larger in our picture. In the same sort of way caricaturists distort their subjects to convey the amusement they feel about them; Michelangelo gives his figures heads that are small in proportion to the rest of their bodies so as to convey a feeling of superhuman dignity; and Epstein defends his representation of Christ by saying that he did not intend to make a realistic figure of a Jewish man — "To attack an artist's Christ in the name of realism is not only the height of folly, but is irreverent as well. To the deeply and truly religious, Christ is not as other men."  

What is here illustrated from the visual arts is equally true of the other arts of representation. No one in real life moves as actors do in ballet, or sings as they do in opera, or speaks blank verse as they do in Shakespeare. Coleridge praises Wordsworth for "the fine balance of truth in observing, with the  
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1 A.C. Bradley points out that the painter is only doing what every spectator does mentally. "A beautiful landscape is not a 'real' landscape. Much that belongs to the 'real' landscape is ignored when it is apprehended aesthetically; and the painter only carries this unconscious idealisation further when he deliberately alters the 'real' landscape in further ways." — "Oxford Lectures on Poetry". p.29.

imaginative faculty in modifying, the objects observed"; for, as he says, it is "the appropriate business of poetry", as it is the business of all representative art, to treat things "not as they exist in themselves, but as they seem to exist to the senses and to the passions", and when they are treated as they appear to the passions, they become modified. Such modification is quite inevitable when one sets out to say, as the artist does, not merely "This is the truth" but "This is my attitude to the truth".

One of the dangers, therefore, in teaching through art is that truth of fact may suffer. So in using works of art a congregation always has to be on its guard against being misled about the facts; and in offering them for use, a Church has to be reasonably sure that they will not be led astray. If the teacher, being an artist, says "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees", there is some danger that he may be misunderstood; if he says "This is my body", he runs a similar risk. If a playwright, desiring to teach through her plays makes her plot into a unity by supposing that the believing centurion is the same as he whose servant was healed, by making the nobleman a guest at the marriage of Cana, and by choosing incidents according to "dramatic propriety" rather than textual authority, and if she adds "picturesque variety" by treating legend as history; she must be careful to make sure that such expedients "do no harm".

The liturgist (who is a very real artist) may express the unity of the whole revelation of God by bringing together passages from the Old Testament and the New, by interpreting the woman's "seed" in the Genesis story as a reference to the Christ who shall come, and Isaiah's statement that "the ox
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1 Coleridge - "Biographia Literaria", p.54.
2 Wordsworth - Essay Supplementary to the Preface to the Lyrical Ballads.
3 D.Sayers - "Man born to be King". Introduction, p.35.
knoweth his owner and the ass his master's crib" as a reference to the events of the Incarnation, and the Kings of Sheba and Soba in the Psalms as a prophecy of the coming of the Wise Men, and Hosea's statement that "out of Egypt have I called my son" as foretelling the flight of the Holy Family; by doing such things he can give men a sense of the real unity of the work of God; but someone will sooner or later have to explain to them that prophecy does not really consist in this kind of detailed forecasting of events, and that all these words had a meaning quite different from that which has been read into them.

To take another example of a different kind, the prayer of Humble Access in the Anglican rite asks "That our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through His most precious blood." That makes a very tidy, balanced statement, satisfying to our feelings; and it also represents a belief which Cranmer held strongly. But most people would agree today with the Puritan objection that "these words seem to give a greater efficacy to the Blood than to the Body of Christ", and would feel that they embody a medieval speculation that is perhaps interesting, but is certainly without foundation. Nevertheless, the tendency is to perpetuate the clauses because they are artistically satisfying, even though their teaching is believed to be doctrinally false.

All these are artistic expedients; and some of them at any rate are justifiable enough as long as we know what we are doing. But there is an obvious danger lest men should mistake an expression of feeling for a statement of fact.

3. Art and Belief.

A great deal of art embodies quite definite and strong beliefs, and certainly the verbal and representative art used in Christian worship is of that

1 See Dix - "The Shape of the Liturgy" p.612.
kind. If its subject is really suitable for Christian worship, then the beliefs that it expresses are very important; and if the treatment is suitable, then they must clearly have mattered a great deal to the artist who thus expressed them.

One would suppose that a belief that mattered very much to a writer ought to matter in the same degree to a reader, and that a work of art that contained or expounded a belief could not be properly enjoyed as a work of art unless the reader accepted that belief. To a certain extent that is undoubtedly true. To recognise a belief as true, and a way of acting as being sensible, may be a necessary constituent of one's reaction to a work of art; and to label a work as illogical and slipshod when its author thought it a piece of good reasoning, and to condemn the actions of its characters as stupid when he evidently intended his readers to suppose them to be wise, would be an aesthetic condemnation as well as a logical or moral one. We cannot, for example, appreciate Jane Austen if we do not recognise her common sense and value it as such.

Nevertheless it is astonishing how often the full acceptance of the artist's beliefs is not necessary for aesthetic appreciation. One can relish Jacobite songs without any love for the Stuarts; one can appreciate Paradise Lost without thinking that Milton justifies the ways of God to man, without for one moment believing in the story of the Fall, and without even believing in God; one can aesthetically enjoy a saying of Dr Johnson while at the same time disagreeing with him entirely; and one can find Hardy deeply satisfying while strongly dissenting from his theology. I.A. Richards puts the issue very well - "It would seem evident that poetry which has been built upon firm and definite beliefs about the world, The Divine Comedy, or Paradise Lost, or Donne's Divine
Poems, or Shelley's Prometheus Unbound, or Hardy's The Dynasts, must appear different to readers who do and readers who do not hold similar beliefs. Yet in fact most readers, and nearly all good readers, are very little disturbed by even a direct opposition between their own beliefs, and the beliefs of the poet. Lucretius and Virgil, Euripides and Aeschylus, we currently assume, are equally accessible, given the necessary scholarship, to a Roman Catholic, to a Buddhist, and to a confirmed sceptic.¹

The fact is that for the appreciation of a work of art we are not usually required to believe or disbelieve an idea, but merely to accept it as present. Coleridge talks of a "willing suspension of disbelief",² but that is to put it inaccurately. The point is not that one suspends disbelief, but that the question of belief simply does not arise. There is a suppressed conditional clause in most art; and we say, as it were, "Supposing these things to be so, this is a good attitude towards them". That is why Sidney can say of the poet that "he nothing affirms, and therefore never lieth",³ and León that a poem "is never 'about' anything."⁴ The poet may affirm all kinds of things, but usually we need do no more than suppose them to be true for the moment, leaving their actual truth or falsity on one side as not being at present relevant.

When we view a work of art, we all become as it were actors, and as we put ourselves into it the rôle provided for us we say "Supposing this is my position, this is a good way of feeling about it".

This is just as true when we perform a work of art as when we listen to one, and it is often found quite satisfying to say beautiful words or sing

---

¹ Richards - "Practical Criticism" p.271.
² Coleridge - "Biographia Literaria" xiv.
⁴ "Aesthetic Knowledge". (Printed in Carritt- "Philosophies of Beauty" p.283.)
beautiful music merely as an actor and without any real belief. We may put ourselves into the song and take the part very well, but no one supposes that we believe what we are singing about; and often we do not suppose it either. The Christian sings at a concert about Isis and Osiris, the landsman sings "I must go down to the seas again", the Yorkshireman praises "Glorious Devon" which he has never seen, and which in any case he would think far inferior to his own county, and the timid soprano is bold enough to declare that "she loves every mouse in the old-fashioned house"! Nobody believes them and they do not believe themselves; they are just performing in a song. If the songs are religious, it often makes no difference. H.C. Colles points out that at Hereford one festival programme ranged from the Latin "Stabat Mater" to the Gnostic "Hymn of Jesus", and then by way of Goethe's Pantheism (as set by Brahms) to Blake's denunciation of orthodoxy under the figure of the "wheel of religion"; and he adds, "probably the musicians who took part in it were serenely unaware that in the course of four hours or so they had thrown themselves wholeheartedly into a series of sentiments so widely incompatible with one another that no Church could pretend to embrace them and remain a Church at all."¹ No one would tax such a choir with ignoring the words, or failing to understand what they meant; but they did not perceive the contradictions because they had not felt themselves required to believe any of the sentiments they had sung; the question of belief was not alive in their minds at all. Terry, in his preface to "Two Hundred Folk Carols", points out that the intelligent foreigner who goes to English concerts "hears rapturous encores of Schubert's 'Ave Maria'; he listens to hearty applause of Gounod's setting (on Bach's First Prelude) which concludes with an appeal to the Blessed Virgin to 'Pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death'; he hears the

doctrine of Purgatory enunciated in Elgar's 'Gerontius' by choral societies made up from every religious denomination." And the only conclusion he can reach is that the ordinary Englishman of to-day, who accepts such theology as a matter of course on a concert platform, "is much too enlightened" to boggle at Roman doctrine in a book of carols. At any rate, whether enlightened or not, he obviously does not boggle at singing a lot of stuff he does not believe. He does not really suppose himself to be committed to what he sings. That, no doubt, is why "Abide with me" and "Jesu lover of my soul" are thought to be good for community singing; for although they make an odd beginning to a football match, no one supposes that the crowd mean it when they sing "Thou O Christ art all I want" or "I fear no foe with thee at hand to bless."

Art, therefore, is not a way of conveying a belief unless the belief is presented in such a way that its truth or falsity is actually brought in question. If the work of art, for instance, contains reasoning to prove a point as most sermons do, or in some other way invites a judgment as the Biblical parables do, then it may convince the hearer; but if it only affirms an idea, then it may make that idea more vivid to those who already believe in it, but it will leave the others untouched - they will merely accept the idea as present in their minds, but will neither believe nor disbelieve.
III. ART, WILL, AND DEED IN WORSHIP

We have said that a full and complete act of worship involves a uniting of ourselves with God in will and deed. It will be convenient to consider the use of art for these two purposes together, for some of the same principles apply to both.

1. The relationship between art, will, and deed.

The Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922, to report on the place of music in the worship of the Church, points out that there is some music that really stirs religious feeling. And then they add, "but even so it must be tested further before it can be finally approved. To stir religious feeling may do good, or it may do harm. The effect will be satisfactory only if the stir reaches beyond the emotions and touches the will, and leads to genuine spiritual effort."¹ What the Archbishops' committee says about music is true of all the arts. Their usefulness in worship will be very limited unless they contribute towards the moving of the will and the performing of an act.

But how far are these things the concern of art at all? Indeed, how far are they even compatible with it? Is it not true, as William Temple said, that "in the artistic experience the will must be wholly quiescent. That experience is of its very essence experience of attainment; and volition is therefore out of place"?² Is it not held with obviously good reason that "the ethical appeal" involves factors which are "inimical to art,"³ and that "art, the object of which is to inculcate moral lessons, is bad art"?⁴

¹ "Music in Worship" p.10.
² Temple - "Mans Creatrix" p.121.
³ Read - "Art and Society" p.182.
a) First, let us remind ourselves that in so far as uniting with God in will and deed depends on feelings, art is favourable towards it. This part of worship is dependent, for example, on bringing home to the congregation both man's need and God's succour; and we have seen that this bringing of things home to the mind is one of art's great functions. Thus the art of the prayers in the Book of Common Prayer brings home to us the need for Christians to be "led into the way of truth, and to hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life;" the needs of "those who are any ways afflicted or distressed, in mind, body, or estate"; and also our own need who are "tied and bound with the chain of our sins". And similarly it brings home to us the fact of God's offered succour, and makes us feel the reality of his "sure defence" and "mighty power", his possession of "such strength and protection as may support us in all dangers, and carry us through all temptations", his "tender love towards all mankind", his will to hear those who pray, and his "wont to give more than either we desire or deserve."

It also depends on bringing about in the mind those attitudes which will lead to the requisite action. It is the attitude of love towards God that leads to the act of serving him; and love towards man that leads to the washing of their feet. Most particularly a course of action can only be chosen and put into effect if it is preceded by the attitude of desire; for the will only chooses that which it approves as desirable. It is under the control of the imagination, and in the long run a man's choices are made.

1 Intercession for all sorts and conditions of men.
2 Occasional Prayers.
3 Collect for 4th Sunday after the Epiphany.
4 Collect for Palm Sunday.
5 Collect for 12th Sunday after Trinity.
according to the things he admires. Art can communicate delight in such things as are honourable, just, pure, lovely, and of good report; and to delight in these things is the first step towards choosing them. No one can read the passage in the gospels about the lilies of the field without feeling how good and desirable is a life without care; and to feel the desirability of such a life is the thing that makes us seek it. If we would be "sincere and void of offence in the day of Christ", we must learn to "approve the things that are excellent"; and to help us to do so is one of the functions of art.

Not only can art make us desire God's will, but as we have already seen it can communicate the attitude of faith through which that will is accomplished; indeed the most valuable element in many prayers is precisely this faith in God which they communicate to those who use them.

So far we have been thinking mainly of prayer, but the same things are equally true of the sermon. We remember here that the function of the sermon is not only to instruct the mind, but to move the will, and as Professor Gossip says, "Beautiful words and finished English win the heart. Style is not idle. It is power. Time spent upon it is not wasted; the mere suggestion is a crime. For a phrase, an image, an apt adjective, may bring home to some needy soul a whole new side of truth, may make it feel God is very near, may win it for the Master. It is often through such things that these great matters happen. It is the added master touch that makes it vivid, runs it into the mind, the heart, the conscience. It is, of course, largely the beauty of our Saviour's way of putting things that moves us."

The story of the Prodigal might have been written with no thrill in it at all,

1 Philippians. i.10.
the same facts set down dully. And we can never be too grateful for the
spiritual power that there lies in the literary glory of the authorised
translation. Souls innumerable have been saved through that. And not a
little of the pulpit's ineffectiveness is due to nothing more or less than
the stodginess of its English.

In colloquial language men talk about "selling" a scheme or an idea when
they mean persuading people to act upon it, and if the Church wishes to
persuade men to act, it might do worse than examine the selling methods of
trade. The use of art to commend one's goods is now widely recognised by
advertisers. John Gloag says to manufacturers and retailers who show their
goods at exhibitions "It is well worth while spending a hundred or a hundred
and fifty pounds in prizes to secure some good architectural brain for the
solution of the problem of display", and again "Trained imagination in the
service of industrial production and retail distribution can become a potent
salesman." Persuading a man to live as a Christian is in many ways very
different from persuading him to buy a piece of furniture, and business
methods are not the same thing as pulpit methods. But nevertheless they are
not different at every point, and if art can be of use in moving the will
about one subject, it can also be of use in moving it about the other. It is
clear that by its connection with the feelings art may be used to put a
personality in the right position for will and deed.

b) The next stage is for the act of will to take place. That it is
possible for the preparation provided by art to pass into an act of will is
clear enough, and many men have changed their ways as a direct result of

1 Gossip - "In Christ's Stead" pp. 190-2.
3 Gloag - "Good Design Good Business" p.78. Cf. also pp.55-6.
seeing or hearing some work of art. In the 9th century Methodius painted a picture of the Last Judgment which was the cause of converting Bogoris, the King of the Bulgarians; the sight of Hogarth's picture "Gin Lane" so opened the eyes of Mark Beaufoy to the evils of the use of gin that he gave up his distilling of it; people who had no desire to pray are said to have been moved not only to tears but also to repentance through the touching song of the chazzan Baruch of Kalisch; and Dr. J.W. Welch, the Director of Religious Broadcasting gives evidence that the radio plays of Miss Dorothy Sayers have changed the atmosphere of homes, and made people join churches; to say nothing of the thousands who have become changed men through the preaching of sermons, the reading of the Bible and the singing of hymns.

We may go further still, and say that art may provide the means by which certain kinds of action are accomplished. Art and purpose are not incompatible. It is a part of the artistic merit of a church that it is suitable to be worshipped in; it is part of the artistic merit of a hymn tune that it is good for a congregation to sing; and it is part of the artistic merit of a prayer that it is good to pray. Art of this kind exists for use, and one of the things that makes it good art is the very thing that makes it good devotion.

Nevertheless, the preparation of the mind and the providing of the instrument are not the same thing as willing and doing. Preparation is not the act itself, and the appreciation of art and its use are two different
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1 Tyrwhitt - "The Art Teaching of the Primitive Church" p.84.
2 Ruth Pry - "Quaker Ways" (Cassell 1933) p.219.
3 Idelsohn - "Jewish Music" p.194.
4 Foreword to "The Man born to be King".
things. The appreciation of art is a theoretical occupation; and, as St
Thomas Aquinas says, "Beauty is that which pleases in mere contemplation."¹
An act of will is foreign to the world of artistic appreciation. As
Schopenhauer has said, "In the act of aesthetic perception the will has
absolutely no place in consciousness"²; one views the work of art with
detachment. When an audience attends a theatre (theatron, a place for
viewing), their function is to behold (theaesthai). They are not required to
take part in the action, but only to see it; they may witness the
representation of a crime, but they are not required to inform the police;
they may see the representation of someone in great danger, but they are not
required to warn them. They know that the situation is not an actual one,
but only a representation, and therefore, although the effect on them is
similar to that of fact, it is not identical. Action is not relevant and
therefore it is not taken.³

But this attitude of being a spectator is quite different from that of
being a worshipper. In worship it is of the utmost importance that one
should not be a mere spectator; the situation is not imaginary but real,
and the time for action is here. God is now confronting his people, and
requiring them in very reality to will and do. Miss J.Harrison says, "It is
at the outset one and the same impulse that sends a man to church and to the
theatre."⁴ If she means that the origin of drama is to be found in worship,
that is true enough; but it is not true that a man should go to the theatre
and the church in the same frame of mind, and prepared for the same sort of

¹ Aquinas - "Summa Theologica" I.v.4.
² Quoted in Dearmer - "The Necessity of Art" p.113 from "The Metaphysics of
² Fine Art."
³ See Richards - "The Principles of Literary Criticism" p.111, and "Science
² and Poetry" p.20.
⁴ Harrison - "Ancient Art and Ritual" p.9.
activity. "The spectacular mood, this being cut loose from immediate action," is, as she says later, the very essence of the artist and art-lover; but it is the very negation of worship. Worship demands personal participation, and the active adherence of the will.

Contemplating and resolving are not enemies; indeed one must contemplate before one can rightly resolve; but they cannot both take place at the same time, and the one has to give way before the other. Resolving may follow the aesthetic appreciation of a work of art, but it is not a part of it. The parable of the Good Samaritan is an admirably constructed and economically and vigorously phrased work of art containing a judgment on conduct. The aesthetic response to it is to say both, "This is a beautiful story," and "I am in agreement with its judgment." It is pleasant to do no more than contemplate it thus, and there are many who love to do so. Nevertheless, if it is to have its proper effect in worship, those who hear it must do more than appreciate its beauty, and more even than agree with its judgment; they must resolve to go and do likewise. And decision means leaving contemplation behind.

Similarly, use also cannot take place at the same time as contemplation. One cannot look at a chair and sit in it at the same time; and one cannot adequately pray if one's work is continually interrupted by the impulse to say "How beautiful! How well phrased! What admirable alliteration! What a perfect comparison!"

The contemplation of a work of art may be an experience so satisfying and complete in itself that the mind does not desire to pass on to an act of will even when it is invited to do so, but lingers in the contemplation of beauty.

1 Ibid p.193.
Every preacher knows the experience of finding that what he had intended to search the conscience and move the will has only roused pleasurable feelings. It is an experience as old as the prophet Ezekiel, to whom God spoke saying, "The children of thy people talk of thee by the walls and in the doors of the houses, and speak one to another, every one to his brother, saying, Come, I pray you, and hear what is the word that cometh forth from the Lord. And they come unto thee ... and they sit before thee ... and lo thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not."

The same thing applies also to all the other aesthetic media of worship, and no doubt there are not a few people who go to church to listen to beautiful prayers instead of to pray them, and to appreciate how well the choir sings "We Praise Thee O God", instead of to make the choir's praise the expression of their own.

2. The appreciation of art as in itself co-operation with God

We cannot leave the subject of the relationship between art, will, and deed, without raising the question whether the appreciation of art is not in itself a co-operating with God. So far we have thought of co-operation with God in worship as being a matter of prayer, the joining of our faith with his power to produce some result that he wills. But it may be that altogether apart from prayer art has a moral and spiritual influence upon us, and if so, to practise it will be an act of co-operation with God which will result in our becoming changed persons through this means which he has inspired.

Here we encounter two radically opposed views. That art has some effect on the moral life has been generally felt (though there are those who
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1 Ezekiel xxxiii, 30-32.
would say with Croce that "art escapes all moral discrimination" because art and morals are in different realms and do not meet\(^1\); but while some hold very strongly that the effect is good, others are equally vigorous in maintaining that it is bad.

What may be called the Puritan view that art is morally objectionable has been held on many grounds. It is a view that goes back as far as Plato, though his objections to art have been often misunderstood and grossly overstated. It is true that he banishes certain sorts of artists from his republic; but as Collingwood has pointed out,\(^2\) he by no means banishes them all. In the "Republic" he is not, of course, writing about art in general but about poetry, with painting brought in by the way for purposes of illustration; and he makes a distinction between poetry that is representative and poetry which is not.\(^3\) In Book three, he banishes certain kinds of representative poetry,\(^4\) and in Book ten, he goes further and banishes all representative poetry, but he still retains certain specified kinds of poetry as not representative.\(^5\)

The following are the main moral objections to art, the first three being those given by Plato in Book ten of the "Republic".

(i) It is said that art is far removed from the truth. "Are there not three sorts of beds?" asks Plato. "One which exists in nature, and which we may say, as I imagine, God made. And one at least which the joiner makes. And one which the painter makes?" So that what the painter makes is at a third remove from reality. And "the composer of a tragedy shall be likewise, since he is an imitator, rising as a sort of third from the King and the truth, and

---

\(^1\) Croce - "Essence of Aesthetics", Chapter 1. Croce of course holds the view that such things as politics and economics also have their own laws that are independent of morals.


\(^3\) Plato - "Republic" //392 D.

\(^4\) Ibid. //398A.

\(^5\) Ibid. //607A.
in like manner all other imitators." Others too, have objected to art on the ground that in some sense it is "not true", but of this relationship between art and truth we have already spoken and need say no more.

(ii) Plato's second objection is that imitative art appeals not to the rational part of the soul which is the best part, but excites and nourishes the passionate part, and strengthening it destroys the rational. Poetry, for example, makes a man give way to his feelings when he ought to try to be tranquil. We need not enter into the respective importance of the rational and the passionate parts of the soul any more than to say that psychology has shown us the tremendous importance of the latter, and no one would now agree that it should be belittled. As for the effect of art, we have seen that at its greatest it produces that very tranquillity which Plato so much desired.

(iii) Plato's third objection is that art imitates bad things as well as good, and nourishes in us therefore those things that ought to die of drought. This is a common objection, made also, among others, by Tolstoy. "The art which flourishes in the upper classes of European society has," says Tolstoy, "a directly vitiating influence, infecting people with the worst feelings and with those most harmful to humanity - superstition, patriotism, and, above all, sensuality." As he sees it, literature teems with "lust-kindling descriptions, pictures and statues with representations of women's naked bodies; and songs and operas are so 'filthy', that it would seem as if they had but one definite aim, to disseminate vice as widely as possible." We should disagree with some of Plato's estimates of what is good and bad, and with many of Tolstoy's; but the objection remains that there is art

1 Tolstoy - "What is Art?" p.183.
2 Ibid pp. 184-5.
which produces a bad effect. We have said that good art produces good attitudes of mind. Art therefore to which we respond with a bad and unhealthy attitude is either in this respect bad art, and is therefore to be condemned on artistic grounds as much as on moral ones, or else, if it is good art, we are misusing it - not receiving the good attitudes that the artist has expressed, but imposing our own unworthy attitudes upon his subject. There are some people whose minds are so unhealthy that any representation of a nude figure kindles lust, because they read their own unhealthiness into it. Similarly, there are pages in the Bible that in some men stir up unholy desires for a like cause. This is a very good reason for some men to avoid representations of nude figures and some of the stories in the Bible; but it is not a condemnation of the Bible or of art, nor even a condemnation of certain biblical histories or of nude figures, but of certain kinds of readers and spectators. The objection that art nourishes in us those things that ought to die of drought falls to the ground.

(iv) Another major criticism brought against art is that it consists merely in the pursuit of pleasure. It is a running away from realities by seeking experience without responsibility, the mere pursuit of a thrill, and a luxuriating in one's own feelings; therefore at its worst it is an act of gross selfishness, and even at its best it is unworthy of the attention of any seriously-minded man.

The appreciation of art does of course produce pleasure; but so does any other good and harmonious use of one's powers, even religion itself, and an activity is not to be condemned on that ground. Indeed, as Oliver de Salincourt says, "The paradox of hedonism ... is as relevant to art as to anything else, and suggests that in all aesthetic enjoyment we have to work
for our pleasure by concentrating our attention on something else, and that if we think only of enjoying pleasure, or deliberately aim at it, it will not be vouchsafed to us. It is true, as we have seen, that art does not in itself involve the making of any act of will, and therefore it is not life complete and whole. But if will and deed are essential parts of life, so is contemplation; these things are not at enmity, but are complementary. And as for art being unworthy of a seriously-minded man, it is easy to see that an occupation which develops right attitudes to life is not only a worthy one, but in some form highly necessary.

(v) The other main objections to art are that it is a luxury which takes up time, attention, energy and money that ought to be spent in other ways, and that some kinds of art are sometimes misused for idolatrous purposes. Obviously art, like anything else, can be over-used and mis-used, but we can omit these objections from consideration here as being irrelevant to our present argument. They are not concerned with the nature of art in itself, but with the use that is made of it.

We have stated all the main criticisms of art as such. They continually recur in one form or another in discussions on the subject, though we must not exaggerate them. They have sometimes been mixed up with a great deal of prejudice, but the unsassiness behind them has often been genuine enough. Nevertheless, as we have seen, they can all be answered; for where they are not fundamentally objections to the misuse of art or to bad art, they are due to a misunderstanding of its nature.

The opposite point of view, that art produces a beneficent effect on
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1 de Salincourt - "Art and Morality" p.16.
2 See Scholes - "The Puritans and Music" passim.
the mind and personality, is also usually traced back to Plato. The myth
in the Phaedrus' represents the soul as existing before birth in a place
beyond the sky. Perfect and fully feathered, it roams in the upper air.
But if it becomes charged with forgetfulness and vice, it sheds its feathers
and falls to earth and is planted into the germ of a man. At times, however,
such a soul begins to recover some of its plumage, and that is when, by the
sight of beauty in this lower world, the true beauty of the world above is
brought to its remembrance. Then it feels new wings, longs to soar aloft,
gazes upward like a bird, and becomes heedless of all lower matters. Plato
holds that although the final apprehension of reality is the work of thought
and philosophy, yet it is beauty which first stirs the soul to turn towards
that reality. As Carritt puts it, Plato believes that "beauty, apart from
any conscious allegory or definite moral, is by some secret affinity, the
nursing mother of truth and goodness."  

Among those who hold this point of view are not only philosophers
like Plotinus, but critics like Matthew Arnold, who said in his 1880 Report
on Elementary Schools, "Good poetry does undoubtedly tend to form the soul
and character; it tends to beget a love of beauty and of truth in alliance
together; it suggests, however indirectly, high and noble principles of

1 Plato - "Phaedrus" p.244-256.
2 Carritt - "The Theory of Beauty" p.47. It has been suggested that it is a
mistake to derive the idea that art is beneficial from Plato. In such
passages as this, it is said, he is not speaking of art but of beauty, and
in Plato, says Collingwood, "there is no connexion at all between beauty and
art" (The Principles of Art", p.37), or in the words of Croce, "the Beauty of
which Plato discourses has nothing to do with art or with artistic beauty"
("Aesthetic" p.163). This may be so, though Carritt for one would not agree
("The Theory of Beauty" p.48.note). But whether Plato intended it or not,
in such words as these about beauty men have found a statement of their
experience and conviction about art; and if Plato is not the father of such
beliefs, they have at any rate had a father somewhere, for they have come
into existence and have found many kind friends to feed and nourish them.
action, and it inspires the emotion so helpful in making principles operative;" and not only critics, but artists like Handel, who thought that "The Messiah" ought to do people good; and not only artists, but men of religion like Westcott, who said, "the physical effects which Art produces exercise a profound moral and spiritual influence upon character. It may be necessary to 'cut off the right hand', or to 'pluck out the right eye', but he who is forced to do so enters into life 'maimed';" and again, "It is no affectation to speak of the moral influence of colours and shapes in the instruments and accessories of everyday life."\(^1\)

What is the truth about this view? Our analysis of the attitudes of mind shows the main connection between art and morality. If art is good, it arises from, and communicates to others, good attitudes of mind. It is produced by a mind that is interested in life for its own sake, that is sincere, sensitive, accepting, that has a sense of proportion, and that respects others and forgets self; and it stirs up like attitudes in those who are able to receive it.

Moreover, since the artist is sensitive to life, he will be sensitive to such an important part of it as the distinction between good and evil, and the more deeply he deals with life the more will this distinction be felt. Tragedy, and even comedy as well, arise out of a moral experience, and moral judgment is one of their necessary aesthetic elements. As Leon says, "art presupposes the ethical experience in the sense that no art - at any rate no great art and least of all great poetry - can be produced or appreciated except by men who are sensitive to good and evil."\(^2\) It does not follow, of
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1 Westcott - "The Epistles of St. John" p.320.
2 Ibid p.359.
course, that he who makes or appreciates art must be always and in every respect a good man; as Ruskin said, "evil men may be prophets"¹, and it is unfortunately not difficult to name some of them. But then artists, like other men, may be sensitive to one part of the realm of morals and insensitive to another, and so they may produce works of art that are partly good and partly bad. They may be good at one time and bad at another, and so do things in their evil moments that they would disown in their time of inspiration. They may know the good, and delight in it in their art, and yet in their life find themselves unable to choose it; where that is so, their art is always likely to show their fundamental weakness, but in spite of that weakness it may in other ways be very good art. They are men of very great powers, and are therefore subject to very great dangers, and their faults and shortcomings are likely to be more extreme and more obvious than those of the ordinary run of men. Artists who are performers need different qualities in some respects from those who are creators; and the fact that their work is done in immediate contact with their public, and that they are continually influenced by the open expression of praise or disapproval, no doubt lays them open to additional difficulties and temptations. Nevertheless, when all this has been said, it remains true that great art is made by men sensitive to good and evil, and it produces a similar sensitiveness in their auditors. As Roger Fry says, "Nobility and geniality of design are only attained by those who, whatever their actual temperament, cherish those qualities in their imagination."²

The artist at his highest is not only sensitive to good and evil, but,

¹ Ruskin - "Modern Painters" ii, 147.
² Quoted in Bodkin - "The Approach to Painting" p.69. (Pub. Collins 1949)
as we have seen, to those great and good forces outside and above his own self which to some extent direct and control him, and which he does not rebel against but accepts. To have such intuitions, whether one receives them from a first-hand contact with life or from a work of art through which they are communicated by an artist, and to accept them as an artist accepts them, is no small step forward towards morality. Baldwin Brown says of such experiences, "The impression of the Sublime, when conveyed either by the appearances of nature or by those of art, is always in one sense a religious impression, for it implies a chastening, and in the Aristotelian sense, a purifying, of the individual emotions by the recognition of what is transcendentally great. This greatness is not hostile or terrifying, for the aesthetic impression of the Sublime is destroyed when the being is shaken or cowed through fear; but it represents, as it were, a challenge, to which we respond by bracing up the powers, and by measuring ourselves with it in the strength of free intelligence and in a certain confidence that does not preclude humility. It is ... by raising the whole being into communion with the highest, that art may best serve the spiritual needs of mankind." To do this, as he says, constitutes a challenge, and it is a challenge to our moral nature.

For any kind of dramatic art, a further quality is needed - the ability to put one's self in the place of another; and to cultivate this is to cultivate an important moral quality. "The great secret of morals is love, or a going out of our own nature, and an identification of ourselves with the beautiful which exists in thought, action, or person, not our own. A man, to be greatly good, must imagine intensely and comprehensively; he must put

---

1 Baldwin Brown in Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics - Article "Art (Christian)".
himself in the place of another and of many others; the pains and pleasures of his own species must become his own. The great instrument of moral good is the imagination; and 'poetry administers to the effect by acting upon the cause.' "Poetry strengthens the faculty which is the organ of the moral nature of man, in the same manner as exercise strengthens a limb."¹

It must be pointed out that the effect of art is temporary. The peace and joy that come from it do not necessarily persist after the experience of the work is complete; for the work has not changed the whole personality in the way that a religious conversion changes it. Similarly the attitudes of mind which are adopted during the contemplation of a work of art do not necessarily persist after that contemplation has come to an end, and the intuitions that are given by its means are not thenceforward a continual experience. Nevertheless, intuitions once received are more likely to recur, and attitudes once adopted, if only for a short time, are more likely to be chosen on future occasions. These, like the imagination of which Shelley speaks, are strengthened by use "in the same manner as exercise strengthens a limb;" and to live with good art is to learn how to live nobly.

In some degree, therefore, the use of great art in worship is of itself a co-operating with God for the fulfilling of his purpose in our moral nature. But the co-operation is much more limited than that of prayer, it is not necessarily through Christ, it is not necessarily with a God who is known to be personal, nor even with a God who is known or thought of at all. It is genuine as far as it goes, but is probably best thought of as the kind of co-operation with God that we practise in our everyday life,

¹ Shelley - "A Defence of Poetry".
rather than as a part of that particular kind that we practise in worship.
We now pass on to consider how art helps or hinders the true corporate-ness of worship; that is, how far it helps to produce fellowship, while at the same time expressing the individual worship of all the various kinds of people who are members of a Christian congregation.

1. Art and the fellowship.

It is often held that a feeling of corporate-ness is very greatly stimulated by art. Tolstoy, for example, who has most to say on this subject, holds that good art "destroys in the consciousness of the receiver the separation between himself and the artist, nor that alone, but also between himself and all whose minds receive this work of art. In this freeing of our personality from its separation and isolation, in this uniting of it with others, lies the chief characteristic and the great attractive force of art."¹ He continues a little later, "Sometimes people who are together are, if not hostile to one another, at least estranged in mood and feeling, till perchance a story, a performance, a picture, or even a building, but oftenest of all music, unites them all as by an electric flash, and, in place of their former isolation or even enmity, they are all conscious of union and mutual love. Each is glad that another feels what he feels; glad of the communion established, not only between him and all present, but also with all now living who will yet share the same impression; and more than that, he feels the mysterious gladness of a communion which, reaching beyond the grave, unites us with all men of the past who have been moved by the same feelings, and with all men of the future who will yet be touched by them."²

¹ Tolstoy - "What is Art?" p. 153.
² Ibid p.165.
We should be very glad to find that all this was true, but unfortunately it cannot be accepted without a great deal of qualification.

a) How much contribution is made by art towards corporateness depends partly on whether the art concerned is one of performance or not. We will consider first those arts, such as architecture, painting and sculpture, which have no performer present in the flesh to offer them.

It is difficult to see that there is anything particularly corporate in the appreciation of a painting, or the contemplation of a piece of sculpture. Men go to art galleries by themselves; and although no doubt it is pleasant to have a friend with whom to share one’s experiences, yet it is not necessary; and it is not noticeable that the spectators who move about in the gallery have much sense of corporateness, not any more, at any rate, than a crowd who go to visit a science museum or attend a cookery demonstration. It is, of course, possible to direct the mind of a whole crowd towards one particular picture or piece of sculpture so that they are all concerned with it at the same moment. If that is done, then there will no doubt be some sort of sense of corporateness among those who share this common experience; but there is nothing to show that it is any greater than that which comes from sharing any other experience. It is also safe to say that in the corporate worship of the Church, pictures and sculptures are seldom used in this way.

The silent reading of literature, as distinct from the speaking or hearing of literature, is similar in effect. Men who read works of art, even though they read in the same room together, and even though they read the same books, are not thereby given a sense of belonging together; any sense of corporateness there may be would be just as great if instead of reading,
say, Walter Scott, they read Euclid. Here, however, there may be a keen sense of unity between the reader and the author. No doubt this applies in some degree to those who look at sculpture or painting, but it seems stronger in certain kinds of literature. It is clear that the degree of unity thus felt varies enormously. If the writer has a sense of affection for his reader, takes him into his confidence, and writes to him familiarly, as for instance Cowper does, then the reader will return the confidence and feel united with his author. But not all great writers, nor even the majority of them, produce this effect in any great degree; and Milton, for example, is none the worse an artist for producing a different attitude.

The writer may please himself how far he wishes to evoke a sense of fellowship with his reader.

Architecture is rather different from the other arts of non-performance in this respect. It is difficult to conceive of a picture or a piece of sculpture that invites the conscious co-operation of a multitude, and is not satisfied to address itself to numbers of separate individuals. But what can hardly be done by pictures and sculptures can be done with ease by architecture. A building may separate its spectators from one another, or it can so arrange them that they inevitably feel to be one body. But the architect can always choose which emphasis to make, and there are good buildings of both kinds.

b) If we now turn to the arts of performance, we must first consider the relation between the performer and the members of the audience. Here there is much more likely to be a sense of unity, for there is a constant interplay between the two, and each affects the other. A speech, a play, or a song, becomes a different thing when given to an audience from what it
was in rehearsal, and it will be different again when given to another audience of a different type. The performer has to find a sense of unity with his audience before his work can be successful. R.C. Collingwood instances what happens at the dress rehearsal of a play, - "It can be described by saying that every line, every gesture, falls dead in the empty house. The company is not acting a play at all; it is performing certain actions which will become a play when there is an audience present to act as a sounding board. It becomes clear, then, that the aesthetic activity which is the play is not an activity on the part of the author and the company together, which this unit can perform in the audience's absence. It is an activity in which the audience is a partner."

He goes on to say that the principle does not apply to a play alone, "it applies to rehearsals by a choir or orchestra, or to a skilled and successful public speaker rehearsing a speech." As Aristotle says in "The Rhetoric", a speech is composed of three elements - the speaker, the subject, and the persons addressed. It is clear that there must always be some degree of unity produced between the performer and his audience.

Then there is the relation between the various members of the audience. They will be united by being sharers in a common experience, by being fellow-partners with the performer, and by the way in which the author addresses them as a unity. This last point is obviously variable, but it may be said that a good artist always addresses a crowd as though it were a crowd, and in a different way from that in which he addresses an individual.

---

1 Collingwood - "The Principles of Art" p.322. This is true in principle, though it is possible that Collingwood here somewhat exaggerates the audience's contribution. See, for example, the comment by Robert Donat in "The Radio Play" by Felix Felton. p.13.
How deeply an audience will feel this sense of unity is not easy to say. Certainly it is sometimes no more than the consciousness of being one of a crowd, but often there is a sense of closer fellowship than that. To go to a concert or a play is felt as a social act, and most people prefer to go with a friend rather than alone. As a member of an audience they want to feel more than merely one of a crowd, and they do not have full satisfaction unless they are in definite fellowship with others in the audience. But this does not apply equally to a film, where the audience are not so conscious of each other, and where the actors proceed quite independently of their response. Nor does it apply to a radio concert in which the members of the audience cannot see, and do not think about, each other; though of course it is a different matter when the response of an audience is broadcast along with the performance.

There is also a sense of unity between fellow-performers of works of art. But to co-operate with other people in anything and to share any experience with them produces some sense of unity; and there is nothing to show that performing of art together is any more effective in producing corporateness than working together or playing games together.

c) A further matter that affects the question of the corporateness engendered by art is that of subject matter, using those words here to refer not only to the thoughts a work contains, but also to its characteristic feelings, for example whether it is comedy or tragedy, whether it is homely or sublime.

Comedy clearly produces a greater sense of unity among an audience than tragedy. For tragedy concerns men who in some way stand apart, and it can be enjoyed when reading alone. But comedy is concerned with relationships in
society; and it is best enjoyed in company. Nothing is more dull than to sit and read a book of jokes alone by one's self; but to enjoy laughter with others takes away our isolation and self-consciousness.

Similarly, the homely is more corporate than the sublime. The sublime seems to isolate the individual. He feels alone in the presence of a great vastness, and he wants to be left alone. Nothing else matters but the great spectacle before him, and he wants no company in gazing at it. Companions are no intrusion upon the homeliness of life; they are a part of it, and it is natural enough to enjoy one's experience of it with them. But in face of the sublime other men seem an irrelevance.

A sense of fellowship with those who are not present in the body can only be produced by making the thought of them part of the subject matter of the work, and sometimes only by making the thought of actual fellowship with them part of its subject matter. Tolstoy may say that he finds in all good art "a mysterious gladness of communion", not only between all the audience actually present, but between them and "all now living who will share the same impression," with "all the men of the past who have been moved by the same feelings," and "all men of the future who will yet be touched by them;" but we cannot find anyone or anything to corroborate that, except in those cases where this invisible company is actually mentioned. If the author definitely speaks of them, then of course a sense of fellowship may be produced; as it is produced by such hymns as "Te Deum", by such prayers as "Therefore with angels and archangels", by such pictures as Fra Angelico's "Coronation of the Virgin", and (if by some means not only the thought of them, but the thought of fellowship with them is brought to the mind of the worshippers) by the figures in our stained glass windows, the flying angels
in our hammer-beam roofs, and the carved saints in our niches.

We see, therefore, that art may or may not produce a sense of corporateness. It will not do it just by being art, for there is much good art that has nothing to do with corporateness at all; but certain kinds of art may produce it, and the use of such kinds in the worship of the Church will clearly be most valuable.

2. Art and the individual.

If we now ask how far art can express the individual worship of all the various members of the congregation, we find that Tolstoy here again puts forward a very definite view. "Great works of art", he says, "are only great because they are accessible and comprehensible to everyone ....

So that, if art fails to move men, it cannot be said that this is due to the spectators' or hearers' lack of understanding; but the conclusion to be drawn may, and should be, that such art is either bad art, or is not art at all."¹ He does indeed later admit that it may not be understood because its form is imperfect or because man are inattentive, but those are the only qualifications he will allow.² "The assertion that art may be good art, and at the same time incomprehensible to a great number of people, is extremely unjust."³ To say such a thing "is the same as saying of some kind of food that it is very good but that most people can't eat it." "Perverted art may not please the majority of men, but good art always pleases everyone."⁴

¹ Tolstoy - "What is art?" p.102.
² Ibid p.164.
³ Ibid p.100.
⁴ Ibid p.100. Cf. Lenin - "Art belongs to the people, its roots should penetrate deeply into the very thick of the masses of the people. It should be comprehensible to these masses and loved by them. It should unite the emotions, thoughts and will of these masses and arouse them." (quoted by Chen in "Soviet Art and Artists" p.1.)
(Pal. Piter Press 1945)
However, the aesthetic judgments that he makes as a result of applying such principles are so extraordinary that it is clear that something is seriously amiss. No man can wholeheartedly condemn, among others, Sophocles, Euripides, Aeschylus, Dante, Milton, Shakespeare, Raphael, Michelangelo, Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms, without making it very clear that something is wrong: either with his standards of judgment or his application of them.

If we reject Tolstoy, the temptation is to go to the other extreme, and to say that really first-rate art can only be understood by the few. "A casual public" says Sir George Dyson, "is utterly unfitted to recognise ... any but the most superficial artistic ideals;" and there have been, and still are, many who think an artist is a man apart from the general run of mankind, and a work of art is something which the ordinary man is totally incapable of understanding. If this is so, then the less the Christian Church has to do with art the better; because if Christianity is not a religion for the ordinary man it is nothing, and if its worship is totally beyond his reach it ought to be abandoned.

It is obvious that ordinary men do not always succeed in understanding art. Let us examine first the reasons for this failure, and then we shall be able to deal with the question of how far the average member of the Church is likely to be able to make use of art in his worship.

a) If we leave aside such abnormalities as blindness, deafness, and the inability to distinguish differences of colour or pitch, we may say that the things that hinder men from understanding art are the following:

---

1. Ibid p.122.
(i) Taste. Just as some men like pork, are indifferent to cold beef, and dislike mutton, so there are those who enjoy music, are not at all interested in architecture, and perhaps actively dislike sculpture. They may agree that no doubt pork, beef, and mutton are all good food, but they like them differently; and so also music, architecture, and sculpture may all be very good for those who like them, but they much prefer one to another. Similarly, certain subjects and certain methods of treatment will appeal to one man and not another. Both may agree that a given work is good art, but one man likes it and the other doesn't. If a man prefers lean women to fat ones, he will have difficulty in appreciating Rubens, and if he is not interested in Nature he will probably not trouble to read Wordsworth.

Such tastes are often controlled by association. If poetry was learnt with great difficulty at school, or if it was badly taught by an unpopular teacher, that may enormously hinder the proper appreciation of it later on; and possibly the appreciation not only of the poetry one tried in vain to learn, but of poetry in general. On the other hand, if one associates certain music with pleasantness in childhood, or a certain hymn with one's conversion, or a certain play with a happy holiday, the proper evaluation of these things is again hindered, because one imports into them feelings which belong not to them but only to their associations.

As we can see, this is not at all a judgment of value, and as a rule the man concerned will admit that it is not; but it is a thing that has to be taken seriously into account, for differences in taste are a common hindrance to appreciation.

(ii) Insufficiency of knowledge, or of mental skill and application. There is some art that demands a high degree of knowledge before it can be
understood at all. Many of the poems of T.S. Eliot for instance, are of this kind. They are full of esoteric allusions, and cannot be properly comprehended unless the allusions are known and recognised. There is other art that requires not so much wide knowledge as an ability to follow close and compressed thought - the poetry of Donne will serve as a good example. The degree of study required by Eliot and Donne is perhaps unusual, but that some degree of knowledge and careful thought should be required is by no means unusual. "The truth is" says I.A. Richards, "that very much of the best poetry is necessarily ambiguous in its immediate effect. Even the most careful and responsive reader must re-read and do hard work before the poem forms itself clearly and unambiguously in his mind." For evidence of this one should refer to his "Practical Criticism", which records experiments in the understanding and appreciation of poetry made with University students, and amply bears out the above statement in his earlier book. Some idea of the degree of application necessary for the successful reading of poetry may be gathered from his statement at the end of "Practical Criticism" about still further evidence which he hopes to publish in due time. "I have made," he says, "since the bulk of this book was prepared, some further experiments with the paraphrasing of fairly simple figurative and semi-allegorical passages. They more than corroborate what was shown by the protocols here given. Not nearly thirty per cent of a University audience are to be trusted not to misinterpret such language." It is clear that, in the realm of literature, quite ordinary stuff needs considerable application before it can be properly understood, let alone evaluated, and the same is true of other

1 Richards - "The Principles of Literary Criticism" p.291.
2 Richards - "Practical Criticism" p.329.
forms of art. John Constable says "The art of seeing Nature is a thing almost as much to be acquired as the art of reading Egyptian hieroglyphs;" and he adds; "if this is to be said of Nature, how much more may be said of the observation and study of art." Canon Peter Green is obviously right when he says, "The quality of a work of art is no more to be judged by the number of persons moved by it than the truth of a scientific theory is to be judged by the number of persons capable of understanding it. In matters of art and of science, heads, as the late Professor Saintsbury used to insist, should be weighed and not merely counted. The idea that no education or training is needed before a person is qualified to pass judgment on a work of art is one of the popular fallacies of the market-place which a correct aesthetic theory will do much to dispel."^1

(iii) Unwillingness to undergo new experiences. We have seen that what a great artist gives us is always to some extent new and original. He is more sensitive than the generality of men, and therefore sees things differently from them; to follow him one must be willing to undergo a new experience. Epstein says, "I find that one of the most important elements that can be present in the appreciation of a work of art is the element of surprise. Greek art gives me that, Michelangelo and Donatello do, and so does Rodin."^3 Nearly all good art is at least momentarily disconcerting, because it makes us feel in a new way.

But men do not like to be disconcerted with something new, they prefer the familiar, and it is always that which is in some way familiar that is most popular. This does not apply of course only to art. New ideas in

---

1 See Rice - "The Background of Art" p.25.
2 Green - "The Problem of Art" p.50.
3 Haskell - "A Sculptor speaks" p.125.
any realm are likely to stir opposition, and there have been few reformers who have not at first met with resistance. But it applies very strongly to art, and therefore men like pictures painted in a familiar style, poetry that says familiar things, songs they already know, and the hymns they have sung a hundred times. If they are suddenly taken with a new tune, it will be because it is reminiscent of something that is old. Good art does sometimes include reminiscences of the familiar (the old ballads have their stock epithets that are already well-known, and folk-songs have their stock situations that recur over and over again, and their musical phrases that come to us familiarly because we have heard them in other tunes before); but a borrowed phrase usually means a borrowed attitude, something put on and dead instead of a living growth, and good art avoids borrowed attitudes like poison.

It is this unwillingness to undergo new experiences that accounts for the fact that popular opinion is particularly liable to go astray about the art of its own time. As we have seen, the artist is a man who is, as a rule, ahead of his time. He finds stimulus in novelty, and is impatient with what he feels to be outworn; he is always likely to choose new subject matter, and to experiment with new technique. If, therefore, even the art of yesterday conveys a new experience, how much more will that of today! The great and original artist has often been misunderstood by his contemporaries, and only hailed as a genius by a later generation when men have had time to get used to his ways.  

1 Cyrilynn gives an interesting analysis of a popular tune, showing how every phrase is reminiscent of something already well known, in "Music Calling" pp. 10-11. And Percy Scholes gives a number of examples in "The Oxford Companion to Music" p.561.

2 The artists who have achieved success during their lifetime have generally been either those who lived in the days when artistic reputations were awarded (continued p.259)
(iv) Weakness in moral character. Appreciation of a work of art may be hindered by a man's unreadiness to accept the moral demands it makes upon him. He may not be willing to be made sensitive to life, particularly to its pain and suffering; he may not particularly desire the artist to show him a right respect, but may prefer to be flattered; he may not want to control his feelings, but rather to indulge them, and so on. What is morally right is far from being what is generally most popular. Moreover in matters like those the average man is not an expert at making distinctions. He does not say "The attitude which I have when I look at this work of art is of such a kind, and it is right or wrong"; he merely says "I like the feeling I get", or "I dislike it". We may know what we like, both in art and in drinks, and yet have a very bad judgment. The artist must follow Reynolds's advice, and "Be as select in those whom you endeavour to please as in those whom you endeavour to imitate"; but it is obvious that when he does so, his work will be rejected by many.

Unfortunately a Christian congregation seems to be no better in this respect than any other body of people. Congregations often like comfortable or merely amusing preaching, architecture that is a lifeless imitation of an old mode of expression, figures that are trivial and childish, hymns that are vague nothings, music that is self-indulgent, and, in general, art that makes them feel what a good time they are having when it ought to be making them feel how great is our God with whom we have to do.

(Continued from p.258)

by artists themselves together with a cultured intellectual aristocracy (though even in such circumstances appreciation is not always bestowed where it is deserved), or those who, (like Haydn and Burns) made use of folk material, and therefore produced work that felt familiar.

1 Reynolds - "Discourses on Art" v.
b) We are now in a position to ask how far the ordinary member of the Church should be able to make use of art in his corporate worship.

(i) It is quite wrong to divide mankind into two groups, one of which consists of strange beings with special capacities called artists, and the other of ordinary men whose experience is outside the realms of art altogether.

If art is fundamentally the expression of feeling, then it is not a strange and rare phenomenon at all, but a commonplace occupation that we all practise every day of our lives. We may not always succeed with the completeness and accuracy that we desire, but, unless we are paralysed and dumb, we regularly put our feelings into actions and words that express them sufficiently well to satisfy ourselves and to communicate them to others. Our fear goes into our manner and becomes infectious, our respect goes into our tone of voice and is conveyed to those who listen to us, our self-confidence goes into our behaviour and is not unnoticed by those about us, and our intuitions go into our words and are received by those to whom we speak.

And as we are capable of expressing our own feelings, so we are capable of understanding the expression of other people's. Not only do we communicate our feelings to them, but they communicate theirs to us. Sometimes, indeed, we can understand their expression better than we can formulate our own. There are times when we can find neither words, nor sounds, nor movements to express what we feel; but if someone else will put our feelings into words for us, we greet the expression of them with pleasure, and say that our friend has put into words exactly what we feel. Sometimes we make mistakes, and often our understanding is incomplete, but communication of feelings takes place, and the means by which it takes place is not merely or mainly through
statement, but through expression, that is to say through some form of art.

The integration of art, the unity and completeness of the feelings expressed in it, is often something we do not manage to attain. But we rise even to that from time to time, and probably not infrequently; and we certainly strive after it always, and are pleased when it is attained either by ourselves or others.

Integration with our whole environment we no doubt very often fail to achieve. But we do not always fail, and in any case it is a thing we understand and seek after. Our ideas about what is fitting may vary, but we all have some ideas about it, and try to put them into practice; and the characteristics of interest, sensibility, respect, sincerity, detachment, proportion, and acceptance, are not wholly unknown nor wholly unvalued by anyone.

As for intuition, it is not an experience impossible for any man, for it forms no small part of our daily life. Nor does art deal with some special kind of intuition, for we have seen that no intuition is unsuitable for incorporation into art, and the material that makes up the experience of the common man is also the material of the artist. Even those intuitions that stand out in art are such as are within the experience of us all.

The media of the various arts are no doubt understood in very differing degrees. The average man is not altogether without the experience of having feelings conveyed to him through shape, mass, line, colour, and tone, and we must by no means rule out these means of expression as being beyond the range of his understanding. But his own most natural medium is speech and gesture, and most men understand those best. It is in their use that the ordinary man is himself most often an artist, and it is by their means that he most easily
apprehends the feelings of others.

It is clear that if the ordinary man has this capacity for art, and both uses and understands it in his everyday life, he is not incapable of using and understanding it in his worship.

(ii) When we think of the worshipping Church, we are not dealing with just a casual group of people, but with sincere Christian men and women gathered together to do something that they know is supremely important. We are surely not expecting too much, therefore, if we hope that they are people who are prepared to take pains in the use of the media of their worship. If they are hindered by taste, then why should they not, for the sake of God, set to work to cultivate new tastes? If the hindrance is that the art the Church uses demands considerable mental application before it can be properly understood, why should they not, for the sake of God, undertake such mental discipline? If they find they are unwilling to undergo new experiences, ought they not, as Christian men, in any case to change their attitude about that? And if their incapacity is due to weaknesses of moral character, does not exactly the same thing apply there? We say nothing at the moment about that sort of art that demands a high degree of knowledge or of mental agility. We will deal with that later on. But all the other hindrances to the understanding and use of art are surely surmountable by anyone who takes his Christian life and worship seriously.

Members of a Christian congregation are helped in this by the fact that they gather in the same place every week and use the same media of worship over and over again. They thus have the chance that a casual crowd does not have of taking pains with a work, and of getting used to a new idea or experience. The first use may be disconcerting, but they have many further
opportunities to understand it. When, in our own day, the church of St Matthew in Northampton commissioned some works of art by contemporary masters, they were not easily accepted. The unveiling of Henry Moore’s "Madonna and Child" provoked a furious local controversy, and angry protests against having such a "monstrosity" in a church; and the purchase of one of Graham Sutherland’s pictures of the Crucifixion caused at first many heartburnings. But they have been seen over and again, week by week; and within quite a short time their former critics have become immensely proud of both of them.¹

(iii) If we turn now to the other difficulty, that some art is completely unintelligible to the ordinary man because it demands more knowledge or mental agility than he possesses, we must say that such art is certainly out of place in Christian worship.

Art, however, that is completely unintelligible is very rare, for even art that is difficult is not usually so abstruse as to convey no meaning at all. Many a man is deeply moved by a picture which he does not fully understand and a building that he finds very strange; and many a man is thrilled even by words of which he does not understand the sense. Dr Rufus Jones tells how as a boy at school he first met Tennyson’s song, "The splendour falls on castle walls." He says, "I had almost no idea what this meant. I learnt it by heart; I felt the charm of the melody, the march of the meter and the swing of the rhythm, and repeated it again and again with a powerful fascination. Years afterwards, when far away from the old schoolhouse and the parsing class, in a sudden flash, as I was saying the poem over, I saw what it meant."² Although he had only understood part of

¹ See article and photographs in the "Manchester Guardian" for April 3rd, 1947.
the meaning of the poem, it had fed his soul. In the same way men read the
psalms and are fed, though many of them do not understand all they read.
They may even hear a sermon in the same way, just as many people in Dublin
used to go to hear John Fletcher preaching in French, though they could not
understand a word he said, because they felt the light of heaven which was
in him shining upon them.¹ Or they may similarly partly grasp a prayer like
the Indian Papunehang, who after hearing John Woolman pray, and not
understanding any of the words, said afterwards, "I love to feel where words
come from."²

No doubt it is best in corporate worship to avoid not only the
completely incomprehensible, but also the very difficult; for it is clear
that sermons and prayers are only partially effective when they are only
partially understood. But such experiences as these remind us that they are
not necessarily entirely useless, for a man may still profit very greatly
from a partial understanding of something which as a whole is beyond his grasp.

Even, however, if we declare all such art unsuitable for corporate
worship, that is not a criticism of the use of art as a whole, but of the use
of one particular kind; and there is not nearly so much of that kind as there
is of the rest.

(iv) Even when it is admitted that a great deal of art is within the
range of the average man, it is sometimes doubted whether such art "can
possibly satisfy all the requirements of a full aesthetic sensibility",³ and
adequately feed the soul of the man of greater capacity. It must be pointed
out therefore that there is a great deal of art that is at the same time both

¹ T. A. Seed - "John and Mary Fletcher" p. 96. (Pub. C. H. Kelly)
³ Read - "Art and Society" p. 71.
simple and profound, and that meets the needs of all. The unlearned does not feel that he has met something that is out of his range, as he would with Donne or Eliot, for he understands it well enough to be satisfied; and yet there are greater depths in it than he fathoms, and so it fully satisfies those also whose intelligence and aesthetic capacity are profound. Richards points out that the very wide popularity of Macbeth, for instance, "is due to the fact that crude responses to its situations integrate with one another, not so well as more refined responses, but still in something of the same fashion. At one end of the scale, it is a highly successful, easily apprehended, two-colour melodrama, at the other a peculiarly enigmatic and subtle tragedy, and in between there are various stages which give fairly satisfactory results. Thus people of very different capacities for discrimination and with their attitudes developed in very different degrees can join in admiring it." He instances as other examples of this possibility of being enjoyed at many levels, Elizabethan Drama, Pilgrim's Progress, Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver's Travels, and the Ballads.¹

If we think how this applies to ecclesiastical art, we may recall that there are references in Wesley's hymns that would be beyond the understanding of most worshippers. His allusions to Hercules strangling serpents in his cradle, to Ariadne's thread which guided Theseus out of the labyrinth of the Minotaur, to the fable that Amphion made the stones move and built the walls of Thebes by the music of his lyre, and to the story of the Sword of Damocles, were no doubt usually missed by the members of his congregations;² they were bits of elaboration that many could not grasp.

² For verses in which these and other references are made see Betts - "The Hymns of Methodism" pp. 128-9.
But the hymns that contained them were nevertheless of "the utmost simplicity and plainness, suited to every capacity"; for the general sense was clear enough for everybody, and those who missed the allusions lost nothing essential. In a rather different way the hymns of Watts are also suited to men of different capacities. They are deep enough to satisfy the most mature intelligence, but "the metaphors are generally sunk to the level of vulgar capacities", the sense is "plain and obvious", and they do not "tempt the ignorant worshipper to sing without his understanding."  

There are many tunes that satisfy the deepest musical sensibility and at the same time find a place in the most popular form of community singing, namely the singing of hymns. Some of them may include a good deal of elaboration. Luther loved that music "where one person sings a suitable melody or tenor (as the musicians call it), while three, four, five other parts all sing along with it, which play and spring, as if in ecstasy, around this simple melody or tenor, and wonderfully adorn and grace it with manifold devices, and, as it were, perform a heavenly dance."  

This is the sort of music which, although it can only be fully grasped by the initiated, can yet be understood sufficiently well by all. And even the ordinary hymn tune, though simple enough for everyone, contains in the combination of its four parts a greater elaboration than the unmusical can fully comprehend.  

In architecture, the churches of S. Sophia in Constantinople and S. Mark in Venice are at the same time elaborate and simple; and there are innumerable churches and cathedrals in our own country which are at once the

1 Preface to "A Collection of hymns for the use of the people called Methodists", 1779.  
2 Watts - Prefaces to "Hymns and Spiritual Songs" and "The Psalms of David".  
3 Quoted by G.W. Stewart in "Music in the Church" p.64. (Pub. Rand R. Clark, 1914)  
4 Professor R. Sencourt says of the latter, "Nowhere is the design and pattern so prodigal and complex; nowhere is the effect more single". (The Consecration of Genius" p.30)
delight of the trained architect and of the ordinary man. And in the Bible there is food for the deepest spirit, although, in Tyndale's words, it is intelligible to "the boy that drives the plough." In it, as St. Gregory said, "elephants can swim and lambs can wade."

Clearly there is nothing in art as such that makes it unfit for congregational use. Certain kinds of art may be unsuitable, but that is a different matter. The fact that the ordinary man is liable often to misunderstand art does not mean that he can never use it, and still less that the average Church member can never use it. It does not mean that if art is suited to the needs of the artistically cultivated members of the Church it is necessarily outside the range of the common man. Nor does it mean that if it is suited to the common man it is necessarily "unable to satisfy all the requirements of a full aesthetic sensibility."\(^1\)

\(^{1}\) Read - "Art and Society" p. 71.
V. THE DIFFERING CAPACITIES OF THE VARIOUS ARTS

While we have been discussing the contribution that art can make to the various elements in corporate worship, and particularly in the last section about corporateness, it has become obvious that not all the arts are of equal use; and that some serve one purpose best and some another. It is now time to point out the capacities and limitations of each.

1. Architecture and instrumental music.

Although architecture and instrumental music are in some ways very different, yet they have many things in common (so much so that architecture has sometimes been called "frozen music"), and therefore it will be convenient to consider them together.

The greatest contribution they make is through those feelings that are most characteristic of art, that is through the sense they give us of the Absolute, Eternal, Infinite, and Powerful, through the seven attitudes that have been mentioned, and through the peace and tranquillity which they can convey.

Both of them are fittingly used in preparing the mind for the fulness of worship. They can calm our fevered and disordered spirits, put our littleness in its place and give us a proper sense of proportion, make us reverent in the presence of supreme worth, and help our faith by giving a sense of the goodness and unshakable stability of the fundamental realities.

The use of architecture in producing this sense of goodness and stability is not limited only to the time of preparation for worship; for the building is a perpetual background to the whole action, and its character affects everything that is done within it. There is a college that could be named where a short service used to be taken every morning in a
very commonplace and unworthy prayer room. It was preceded by much whispering and accompanied by a great deal of restless movement. But when a new chapel was made, its dignity and reverence communicated itself to those who used it, so that the whispering and commotion immediately ceased as though they had never been. Architecture can make pettiness unthinkable and show up anything that is unworthy, and more than any other art it can pervade the whole service with a sense of things that cannot be shaken. If in this way it conveys a sense of the strong eternal peace of God, then it will put anything that conflicts with that peace into its proper place as a small and temporary aberration which can be contained within that which controls the whole.

Generally speaking neither architecture nor instrumental music embodies intellectual ideas. It is true that a church can make clear the purpose for which it is intended to be used, and by the arrangement of its parts and furnishings can indicate the relative importance of the various things that are done. It is true also that musical instruments can imitate natural sounds, and even illustrate a whole "programme" of events - though such representation is not characteristic of music's powers, and in any case is very little used in worship. But in the ordinary way music and architecture do not present our minds with an intellectual subject, still less do they reason about one, or conduct us by a chain of arguments to an intellectual conclusion.

Even the feelings they give are not linked up with the intellect. Their intuitions do not concern concrete objects but abstract qualities, and they are given to us in such a way that we feel them without thinking them. The attitudes they communicate are similarly unattached; so that we feel,
for example, reverence without thinking what it is that we reverence, and
humility without thinking what it is in comparison with which we feel small.

Such arts, taken by themselves, are evidently not much use for
purposes of instruction. John Harvey says of the tower of Fountains Abbey
that it is "a witness to man's divine ancestry more convincing than fifty
sermons"; but this is the exaggeration of enthusiasm. It may be pointed
to as evidence, but someone must do the pointing and draw the moral (perhaps
in one of the fifty sermons); and even then, unless the hearers are
religious men to begin with, they are likely to find such evidence
unconvincing. If they are religious men, then no doubt their minds will
link up their experience with God if the circumstances suggest it. Thus a
church building will be mentally linked with God, and music that is played
in church as part of the service will be so linked; but a noble secular
building will not necessarily suggest thoughts of God, neither will great
music that is played at a concert. Where the link is made, we may say that
such art teaches that the God for whose worship it exists must be infinitely
great and good. That is no doubt very valuable; but it is teaching by
implication only, and it is a very limited lesson.

As a means of stirring or expressing the will these arts are of even
less service to the Church. The experience of them, like any other
experience, may of course become the occasion on which some act of will is
made, but they will hardly be the cause of such an act. Similarly, they are
not means of co-operating with God in deed, except of course that a church
exists for the purpose of being the place where such co-operation shall take
place.

We have already pointed out that architecture may have a very strong effect on the feeling of corporateness, and that it is possible for a building to weld men together into a whole. The effect of instrumental music is not so marked, though we should be wrong to suppose that it is without any effect of this kind at all. If it is performed by several people there will of course be a sense of unity engendered between them. But instrumental music also has some effect on an audience, varying according to its own character and the manner in which it is played. There is a distinct difference, for instance, between the feel of full orchestral music and chamber music; one feels designed for a large audience, and the other is much more intimate. There is also some difference between the manner in which an artist performs in front of a large audience and the way in which he performs in a private room before his friends. Music, therefore, must have some effect upon the hearer's consciousness of belonging to a body of people; but we cannot think that it is a very large effect.

2. Painting, sculpture, and glass (in general)

The static visual representative arts have obvious weaknesses in several directions. They are not well adapted to the expression of an act of will, nor are they means by which men co-operate with God in deed. Figures of saints and angels may serve to remind the worshippers of their fellowship with the Church triumphant, but they do not usually do so unless attention is specially called to them. In churches where the saints are invoked, standing figures or pictures may serve to give the worshipper a sense of the reality and actual presence of the saint represented;¹ but the

¹ Portraits of saints are usually imaginary, and in such cases one receives intuitions of their reality and their presence, but not of their authentic personality. Indeed, when one looks at an imaginary portrait one intuits a definitely different personality. This does not seem to matter so much where the saints are concerned, but, as we shall see, it is very important where we are dealing with figures of Christ.
use of such figures and pictures seems to belong rather to worship that is private than to that which is corporate.

What is usually claimed as the main merit of these arts, however, is their capacity for instruction. The Synod of Arras in 1025 declared that paintings were good because the illiterate contemplated in the paintings what they had never learned to read.¹ In the words of St. Gregory, "what writing is for those who can read, painting is for the uneducated who can only look."² Didron says, "a sculptured arch in the porch of a church, or an historical glass painting in the nave, presented the ignorant with a lesson, the believer with a sermon, — a lesson and a sermon which reached the heart through the eyes instead of entering at the ears. The impression, besides, was infinitely deeper; for it is acknowledged that a picture sways the soul far more powerfully than any discourse or description in words".³ He believes that, "assisted by such material objects, by statues, images and scenic games, the most feeble intelligence might rise to the conception of truth, and a soul plunged in the lowest abyss of darkness might soar upwards in the light displayed by art before its eyes."⁴ F.H. Crossley says of the art of the Middle Ages, "When it is remembered that the services were in an unknown tongue, and that after the Black Death the average priest was none too learned, the importance of painting the walls and windows with scenes for the purpose of inculcating doctrine cannot be exaggerated."⁵ Today we do not so thoroughly cover our churches with statues and pictures, but it is still held that where they are present, such objects "are valuable aids to

⁴ ibid. I, I,p.7
⁵ Crossley - "English Church Craftsmanship", p.75.
There are, however, certain important limitations in this capacity to teach. For instance, it is difficult for the static arts to teach those things that are inseparably bound up with movement, whether it is movement in time, space or thought. If they attempt to portray an action, they are under the necessity either of packing all their significance into one particular moment, and in that one static moment revealing the whole; or of combining several such moments into one picture, as for example Fra Angelico in one picture combines the Annunciation with the Expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, or as Sassetta portrays many scenes from the life of St. Anthony in one altar piece. One might suppose that static figures would, on the other hand, be able to convey the eternal and unchanging better than words or movement could do; but there seems no evidence to show that this is so.

It is difficult for static visual art to teach abstract truth. Hegel, indeed, says that the content of art should never be anything abstract in itself; but that is not wholly true. There is nothing to prevent the verbal arts from dealing with an abstract subject; there is, for example, nothing very concrete in I Corinthians 13 until we reach verse 12 which speaks of a mirror. But it is true that the representation of an abstract subject in visual art is not possible except by means of some kind of symbolism; and although I Corinthians 13 can be written it cannot, except by giving a whole series of exemplifying incidents, be painted.

1 Mellor - "Modern Church Design", p.125. (Pub. Skelton 1948)
2 The Annunciation in the Baptistery at Cortona.
3 National Gallery of Art, Washington.
are often effective enough, but not even by using symbols is it easy to say visibly everything that one desires. To portray the fact that God is speaking to a man, for example, by painting a little angel whispering in his ear, is obviously an attempt to do something by visual art which ought to be left to words.

Another difficulty is that visual art, if it is at all realistic, is under the necessity of showing all the parts of its subject, even though some of them may be unknown, irrelevant, difficult to portray, or best left to the imagination. In words the Madonna may be just the mother of Jesus, but in paint she becomes Italian, Flemish, Negro, or Chinese; pretty or plain; intelligent or obtuse. In a verbal description the death of Holofernes or Goliath raises no difficulty, but in a picture their severed heads are unpleasant and unreal. In the Gospels there is a fine reticence about the stories of the crucifixion and the resurrection, and the mind can dwell on the great spiritual essentials; but pictures and carvings must show details that often hide the essentials. The story of the Ascension, when told in words, is full of significance; but put into visual terms it is merely unconvincing.

Generally speaking, this kind of difficulty is more troublesome in sculpture than in painting. Painting, dealing only with visible and not tangible form, is more able to work by suggestion; it can use shadow and atmosphere, and can much more easily arrange its composition so as to cover up what is best not shown. But both sculpture and painting fix the mind on the material fact, and are under the necessity of showing it more or less whole; whereas words can speak of it just as much or as little as the artist chooses, and can define or leave undefined in any degree that seems best.
A still further drawback of visual art is that most pictures, if they are to instruct, need to be explained by words or by a previous knowledge of the subject matter. If we do not know the biblical stories, then we are not enlightened very much by seeing paintings of them; if we do not already know something of the history of the saints, we often find it extremely difficult to decide who and what it is that is being portrayed; and rows of figures, even when each is given his usual emblem, cannot be said to convey very much. If the painting is symbolic, then very considerable explanation may be necessary. Who would correctly interpret the centaur's arrow as the soul of Christ departing to help those he loved, or the Camel as Christ stooping humbly to take upon himself the load of the world's sin, or the elephant as symbolising the chaste Christian tempted by women, or the hydra as a type of Christ who descended into hell to burst its gates, or the lion as symbolising sometimes vigilance and sometimes the resurrection, or the peacock as representing immortality? In point of fact it is quite clear that many ecclesiastical representations have failed to be understood.

C.G. Coulton has shown quite conclusively that as far as teaching was concerned the pictures of the Middle Ages were largely a failure; often men did not know what was being taught, and often a picture intended to represent one thing was interpreted to mean something completely different.

Finally there is the fact that it is the same pictures that are being seen by the congregation week after week. They may learn something from them the first time, and it may be very good for them to be reminded of the same truth over and over again, but the quantity of teaching that can be given by such static art is very limited indeed. It is clear therefore that

1 See Anderson - "The Mediaeval Carver" for further examples of such symbolism.
the importance of painting, sculpture, and glass, for the purpose of instruction has been very greatly exaggerated. What they can do best is to convey intuitions, to bring home to men the reality of things they already know.

3. Painting, sculpture, and glass (in representing the divine persons).

The visual representation of the Divine Persons presents special problems, and needs separate treatment. Men have persevered for generation after generation in attempting it, and have tried one method after another, but the trouble with all such attempts is that they say either too little or too much, or more usually both; and they are therefore often in danger of being seriously misleading.

A triangle or flour-de-lys that is supposed to represent the Trinity is so inadequate as to seem completely futile, and in any case makes one wonder why that particular threefold object should be chosen. Words and letters such as alpha and omega or IHS have their uses, and a cross has noble ones; but these things are merely reminders and need to be filled with content. Rays of light may suggest a visitation of the Spirit, but in a very impersonal and attenuated way. Allegorical animals, such as the lamb, fish, pelican, lion, or dove, embody some part of the truth about God when they are rightly understood, but at best they are only inadequate pointers, as also are such parts of the human body as a hand, head, eye, or flaming heart.

The least inadequate symbol for God is a human figure. It does at any rate suggest one who is personal. Yet it cannot properly represent God's impersonal qualities, and although it may suggest something of infinity and omnipotence, it can hardly suggest omnipresence, and it cannot suggest immanence at all. A realistic figure also suffers from the disadvantage of
having to represent one or other of certain human categories, none of which applies to its subject. For a human skin must be black, white, yellow, or brown; a human face must be Caucasian, Mongolic or Negroid; and a human figure young or old. Blake tried to solve the last difficulty by portraying God as both old and young at the same time, giving him the beard of an old man and the strong, muscular body of a young one, but that does not help very much in representing one to whom the category of time does not apply.

To attempt to represent the Trinity in human form is of course to add another impossibility. Part of the truth may be suggested by a representation of three separate figures, but the custom of attempting to convey something more by painting one figure with three heads has rightly been discarded, and the figure with three faces in one head was mercifully prohibited by Pope Urban VIII in 1623.¹

In portraying the Father or the Spirit we are clearly using symbols for that which is invisible. But the figure of Christ is in a different category. As St. John of Damascus says, although we cannot depict the invisible, or picture the inconceivable, or give expression to the limitless or the immeasurable, "it is clear that when you contemplate God who is pure spirit becoming man for your sake you will be able to clothe him with the human form."²

This would seem to be better than the attempt to portray Christ by means of allegorical animals, and the early Church certainly felt it to be so;³ for they feared lest allegory should swallow up reality and history.⁴ They

¹ Didron - "Christian Iconography" ii.p61.
³ Canon 82. See Martin p.142. - "A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy."
⁴ Didron - "Christian Iconography" i.p332.
looked upon the picture of Christ, indeed, as a defence of the incarnation against heretical teaching, and by representing him as human they desired "that all may understand by means of it the depths of the humiliation of the Word of God, and that we may recall to our memory his conversation in the flesh, his passion and salutary death, and his redemption which was wrought in the whole world."¹

But there are immense difficulties. If the figure of Christ is portrayed with historic realism, as that of a Jew in the first century living in Palestine, his face will be to us that of a foreigner, his dress and manners far removed from our experience, and his surroundings those of the ancient world. But the Christ whom we worship is not merely one who used to live as a Jew in Palestine nearly 2,000 years ago, he belongs to the whole of humanity; he is not removed from our everyday experience, and he is our contemporary. If, in an attempt to overcome this difficulty he is made to have our face, to wear our clothes, and to move in our surroundings (as the painters have so often portrayed him); some part of eternal truth is gained, but historical truth is lost.²

Similarly if we concentrate on the historical truth of his death, and make a crucifix which is a realistic exhibition of suffering, we neglect the fact of his triumph; but if we are concerned with eternal truth and show him on the cross robed and crowned as a king, then we are failing to show the full horror of the thing that was done on Calvary.

² Cf Westcott's comment - "The early Church by a right instinct refrained from seeking any direct representation of the Lord. It was felt that the realistic treatment of His Person could not but endanger the living sense of the Majesty which the Church had learnt to recognise. By no effort could the spectator in a later age place himself in the position of the disciples before the Passion and Ascension. The exact reproduction, if it were possible, of what met their eyes would not produce on him the effect which they experienced." ("The Epistles of St John" p.337).
If in any way Christ is shown as obviously and clearly human, then it is difficult for us to feel at the same time that he is divine. And yet if he is portrayed as clearly majestic and divine, he is likely to seem removed from the realm of humanity. The Byzantines in their mosaics only succeed in making him divine by making him unhuman; and even Eric Gill in his Stations of the Cross in Westminster Cathedral only makes him different from ordinary men at the cost of making him less interesting and vital than Pilate and the soldiers.

Suppose then we take refuge in human allegorical types. E. I. Watkin, saying that no artist has ever given us a truly satisfying Christ, prefers the "Frankly allegorical Shepherd of the catacombs", and others may choose the Pilgrim, or the Light of the World, or the figure of Orpheus who rescued his beloved from the realm of darkness. But such figures are a poor makeshift, woefully incomplete; and in spite of the fact that they are "frankly allegorical", even they are easily misleading, for it is difficult to take them in a completely allegorical way.

Here we come to the greatest difficulty in all attempts to represent Christ by the realistic figure of a man. A human face always suggests a whole personality. It is a most expressive instrument, and we cannot look upon it without intuiting the personality to whom it belongs. If we are given a portrait that is authentic, it immediately helps us to understand what kind of person it is who is represented. If the portrait is not authentic but purely imaginary, it does not cease to present us with a

---

1 Watkin - "Catholic Art and Culture" p.94.
3 We may of course be mistaken in some respects about the nature of the personality, because faces can tell lies; but a personality is always expressed in a face, even if it is a false personality.
particular individual personality; it presents us with one that is different from the reality. Now we have no authentic portrait of Christ, and therefore when the artist paints a picture of him, he gives us a personality that is definitely not his. As Edwyn Bevan says, "The person the picture shows has his own peculiar individuality, and (unless by some incredible fluke an artist were to hit off a precise likeness of Jesus without knowing it) it is a different individuality from that of Jesus. My thought of Jesus is thus confused by the intrusion of another quite different person. If I direct my thought, or my prayers, to a fancy picture of Jesus, it is impossible for my idea of Jesus to be uncontaminated by the alien personality." Moreover, when we look at such pictures we can feel very well that it is an alien personality. There is no painting of Christ that we recognize as entirely satisfactory.

There is a great deal to be said for confessing one's inability to portray the face of Christ, as Blake did when he showed him ascending to heaven with his back to the spectator, and when in one of his pictures of the crucifixion he shows only Christ's two hands outstretched on a cross which radiates light over the two crosses of the thieves. There is also a great deal to be said for a stylised portrayal of Christ, that is to say for creating a figure so simplified and patterned that it shows a man rather than a member of any particular race, and one aspect of his experience rather than a whole personality; so that it is obviously partial, something abstracted and reduced to aesthetic form. This is done, for example, in a most notable piece of 11th century sculpture at the Abbey Church of Werden in Westphalia.

The face of Christ on the bronze crucifix is frankly unrealistic; it suggests in a most moving way the painful death of a noble man, and leaves all other points of personality unstated. Such a method of representation will not serve every purpose, but it may often portray one truth without seeming to contradict others.

Whatever method of representation is adopted, however, it seems important to concentrate the spectators' attention on the deeds that Christ performs rather than on his appearance. We can put up with some inadequacy in a portrait if our attention is fixed not on Christ's face, but on the fact that he healed a blind man, distributed bread and wine, or was crucified. But a picture in which the main interest lies in the features is bound to be unsatisfactory.

The service that can be rendered to worship by visual representations of Christ is, even at its best, very limited. Some particular aspect of his person or work can be brought home to us, as in the Warden crucifix; some particular action of his can be made to feel living and real, as Grunewald brings home to us the horror of the crucifixion, and as the anonymous Chinese artist who painted "The Stilling of the Storm" makes us feel the situation on Galilee; some aspect of the truth can be suggested by the portraying of an allegorical character or animal; and an attempt may be made partially to combine various truths about him, as when he is shown crucified, but robed and crowned as a king. But there is a danger in portraying one truth of contradicting another, and even an approximation to the full reality of his nature is impossible to visual art. If, as Reynolds says, art cannot

---

1 See "The Life of Christ by Chinese Artists" (pub. S.F.C. 1939) p.32.
even represent all the power of Jupiter, how shall it fare with the real and living Christ?  

4. Literature and rhetoric.

Literature and rhetoric are of unique importance in Christian worship. They can in themselves do everything that is necessary for it. They can communicate and express all the feelings - all intuitions, all attitudes, and all degrees and kinds of excitement. They are the best material for teaching; they can express abstract conceptions and reasonings, and can frankly tell of the invisible and leave the infinite undefined; they move in time and are therefore suited to the portrayal of historical events in time; they can state the two sides of a paradox without loss to either; in order to give a less imperfect impression they can go on adding description to description, combining an infinite number of portraits in one breath, saying that Christ is "Shepherd, Brother, Friend, Prophet, Priest, and King," and then adding that when all that is said, we are not seeing him as he is; and much more easily than the visual arts they can join together eternity and time, human and divine, and even three persons in one God. They can produce and express acts of will. They can be the means by which we co-operate with God. They can both produce a sense of corporateness, and be suited at the same time to all the varying capacities of the different members of the congregation.

They are indeed understood by every member of the congregation, because

---

1 Reynolds - "Discourses on Art" v.
2 Visual representations cannot be changed every week like verbal ones, and neither can we easily have such a number of them as to balance one portrayal of Christ by others that are complementary. It follows therefore that they should never be more than a subsidiary part of the decoration of a church; for that which is so seriously incomplete ought not to be in the forefront of the congregation's attention every week, for year after year. Not even a crucifix should dominate the building, for we do not see even there the whole fulness of the divine nature, nor every aspect of the divine work.
every member practises them for himself. And it is an added commendation that the finest works in these media are within the reach of all: a poor village congregation may have to put up with inadequate buildings, may have to dispense entirely with pictures, glass, and sculpture, and may have no skill available for good music and acting; but it can use the finest literature in the world.

With one exception, words can serve all the purposes of worship as well as any other medium, and some of them a great deal better. The exception is that they do not of themselves carry such a strong intuition of reality as those media which are addressed directly to our physical sight; but nevertheless, when expertly used they are capable of tremendous force even in this respect.

They are the one medium of corporate worship which is completely indispensable. It is possible to abandon architecture and worship in the open air, to abandon with it the arts of painting, sculpture, and stained glass, to dispense with all kinds of music, procession, dance, and drama, and as we have said earlier it is even possible to dispense with the symbolism of Baptism and the Holy Meal; but we cannot dispense with words.

Words need no other art to help them out, though it is natural to use other arts, and enriches the worship to do so. Other arts cannot do the work of worship by themselves. We have already seen that there is a great deal in worship that architecture and music cannot do, and that painting, sculpture, and glass very often need to be helped out by words; and we shall see later that dance and drama also have serious shortcomings. But words by themselves are sufficient for all worship's needs.

There are two special kinds of verbal art about which something more
must be said. The first is verse. Verse is a natural medium for expressing that sort of combination of thought and feeling in which the feeling is the more important partner. It is not an equally natural medium for expression in which thought is the more important partner. The reason is that verse places a great stress on rhythm and often on rhyme, that is to say on the sound of what is said; and sound is addressed not to thought but to feeling. In poetry these sounds get to work first. As I.A. Richards points out, "a feeling that is quite pertinent seems often to precede any clear grasping of the sense"; and that feeling affects our understanding of the sense itself. "In nearly all poetry the sound and feel of the words, what is often called the form of the poem in opposition to its content, get to work first, and the sense in which the words are taken is subtly influenced by this fact. Most words are ambiguous as regards their plain sense, especially in poetry. We can take them as we please in a variety of senses. The sense we are pleased to choose is the one which most suits the impulses already stirred through the form of the verse." When we have grasped the sense, we develop other additional feelings which arise out of it. It will be seen, therefore, that poetry is heavily weighted on the side of feeling as against thought.

This means that it is not a particularly suitable instrument for purposes of instruction. Instruction can be, and has been, given by this means. In the middle ages "rhyming lives of the saints and gospel expositions were undoubtedly read or recited 'ad populam' on feast days and Sundays in our own churches," and one of Wycliffe's complaints concerned the rhyming sermons of the friars. One can see how a story might be attractively

---

1 Richards - "Practical Criticism" p.216.
2 Richards - "Science and Poetry" p.23.
3 Owst - "Preaching in Medieval England" p.275.
dressed up in this way. But the result would certainly be an over-emphasis on neatness and wit; and anyway, the telling of a story is only a small part of the instruction required from a preacher.

The second kind of verbal art that demands special mention is rhetoric. This is of particular value in worship for teaching, and for moving the will. The reason is partly that in the hands of the ordinary practitioner the spoken word is more expressive than the written one; for most people express themselves less completely by words alone than by words combined with intonation, variations of speed, and gesture. But a still more important reason lies in the more direct and complete relationship there is between speaker and listener than between writer and reader. As Professor H.H. Parmer says, "In the spoken word my will objectifies itself for you with such force and immediacy that it and its objectification are one and indissoluble, almost indistinguishable. The word is my will, and my will is the word. This is clumsily and therefore inaccurately expressed, but a single consideration will show what I mean. Precisely at the moment when my will is withdrawn the word ceases as absolutely as annihilation. And it comes into being again just where and when my will ordains it. ..... It is this immediate dependence of the spoken word on the will that gives it its superiority over the printed word as a medium of personal relationship. What seems, what indeed from one point of view is, the advantage of the printed word, is that it can be listened to again and again whenever I choose - I have only to take the book down from my shelves and read it, and it can stay on my shelves a score or more years and not perish. This is precisely its disadvantage from the point of view of personal relationship; for the essence of the personal relationship is in the activity of your will.
bringing the word into being and giving it the only being it possesses, not in the activity of my will."\(^1\) He goes on to say, "Second, and to be taken inseparably with what has just been said, in the spoken word you have in a maximal form the element of claim. To begin with, I claim your attention. I should not speak if I did not want you to listen. By speech I ask you to listen .... Then, further, by my speech I claim your answer. My word, containing my will, is addressed to your will, and asks your answer containing yours, even if it be only the answer of a nod or shake of the head. I want response."\(^2\)

Thus the spoken word has great capacities in the realm of the will, but for its full effectiveness it must be the spoken word of a person who is inescapably present. A speech heard over the radio has nothing like the same effect, for it can be switched off by turning a knob; neither has the speech of a man in a film an equal effect, for we know that he cannot tell whether we respond or not.

**5. Song.**

For the purposes of worship, the merits of vocal music include all those of instrumental music, and no more need be said about them now. But to them must be added the effect of incorporating words. We must therefore consider what happens when words and music are combined.

There is no universal rule about which is the dominant partner. At one extreme it is the music that is supreme, and then the voice is treated as little more than a particular kind of wind instrument, and the words have very little significance. The voice can indeed be used without any proper

---

\(^1\) Farmer - "The Servant of the Word" pp. 46-7.  
\(^2\) ibid. pp. 49-50.
words at all, as for instance in "The Song of the Nightingale" by Saint-Saens, which consists entirely of a succession of phrases sung to the vowel "ah"; or where nonsense syllables are sung such as "fa-la-la"; or where the last syllable of a word is prolonged in a melisma as in the mediaeval jubilus. But even if we take songs where the words have some genuine sense, there are many in which that sense matters hardly at all. To know the subject (for instance that the song is perhaps about the sea) may add to the significance of the rhythm; to recognise a key word like "wind" or "gold", may add a certain emotional colouring; but often that is all that is necessary for a complete appreciation of the song. Indeed there are many occasions when even that is not needed; the words of Handel's "Ombra mai fu" hardly seem to matter at all, and the effect is very much the same whether one hears it sung as a vocal solo or played as "Largo" by an orchestra.

On the other hand, it is possible for the words to take charge and the music to matter comparatively little. In the intonation of parts of the Christian liturgy, for example, melody becomes almost non-existent, and the rhythm is entirely that of the words. In genuine formal recitative we are also moving in the sphere where music is usually very much the lesser partner, and Handel's setting of "Behold a Virgin shall conceive" for example, gains nearly all its effect from the words. In between the two extremes are all possible degrees of the interpretation of the words by the music.

We must remember, however, that sound is a more direct way of expressing feeling than thought is. We have already seen that in poetry sound gets to work before sense, and if that is so even in poetry, it is
easy to understand that in song the pre-eminence of feeling will be even more marked, for song places even more emphasis on sound than poetry does. Now in poetry the sound is not completely satisfying by itself; the sense of the words is needed to complete the experience, and the mind therefore moves forward to grasp them. But in song the matter is different, for there it is possible to combine words and music in such a way that the sound is completely satisfying by itself. Where that is so, the tendency is for the mind to go no further. That is why the words are of so little importance in "Ombra mai fu"; the music has got to work first, and has already been found satisfying before the words come to be considered at all. That being so, the mind hardly bothers to notice them.

Christian hymns and tunes make the same kind of combination. The tunes are complete in themselves; they can be, and sometimes are, played by themselves, and are found quite satisfying without any words at all. The result is that although words may be added to them, there is a tendency for the mind never to get as far as the sense of the words. Certain epithets here and there, if they are forceful in themselves and if they are placed in strong positions where they cannot be overlooked, may indeed contribute a certain emotional colour; but the sound gives an experience which is satisfying without any detailed understanding of the sense. This is amply borne out in common experience, for all worshippers know how easy it is to sing most heartily, and yet to have little idea what they are singing about. To read a hymn through instead of singing it is for most people a very revealing experience, and shows how little attention they generally pay to the words.

What has been said about the singing of hymns applies also to the singing of anthems by a choir, except that the influence of the words upon the
congregation is there even less important, because they are usually much
less clearly understood, and are always much less attended to.\(^1\)

We are now ready to assess the usefulness of vocal music in Church
worship. There are three respects in which it is generally claimed to be
of particular use.

(i) It is usually believed that the singing of hymns is a most
important means of instruction. Paul believed in the singing of hymns for
the purpose of "teaching and admonishing one another"\(^2\); and hymn-singing
is said to have counteracted Gnosticism and Arianism\(^3\), to have spread the
doctrines of the Reformation\(^4\), and to have been more effective in disseminating
Methodist theology than Wesley's sermons.\(^5\) No wonder that N.J. Gilman
says "Next only to the Bible, the hymnody of Christendom is probably the
most influential medium of religious culture we possess. In public worship
it directly affects millions of people every week; awaking, educating and
sustaining their spiritual life, and guiding them, quite as effectually as
sermon or prayer, to an understanding of Christian truth."\(^6\)

If that is really so, then it is very strange that so many who sing good sound
Christian hymns have so little knowledge of good sound Christian doctrine.
But now that we have seen how satisfying hymn-singing may be as an aesthetic
occupation even when one takes hardly any notice of the words, we may doubt

\(^{1}\) Dr. Müller-Gräfenbergs has made a statistical investigation into the effect
of hymn-singing, and has discovered, as one would expect, that singing
in which the worshipper himself takes part has a much greater effect upon
him than that to which he merely listens. See Pratt - "The Religious
Consciousness" pp. 302-3.

\(^{2}\) Colossians iii, 16.

\(^{3}\) Frere - "Historical Edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern" x.

\(^{4}\) Phillips - "Hymnology Past and Present" p. 100.

\(^{5}\) Bett - "The Hymns of Methodism" p. 60.

\(^{6}\) Gillman - "The Evolution of the English Hymn" p. 9. Cf. also J. Bishop -
"Methodist Worship" pp. 20, 21, 142, and 144.
whether such a judgment is not very wide of the truth.

The Wesleys knew something of the danger of failing to attend to the words; and although others may claim on their behalf a tremendous teaching value in Methodist hymns, it is certain that they would not have agreed without notable qualifications. John Wesley was so concerned that he even instructed his preachers often to interrupt the hymns and ask the congregation, "Now do you know what you said last? Did it suit your case? Did you sing it as to God, with the spirit and understanding also?" Similarly, his brother Charles wrote verses on "The True Use of Music" which include the following:

Still let us on our guard be found,
And watch against the power of sound,
With sacred jealousy;
Lest haply sense should damp our zeal,
And music's charms bewitch and steal
Our hearts away from Thee.

It can hardly be supposed that a congregation is taught very much by a hymn whose words they do not take any notice of; but this is plainly the state of affairs that the Wesleys feared, and one that is a constant danger in the singing of hymns.

In assessing the teaching value of vocal music, we must not forget also the principle already discussed, that art is not a way of conveying a belief unless the belief is presented in such a way that its truth or falsity is actually brought in question. Hymns do not usually do this, and the result is that even when our attention is directed to the words, there is a strong tendency for us to accept ideas as present rather than to believe them as true. We need to ask not only, "Do you know what you said last?" but "Did it suit your case?"

1 Minutes of Conference 1746.
We are not to infer that hymns are without any teaching value at all. If there is some special reason for taking notice of the words, then to sing them drives them home. If the air is already full of controversy about Christian belief and heresy, then the popular songs on both sides will be important for the ideas they contain; and though they may not be much help in convincing those who hold opposing views, at least they will confirm the faith of those who already believe them. The hymns of the Methodists had the further advantages that many of them were learnt as the application of a sermon that had just been preached on the same subject, that the words were read out a line at a time before they were sung, and that they were thought over and prayed over in private devotion as well as being used in public worship.

It is clear, however, that hymns sung casually, as they often are today as a piece of community singing, are not likely to teach anything; and even hymns sung in services in Church will leave the belief of the congregation unaffected, unless in some way their attention is directed to the meaning of the words, and they are made to feel that in the singing they must express their personal beliefs.

(ii) The singing of hymns is commended as a way of moving the will, and as providing a means by which men may co-operate with God. It is easy to see that the same things apply here that apply to the use of hymns for purposes of teaching. Hymns that are sung without any thought of the words, or without any sense that the words commit the singer to anything definite, will obviously not move the will to any kind of action, nor will they serve as a means of co-operating with God for the fulfilment of his purposes.

Experience proves that it is not at all difficult for a man to sing "Take my
silver and my gold, not a mite would I withhold", and then put coppers in
the collection box; and for him to sing with lusty fervour

Ready for all thy perfect will,
My acts of faith and love repeat,
Till death Thy endless mercies seal,
And make the sacrifice complete.

without for a single moment meaning that he offers his whole life as a
sacrifice to God. And similarly it is quite easy to sing without meaning
it as a genuine prayer such a verse as

Let holy charity
Mine outward vesture be,
And lowliness become mine inner clothing;
True lowliness of heart,
Which takes the humbler part,
And o'er its own shortcomings weeps with loathing.

The singing of hymns is not in itself a means of co-operating with
God in will and deed, and it only becomes so if in some way attention is
drawn to the words, and if the worshipper is made to feel that in singing
them he must express his own genuine intention.

(iii) The third thing usually commended in hymn-singing is the sense
of corporateness it is said to produce. Thus Percy Scholes says "the social
effect of community song is marked; it diffuses a spirit of friendliness,
the common effort tending to sink temperamental differences and class
distinctions. At any time when unity of spirit is particularly essential,
community singing is found to be of enormous public value." And Ambrose has
a rapturous passage in which he says "Psalmody unites those who disagree,
makes friends of those at odds, brings together those who are out of charity
with one another. Who could retain a grievance against the man with whom
he had joined in singing before God? The singing of praise is the very bond

1 Scholes - "The Oxford Companion to Music" p.192.
of unity."

No doubt some sense of corporateness is produced when men do anything together, and it will probably be increased if they realise that they are declaring a common faith. There is, too, something about a hymn tune that seems to demand a congregation; it is not fully satisfying when sung by a solo voice, and that is no doubt one reason why, in spite of William Law's earnest exhortation, most people do not think of singing hymns or psalms in their private prayers. Nevertheless we cannot but feel that the degree of corporateness engendered by hymn-singing is exaggerated; and certainly there is a good deal of evidence to show that it does not do all the things claimed for it by Ambrose.

6. Drama and dance.

We found that the one thing the visual arts could do better than the verbal ones was to produce a strong sense of reality, because we all feel that seeing is believing. We might expect, therefore, that if the verbal and visual arts were combined, as they are in ordinary drama, we should have a resulting art which would be a singularly effective instrument for our use. In some ways this is true, but not in all.

Drama possesses the limitations of static visual art as well as its advantages. It is under the necessity of showing details, even when some of them are irrelevant, unknown, or invisible. A Biblical story must be filled out with incident and conversation to give it body and verisimilitude, and that means invention which may be misleading (Miss Sayers, for instance, in her play cycle makes the Apostle Peter less important, and Matthew more

2 Law - "A Serious Call" xv.
important, than they seem in fact to have been); any representation of the
divine persons involves insuperable difficulties (though fortunately such
representation is forbidden by law in this country, and we are thus spared
much that would necessarily be unsatisfactory and unconvincing); and not
all the things that one wishes to teach are capable of being interpreted in
incident and action. Nevertheless, when one considers that many things
that are better left unseen can be described, that action can be spiritual
as well as physical, and that the conversation of the actors can be as full
of reasoning as one desires, it is clear that drama is in nearly everything
the most effective means of worship we possess. There are, however two
respects in which it falls short, and unfortunately they are fatal.

The first is that the fundamental distinguishing mark of drama is
impersonation. Karl Young puts it very well - "A play ... is above all else,
a story presented in action, in which the speakers or actors impersonate the
characters concerned. Dialogue is not essential, for a monologue is drama
when the speaker impersonates the one from whom the utterance is represented
as proceeding. Even spoken language may be dispensed with, for pantomime is
a true, though limited, form of drama, provided a story is successfully
conveyed, and provided the actors pretend to be the personages concerned in
the story. As to the nature of impersonation in itself, there can scarcely
be any substantial disagreement. It consists in physical imitation. In
some external and recognisable manner the actor must pretend to be the person
whose words he is speaking, and whose actions he is imitating:"

Now thoroughgoing impersonation is out of keeping with worship. In
worship more than anywhere else we must be as completely ourselves as we can.

1 Young - "The Drama of the Mediæval Church" p.30.
We must, in our own character, mean what we say and do. We can put on
vestments, express ourselves in ceremony, and use as much symbolism as we
find serviceable; but we must not play at being someone we are not. The
needs expressed must be our own needs, the desires uttered our own desires,
the sins confessed our own sins. We put off all pretence and go to God
just as we are. Worship must be reality, not illusion. W.L. Sperry says
"Drama demands that an actor play many roles, and depends upon the convention
of an illusion, accepted by both player and spectator. Things are not what
they seem. Worship requires us to put off the playing of roles and to be
ourselves. It has no interest in creating illusions."¹

It might seem at first as though this were only concerned with the
worship of the actors, and not with that of the congregation; but that is
not so. Anyone who is leading worship must himself be a worshipper; and if
the worship of the actors is interfered with, so will be the worship of the
congregation also.

That an actor may impersonate a character and worship God at the same
time can hardly be denied. He may be performing the actions and speaking the
words of a Wise Man as he kneels before a china doll on a stage, and yet be
in very reality John Jones worshipping Christ in heaven. But although on
such an occasion what he does and says as a stage character may express what
he would do and say in his own person, the actual representation of an act
of worship is at the most only a small part of any religious play, and in
most religious plays is not present at all. In any other situation, the
actor, if he is to be a true worshipper, must remain in some sense "outside"
his part. He must not so identify himself with the character as to cease to

¹ Sperry - "Reality in Worship" p.221.
be a Christian man now worshipping God; whatever his character says or does, there must go with it the reverence of a worshipper saying and doing these things in the very presence of God and for his glory. But that is not the method of successful drama.

That brings us to the second shortcoming of drama, not perhaps one that is absolutely inevitable, but one that is so common as to need to be seriously taken into account. A good drama will in all probability portray figures who speak and behave as no man would dream of doing if he were consciously in the immediate presence of God; and for them to do such a thing in a Christian service inevitably introduces a discordant element into the worship.

The reverence of a Christian congregation is that of people who know they are in God's very presence, and nothing must be allowed to destroy that consciousness. It would not do, for example, to try to fulfil the purpose of worship by arranging for a debate between a Christian and a vigorous and outspoken atheist. Such a debate might very well be an excellent thing in itself, and worship might be arranged to precede and follow it, but at any rate while the atheist was speaking the assembly would no longer be the Church at worship. The visitor's attitude would not befit one who was standing in the immediate presence of God, and the whole congregation would be affected by it.

Similarly, when a character in drama is made to speak and act as no Christian ever would do in the sanctuary of God, an alien element is immediately introduced, and for the time being the worship of the people of God is held up. A good religious play frequently contains such characters; they make it more realistic and more impressive, but they render it less
fitted for use in the worship of the Church. The conversation of the
Israelites, for example, in the opening scene of Philip J. Lamb's play "Go
down Moses", has this effect. The scene is good drama, and the play as a
whole is not only an unusually good play, but is a magnificent exposition
of Christianity. Nevertheless the Israelites' lechery, blasphemy, and foul
ancenss, make a scene that is obviously out of place as part of the worship
of the Christian Church.

The performing or watching of a Christian drama is a mixed sort of
occupation that may be partly worship, but is partly something else. It can
be a most valuable piece of service offered to God, and a most successful
means of teaching and moving the wills of men. It may even lead them straight
into worship; but it is not pure worship in itself, and cannot rightly be
used as part of the normal Sunday service of the Church.

All other kinds of impersonation are subject to the same disabilities
in worship. There have been ministers whose powers of impersonation were so
great that in highly dramatic preaching or reading of the scriptures they
could produce the illusion that they really were the character whose words
they were speaking, and that the situation they depicted was actual and
present. The result is most vivid and gripping, and even on occasion
startling; but it may easily be destructive of worship. The best kind of
reading and preaching for the purposes of worship is that which has a covering
of reverence about it. Certainly changes of voice and intonation ought to
mark different characters and situations; but reading and preaching should
never be so realistic as to attempt to create an illusion. They should
always remain the speech of a Christian man who is reporting these things to
a congregation engaged in worship in the immediate presence of God. Similarly,
for the purpose of corporate worship in the Church, the best portrayal of
the different characters in a cantata is of that kind which does not allow
one to forget that the singers are really Christian men and women worshipping
God.

Drama has very close associations with the dance, and one of the,
original main purposes of the dance was mime. What has been said about the
impersonation of drama applies of course equally to that of dancing. But
there are other kinds of dance that have been used in Christian worship, and
they ought not to be left completely out of account; though it is very
difficult to assess their usefulness without first-hand experience of them.

We should expect that mimetic dancing would cultivate and express
attitudes and emotional excitement of various kinds, and certainly that it
could be used to express the will. The fact that a dance can be performed
by many people together also suggests that it could produce a strong sense of
corporateness. But it is obviously not easy to arrange for its performance
by a congregation in buildings that are filled with furniture, and in any
case it can never be a suitable means of expression for a mixed assembly of
young and old, agile and infirm. In its full and complete form it is not
now much used in the West; though that part of it which we know as the
procession has a limited usefulness, and that which is represented by gesture
has a very great one, and in one way and another is of service in all the
constituent elements of worship.
VI. CONCLUSION

1. The necessity of art in corporate worship.

It may be said that although no doubt art may be very serviceable in corporate worship, and may be very pleasant for those who have an interest in such things, we can after all do very well without it, it is not strictly necessary.

It would seem, however, that even if we did desire to do without it, it would be extremely difficult for us to do so. As we have seen, art is not a rare phenomenon practised only by a special class of men, but something practised regularly by us all. Moreover we most often practise it unknowingly. If we have any mastery over materials at all, it is very difficult for us not to express our feelings when we use them. A man who has mastered the art of drawing, for example, tends to express himself when he draws, even if he does not intend to do so. Durer once produced some drawings of the human body which were intended to be merely a study in proportion, and were born of a desire to find a mathematical formula for beauty. But they are in fact much more than that, and Professor Weidle describes them as "among the most lovely things that he has done, and among the most intensely expressive, even though he wanted to make them the incarnation of a kind of mathematical impassibility."

Similarly, when we use speech, a medium over which we all have a certain mastery, it is very difficult to use it purely indicatively. Even if the words taken by themselves are not very expressive, the tone of voice in which they are spoken and the gestures that accompany them almost inevitably embody our feelings, and therefore our speech is nearly always a work of art - either good or bad according to the wholeness
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1 Weidle - "The Dilemma of the Arts" p.18.
and fitness of the feelings expressed. It would be extraordinarily difficult, therefore, for a man who has skill in the use of his medium to produce articles for worship that were not in some degree works of art.

Not only do we almost inevitably practise art ourselves, but in some realms we demand it of other people. When we see their work, even if the idea of art was not in their minds when they produced it, we often find that it is very much in ours when we judge it. If we go into a room, for example, we assess its proportions. If it is well-proportioned, it has artistic merit; if it is ill-proportioned, it is not thereby artistically negligible, but artistically bad. If the skirting, frieze, and cornice are suitable, that is aesthetically good; if they are not suitable, the result is not aesthetically neutral, but aesthetically unsatisfactory; if there is no skirting, frieze, or cornice, then again the result demands aesthetic judgment, because we cannot help but notice that the room looks unfinished. There are, no doubt, varying degrees of fitness, and while the complete fitness of one thing may enrapture us, that of another may be quite unobtrusive. But in most of the matters connected with worship, complete neutrality in aesthetic judgment is very rare. Generally speaking, if a work is not felt to be fitting, it is felt to be unfitting; and if we do not find in it art that is good, we find art that is bad.

It is sometimes maintained, however, that even if art is in some degree unavoidable, it is in a realm apart from that of worship and is therefore not in any way necessary to it; that if it were possible to provide materials for worship that had no relation to art at all, we could get on just as well. In particular, it is said that the symbols we use would be found quite adequate for religious purposes if they were merely indicative.
Even Evelyn Underhill speaks of symbols in this way, although admittedly she is dealing with religion in general, and not specifically with corporate worship. "It is a peculiarity of the religious symbol", she says, "that it need not be beautiful in order to be effective; a point which its critics often fail to understand. It is only required to set going the necessary trains of association which arouse absolute feeling, and this can be done without any appeal to the aesthetic faculty: for the Holy, though manifested in the Beautiful, can be found apart from it. Thus the crude image, the simplest suggestion, may do just as well for religion as the aesthetic masterpiece: often indeed better." ¹ The fact, however, seems to be that although in some cases the religious symbol need not be artistic, in other cases it must be. Let us first draw attention to those places where its artistic merit is irrelevant.

It is easy to see that it is often irrelevant in private prayer. There we often have to content ourselves with using symbols that are only imperfectly expressive, and perhaps do little more than indicate our feelings. It does not disturb us very much; we know that although our side of the communication has been very imperfectly done, yet He to whom our symbols are offered understands what we mean by them, and so we are content. Thus Flaubert tells of an old servant who placed her stuffed parrot on the resting-table of the Host, that thus she might honour God with her dearest possession. The presence or the lack of artistic merit was obviously irrelevant; her gift represented her dedication, and therefore the divine compassion found it acceptable; and she herself was satisfied, knowing that she had done what she could. Similarly, if a man has not the gift of using

¹ Underhill - "Man and the Supernatural" p.171.
words, he may offer prayers to God that are quite inadequate as expression. They may be little more than inarticulate groans, which not only fail to express more than a fragment of what he feels, but fail even to state his needs and desires; yet they may be received by God as true devotion, and be accepted and even used by him.

In corporate worship also there are symbols used in an individual way, not to utter the mind of the community, but only the mind of each separate person. The worship may still be corporate, because the worshippers are all consciously doing the same thing together; but nevertheless each one is doing it for himself and not for another. It is enough that such symbols should be indicative. We do not need to bow or kneel like members of a corps-de-ballet, or sing like members of an opera company, nor do we take pains to eat the bread and drink the wine in an artistic manner. As long as no one else's worship is hindered by our bad voice or our curious gestures it matters nothing; they are not addressed to men nor done on their behalf. We know the quality of our feelings by internal evidence, and God knows them whether they are expressed well or badly; and so, since the only necessary communication has taken place, our work is complete and we are satisfied.

The other place in worship where artistic merit is irrelevant is in anything that is to be considered only as part of a whole, and not as a complete and significant entity in itself. This principle of course applies to any work of art; it is the whole which must be expressive, not the separate pieces of material out of which that whole is made. A poem is expressive, but not the separate sounds of the vowels and consonants which compose it; a picture is expressive, but not its lines and colours taken one by one; a play is expressive, but not necessarily all the properties which
are needed for its performance. Some of them may be - it depends whether
the effect of the play involves their being seen as entities in themselves
or not - but aesthetic qualities are irrelevant in the shape of the pieces
of bread which the actors are going to eat, or the stick with which someone
is going to be beaten, or any of the things that are to be considered only
as a part of an action.

In a service of worship there a number of things of this kind. For
example the bread and wine in a Communion Service are to be thought of as a
part of the whole. They are, as it were, a "property" to be used, an
instrument in the action, and not a whole in themselves apart from that action.
It does not matter, therefore, whether the bread is formed into expressive
shapes or not; if some branches of the Church care to make it that way,
nothing is gained, and if others break it into pieces of haphazard and irreg¬
ular shape, nothing is lost.

Similarly, the literary form of a sermon should be thought of only as
a part of the activity of preaching, and should not be assessed apart from
the delivery from which it is inseparable. A published sermon of course is
a different matter, because by the act of publication its literary form is
made to stand by itself. But a preached sermon is one whole, and the fact
that the words taken by themselves might not be very expressive is beside the
point. They are not intended to be taken by themselves, and are not heard
apart from the preacher's manner and voice which interpret and change them.  

1 It might be held that hymns also should be considered as parts of a whole,
and that they should not be judged apart from the tune. When hymns are sung,
even when the sense is clearly perceived and attended to, the rhythm and
intonation of the words are destroyed, and the rhythm and pitch of the music
take their place. Rhythm and variation of pitch are most powerful instruments
for the expressing of feeling, and it is not surprising that the feeling that
results from singing a hymn owes much more to the tune than to the words. It
is possible indeed for music so to impose itself upon the words that even when
(Continued p.304)
But although artistic merit may be irrelevant in those things which are individual and those which are only considered as parts of a whole, in every other place in corporate worship it is very relevant indeed. There are two reasons for this.

First, although we may be content with our own stammering and inexpressive attempts to say what we feel, we are by no means satisfied with other people's inexpressive attempts when they are made on our behalf. If someone else is to speak for us, whether it is by providing us with words to say or music to sing, or by actually doing the speaking and singing in our stead, we are not content unless the result is properly expressive. In corporate worship there is a continual necessity both for the congregation to be provided with words and music to use, and for one person to voice the mind of the whole. But the congregation is baffled and thwarted if these things do not really express their feelings. A cold statement of fact that is purely indicative may carry their thoughts; but if their attitude is all reverence and faith, if their love is kindled, if they are filled with joy and have a sense of the immediate presence of God, in fact if they are carefully attended to, their feeling is completely altered; that is why the futility of the words of Judas Maccabaeus is unnoticed when they are set to music by Handel, and the monotony of Longfellow's Hiawatha is transformed by the setting of Coleridge Taylor. It may be argued, then, that as long as the words of a hymn utter Christian doctrine they need not express any feeling, or may even express bad feeling, because in any case when they are sung it is the feeling of the music which will prevail. We hold, however, very emphatically that hymns should not be considered only as a part of a whole which includes the tune. It is only when Christian people think of them as entities by themselves, and meditate upon them apart from the tune, that they are able to use them with their full meaning when they come to sing them. A hymn need not be superb poetry (though it is all to the good if it is), but it must not be bad poetry; the feeling in it need not be superlatively beautiful, but it must not be obviously inadequate; the expression need not be a work of genius, but it must not draw attention to itself by being doggerel; a hymn need not be specially notable as literature, but it must not contradict the nature of literature.

(Contd from p. 303.)
worshipping fully with all their being, no purely indicative words that have been provided for their use will suffice, and no statement coldly made on their behalf will satisfy.

Second, all the media of worship are communicative. If they express feeling, that feeling will be communicated to the congregation. If they do not express feeling, they do not thereby have no effect on the congregation; they communicate to it a lack of feeling. Thus a man who preaches in a lifeless way will make his congregation lifeless; if he reads a liturgy so as to cut out all expression of feeling, the result will be that his congregation's feelings are quenched. There is no neutrality in this matter. If he does not sound like a man praying, he will sound like one who is saying words without praying. If he does not help he will hinder. Similarly, to say words without expressing the feeling that they matter is to communicate the feeling that they do not matter, to utter truth without expressing any

1 The prayers of the minister should clearly be of such a kind that the members of the congregation can use them for the expression of their own feelings. It is sometimes thought that the only way to secure such a result is for the minister to avoid the expression of feeling altogether, so that the congregation can, as it were, pour their own feelings into the empty vessel which he supplies. But, as we have just said, this method does not work. It would seem that the right method is for the minister to express only such feelings as his congregation can share. This is what is meant when it is said (as it so often is) that in prayer, particularly in liturgical prayer, the minister should be impersonal (e.g. T.L. Harris - "Christian Public Worship" pp. 151-2; Robert - "The Parish Communion" p.15; Irwin - "Church Worship and the Non-Churchgoer" p.145). Nevertheless impersonal is the wrong word. The question is not so much one of personality as of individuality, and the point is that the minister must not be individual in such a way that he ceases to be representative. He remains an individual person whatever he does, and he is mistaken if he thinks he should try to become a mere voice. But he is an individual person who is uttering prayers that are not only his own but his congregation's as well. We have seen that corporate worship should be corporate and individual at the same time, and the prayers uttered by the minister are no exception to that.
feeling of belief is to communicate unbelief, to present men with a figure of Christ crucified in the form of a diagram without any worship in it communicates the absence of worship, and to give them music in which the composer does not express any interest in life is to communicate boredom.

Not all men, of course, are very sensitive to some of the arts, and therefore symbols that are inexpressive do not always do as much damage as they otherwise might. But most men make some response to architecture, painting, and music, and all of them make a very considerable one to speech. If therefore these things when they are used in worship do not express feeling, that is to say if they are not works of art, then (unless the congregation can manage to withdraw their attention from them) their lack of feeling will be a serious stumbling block to the worship. For corporate worship art is essential.

2. The quality of art required for corporate worship

Various views have been expressed about the sort of art that should be used in worship, some holding very tenaciously to the belief that it must be good, and others considering that its quality matters very little.

It is in the realm of hymns and tunes that feelings run most high. Gardiner and Nicholson say, "If good music uplifts, braces, strengthens, and inspires, awakening more powerfully than any speech the religious emotions of awe, wonder and love, bad music is as potent for ill. It relaxes, enfeebles, and lowers the moral sense." Then, after referring to unworthy Mission hymns, they continue "A congregation singing choruses of this type are hypnotizing their intellectual and moral faculties out of all self-control. This is evangelistic drug-taking ....... It is difficult to exaggerate the real harm that some of these more debased examples of Mission
On the other hand, C.S. Phillips says, "In the great work of saving souls questions of artistic taste are of secondary importance"; and he speaks with approval of a remark "made by the organist of a church famous for its exquisite musical services, to the effect that if he could fill an empty church and keep it full by using music that he knew to be artistically worthless he would not hesitate to do so." His advice to the cultivated critic is that he should "console himself by reflecting that, after all, the things which he dislikes so much are doing no great harm." "It is sometimes alleged", he adds, "that the use of sentimental hymns and tunes is enervating, and calculated to sap the moral fibre of those who sing them. But this argument is hardly borne out by the facts. It is curious but undeniable that the most virile types of men — sailors, soldiers, miners and the like — show a special liking for just these sentimental hymns." Professor George Sampson seems to say the same thing of verse when he declares that "The hymn has been the poor man's poetry, the only poetry that has ever come home to his heart. When he sings 'Abide with me, fast falls the eventide, The darkness deepens, Lord with me abide' he makes the emotional response that the more fortunately endowed person makes to great poetry." And there are many who would not limit themselves to these two admittedly innocuous lines, but would say the same of such whole hymns as "When wilt Thou save the people", "Oh, that will be glory for me", or "I should like to die, said Willie".

3 Ibid. p.253.
Although there would seem to be something very commendable about this second point of view, we believe it to be completely mistaken, and that for more reasons than one.

a) Art used in worship must be good because of the effect produced upon the mind of the worshipper. A work of art may be good or bad in various ways. First, it may or may not be integrated within itself. The need for interior integration for the purposes of worship is clear enough. A work of art that is orderly and coherent will bring the mind to peace and rest, and set it free from interior discords and disturbances which would otherwise distract the worshipper from the business on which he is engaged. But if the work is not so integrated, then the mind of the worshipper will be confused and his attention dispersed. A building that is unbalanced, decorations that are top-heavy, colours that do not harmonise, sermons that are full of loose ends and without form, gestures that are awkward and unnecessary, hymns that do not cohere, tunes that are made up of detached bits and pieces and seem to lead nowhere, prayers that are a jumble of unassociated thoughts, and forms of service that are a mere collection of separate unrelated items; all these are a hindrance to the worshipper.

A second way in which art can be good or bad lies in whether or not the feelings it expresses are integrated with their environment. In good art, all the attitudes expressed are fitting; if in some art the attitudes are unfitting, that art is bad. The characteristic attitudes of bad art are the opposites of those which we found to characterise good art. They are, namely, lack of interest, insensitiveness, lack of respect, insincerity, self-centredness, lack of a sense of proportion, and rejection of life or
rebellion against it. Art may of course be good in one sense and bad in another, for example full of interest and entirely self-centred; and the bad things in it may be counteracted by the way it is performed, or by old associations that prevent its real quality from becoming known at all. But it is clear that whereas the communication of good attitudes is a help to worship, the communication in any degree of these bad attitudes is a hindrance to it, and a vivid communication of some of them is absolutely fatal. We are dealing here with moral questions, and in worship moral questions are quite fundamental. If art communicates bad and wrong attitudes, then it is no use trying to pretend to ourselves that it does no great harm; we cannot do much greater harm than to lead a man into, for example, insincerity, and make him think he has adopted an attitude of mind fitted to the worship of God. The fact that he likes to indulge in bad attitudes of mind is no reason for encouraging him; for it is no more right to give men bad art because they like it than to give them any other sort of bad morals for the same reason. It is no proof that sentimental hymns and tunes are not enervating, and do not sap the moral fibre of those who sing them, to say that among those who like them are the most virile types of men—namely sailors, soldiers, and miners. It has yet to be proved that sailors, soldiers and miners are particularly notable for purity and excellence of morals, whether we think of due respect for God and their fellow men, sincerity, detachment from self-seeking, a sense of proportion, a glad acceptance of life, or even sensitiveness to it.

As we have seen, one cannot of course say that the use of good art will unfailingly make men develop good moral personalities; but the practice of bad attitudes will certainly hinder them from doing so.
The third way in which art can be good or bad lies in whether the artist's technique is adequate to the things he wants to say. There is obviously a connection between a failing here and a failing in the other two respects. It may be argued that one cannot be integrated within one's self if one is at the same time baffled by problems of technique, and also that one cannot have a right attitude to one's material at the same time as one finds it unmanageable. Nevertheless, just as it is possible to have a very good technique and yet have nothing valuable to say, so it is also possible to be unable to say something really important because one lacks the technical skill.

The price the artist pays for poor technique is that he draws attention to his lack of skill instead of his subject. Here is a verse from "Convention Hymns for the deepening of the Spiritual Life", a little hymn book privately printed and used at the Southport Convention:

\[\text{God has blotted them out, I'm happy and glad and free;}\]
\[\text{God has blotted them out, I'll turn to Isaiah and see;}\]
\[\text{Chapter forty-four, twenty-two and three;}\]
\[\text{He's blotted them out, and now I can shout;}\]
\[\text{For that means me.}\]

It may very well be that the man who wrote that had something valuable to say. But it is clear that he had not the technique with which to say it; and the result is that his faulty expression so commands the reader's attention that it prevents him from listening to what is being said.

A similar thing is true of many of the metrical psalms when they are read, though, for reasons given earlier, the effect is not nearly so strong when they are sung. The cause of inept expression here is not so much lack of capacity as the desire to preserve as far as possible the very words of scripture; but the result is just as distracting. It is very difficult to
treat seriously the thought behind such a verse as this -

Judge me, O Lord, for I have walked
In mine integrity.
I trusted also in the Lord,
Said therefore shall not I.

or this -

What profit is there in my blood
When I go down to pit?
Shall unto Thee the dust give praise?
Thy truth declare shall it?

We are told that Bernard of Clairvaux sometimes purposely wrote in uncounted measures for fear that the artistry of words might distract the mind.¹ We can see how gravely he was mistaken. Uncouthness is one of the things that itself distracts the mind, and art must be satisfactorily expressed for the very purpose of avoiding that danger.

b) The art used in worship must be good because it is an offering to God, and it is of the essence of our relationship with God that our offerings to him must be the best that we can give. His love is not satisfied to receive less than our best; nor, if we love him aright, are we content to offer less. So we find under the Old Covenant that when animals were offered in sacrifice they were to be without blemish. The man who gave a beast to the Lord was not to give him anything second-rate; whatever he offered was to be perfect of its kind. And so men of insight have always felt. Glutton-Brock speaks in the true religious spirit when he says, "the altar .... should be the best table possible. Its cloth should be the best tablecloth possible .... If there are candlesticks on it, they should be the best candlesticks ...... If there are flowers in vases, the vases should be the most beautiful that can be obtained ...... and the flowers should be chosen and arranged for them as one would choose and arrange flowers in a room, only with more care and

delight in their beauty."¹ So are the advisers of Methodism when they say, "However plain, let the materials be as good as can be secured. It is unthinkable that anything second-rate should belong to the House of God. Not only is it sound policy but spiritually fitting that nothing but the best in building and furnishing should go into the fashioning of the structure for the purposes of the Christian Church."² So is Pugin when he says "architectural propriety as regards ecclesiastical buildings requires that they should be as good, as spacious, as rich and beautiful, as the means and numbers of those who are erecting them will permit."³ So were the writers of the rubric in the Book of Common Prayer when they said of the bread used for Communion, "It is desirable that the Bread shall be the best and purest wheat bread, whether loaf or wafer, that conveniently may be gotten."⁴

It should be noticed that the principle applies not only to the materials but also to the skill with which they are used; for a man must not only give his best stuff for the service of God, but his best workmanship. The makers of Elizabethan and Jacobean communion tables worked in the right spirit when they put their best workmanship into their carving; they knew that their work would be hidden under a heavy and voluminous covering, but they desired it to be as worthy an offering to God as possible.⁵ Similarly the preacher's sermon, the composer's music, the singing of each member of the choir and congregation, the design of the architect, the workmanship of the builders, and everything else that is used for the purpose of worship.

² Forkins and Hearn - "The Methodist Church builds again," p.74.
⁴ This is the version of the rubric given in the 1928 book.
⁵ See Addleshaw - "The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship" p.110.
must be as good a piece of work as those who offer it can make it.

It is not necessary that the offering should be elaborate or costly. If a man's means do not suffice for a lamb for a guilt offering, he may bring two turtle doves or two young pigeons; and if he cannot afford even that, he may offer the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour. So on the great Festivals, Swedish congregations are directed to sing Te Deum Laudamus, but only "so long as it can be performed in a worthy fashion"; if it cannot, a simpler hymn will suffice. What can be given in our worship, as Pugin says, depends on "the means and numbers" of those who are contributing. Two mites that together make a farthing may be a perfect gift, and so may a stuffed parrot, if the one who offers it brings what she believes to be her best.

But we are misrepresenting our religion if we lead men to associate it with the meretricious and willingly imperfect. The God we worship is not content with that kind of sacrifice, and we must not lead ourselves or others to suppose that he is. Walford Davies and Harvey Grace point out that town and village choral societies of men, women and children of exactly the same type as those in church and chapel choirs (many, in fact, are members of those choirs) can in competition festivals reach and sometimes pass the 90 per cent mark, often in music making more demands than that which the church choirs of the same calibre would be called on to sing in church. We must not allow them to suppose that a less careful performance will do in church for God's glory then that which they give at a competition for their own.

---
1 Leviticus v.7.
2 Leviticus v.11.
3 Rubric in 1942 Swedish High Mass. p.36.
4 Davies and Grace - "Music & Worship". p.240.
Similarly, if we ask our architect and builders to design and put up a church that they believe to be tawdry and futile because we hope the public will be captivated by it, or if we try to persuade our preachers to adopt a style they know to be unworthy because the congregation will like it better, or if we ask our organists to play tunes they know very well to be bad because they are popular, we are injuring these men's religion. Those can offer poor stuff who know no better, but those who know what is the best must offer no less.

c) If it is true that bad art is as wrong as we have said, then there would seem to be no excuse for the use of it. Nevertheless it is sometimes maintained that it is expedient to use at any rate a certain amount of it. Men, it is said, are fond of bad art, and therefore it is justifiable to use it as a bait to draw them to worship. Let the pill be well sugared, because that is the only way we shall get them to swallow it. Leaving now the question of whether this particular coating is really sugar or poison, let us ask whether in actual fact the use of bad art is a good or necessary way of drawing men to the services of the Church.

We have seen that it is indeed regrettably a fact that men are often attracted by bad art. Sometimes that is merely because good associations have unfortunately been formed in their minds with art that is of poor quality. Sometimes, however, there is a genuine liking for a work because of its badness. In such cases the liking is not usually for art which is bad because it is ill-expressed or because it fails to be integrated within itself, but for art which is bad because it expresses unworthy attitudes. There is nothing unexpected in this. Man's moral nature is warped, and that fact comes out in his dealings with art as in everything else. When evil is
expressed in actual deeds - in theft, adultery, murder - it is fairly easily recognised for what it is. When it is confined for the time being to an attitude of mind - covetousness, lust, hate - it is much more difficult to assess it; and those attitudes which are the characteristic sins of bad art - disrespect, insincerity, attachment to self, lack of proportion, and the rejection of life - are particularly difficult to recognise for what they are. It is not surprising, therefore, that even well-inclined church-going people, and indeed even those who in many respects are, good, moral, sound Christian people, are inclined to like bad art.

But if bad art attracts some people, it also repels others. There are a number of people, and it is a growing number, who understand enough about art to hate that which is bad, and to find that when it is used it most seriously interferes with their worship. The Church Music Society in its "Occasional Paper No.3", says "To such a degraded level has the normal Church music fallen that it is already an actual problem whether an intelligent lover of good music can be at the same time a regular church attendant." That was written some years ago, and the position has mercifully changed a good deal since then, but it raises a relevant point. H.T.Whitley says, "The Church today is more anxious than ever to attract the outsider; and it cannot possibly do so if it relies on tunes which the average music-loving member of the public, who knows something of folk-song, of Bach and Handel, of Beethoven and Brahms, feels instinctively (even if subconsciously) to be wrong, and unworthy of that highest level to which he knows church music should attain."1 That is true, and when we are counting up how many men have been brought to church by bad music, we

1 Whitley - "Congregational Hymn Singing in England" p.218.
should also try to count those whom it has kept away.

Moreover bad art is not the only kind that is attractive. If men are given a chance to hear it, there is a great deal of good art that they like also. It is true that bad music is popular; but it is fortunately true that tunes like Dundee (French), Adeste Fideles, Sine Nomine, Richmond, Darwall, and Easter Born are also popular. If bad hymns are popular, so is the 23rd psalm. If dingy little halls and ugly chapels full of fussy ornament are popular (it is more than doubtful if they are), the nobility of our medieval churches and the strong calm lines and balanced masses of our good modern ones are much more so.

Nor is it necessary to give men bad art in order to preach the gospel to them. The parables of Christ are not bad art, but they drew crowds when they were first uttered, and still speak to the minds of common men in our own day. The Reformation did not flourish on bad music; it flourished on first rate hymn tunes collected by Luther, and first rate psalm tunes put into circulation by Calvin. The Methodist Revival did not make the praise of God popular by pandering to men's debased tastes, but by using words and music that were as good as the Wesleys were able to provide. The words were not all by any means superb art, but at any rate generally speaking they were not bad art, for Wesley was very concerned that his followers should not sing words that were unworthy. He proudly and rightly claimed in his preface to the hymn book of 1779 that "in these hymns there is no doggerel; no botches; nothing put in to patch up the rhyme; no feeble expletives;" that there is "nothing turgid or bombast on the one hand, or low and creeping on the other;" that on the contrary the user will find in the hymns "both the purity, the strength, and the elegance of the English
language;" and that if he be a man of taste he will recognise there "the true Spirit of Poetry." As for the music, Percy Scholes points out that John Wesley, although he "had himself no musical knowledge or practical ability, in his many hymn-books supplied music at least as good as that in general congregational use in the Anglican worship of that period; that is, he did not find it necessary to descend."¹ These hymns and tunes were not paltry doggerel, nor were they self-indulgent, nor insincere, like so many that are in some places thought suitable for bringing sinners to God; and yet they did their work - none have ever done it better.

If, then, the greatest quickening movements in Christian history could take place while using for their purposes art that was good and eschewing that which was bad, it is obvious that bad art is not at all a necessary and indispensable means for drawing either Christians or non-Christians to the services of the Church. That is as we should expect, for we cannot suppose that God has so made the universe that the doing of evil is a necessary condition of the propagation of good.

On every ground, therefore, it is clear that the art used in Christian worship must be good. If bad art is used, God may still speak to men through it, and no doubt he often does; for in this realm as in every other, he does not disdain to use an instrument because it is unworthy. But that does not justify us in offering unworthy instruments; and any good effects produced through bad art arise not because of its badness but in spite of it. We must not let the devil have all the good tunes, nor all the good buildings, statues, pictures, or literature; but we must certainly see

to it that he alone has all the bad ones.

5. The kind of art suitable for corporate worship.

It is clear that goodness is not the only thing necessary in art that is to be used in the worship of the Church. It must also be suitable. It may be said that if one of the qualities of good art is that it shall be fit for its use, then if Church art is not suitable it will not be good art. But there is a great deal of art that does not bear upon it the mark of any specific purpose, and that may be used indifferently for a number of purposes that are somewhat similar. It is necessary to say therefore that a great deal of art that is good and noble, and even a not inconsiderable quantity of that which is deeply religious, is not suitable for the corporate worship of the Church. Corporate worship needs art which has certain characteristics, and we must now try to say what they are.

a) Art used in Christian worship must either have of itself, or be given by the worshipper, a Christian content. It is sometimes supposed that all great art is by its very nature Christian, and that to spend an hour in the contemplation of any of it is to have an experience identical with that of Christian worship, or at any rate one so similar that it may be substituted for it without real loss. It is easy to see, however, from what has already been said, that this is not so.

It is true that art and religion have some very deep things in common. Weidle says that they "belong to the same plane of reality"\(^1\), and that "the artistic experience is, deep down, a religious experience"\(^2\). William Temple goes further, and speaking of perfect beauty, he says, "the work of art is

\(^1\) Weidle, "The Dilemma of the Arts" p.127.
\(^2\) Ibid. p.125.
become a Sacrament and the aesthetic experience is passing into religion; and that he on whom Beauty has cast her spell "must gaze and listen - rapt in a meditation which is perpetually passing into communion with God."

And Coleridge bears him out when he describes the experience of hearing Wordsworth read to him a great part of "The Prelude" -


Source conscious, and yet conscious of its close
I sate, my being blended in one thought
(Thought was it? or aspiration? or resolve?)
Absorbed, yet hanging still upon the sound -
And when I rose, I found myself in prayer.  

But religion is not necessarily Christian religion, and communion with God is not necessarily communion with God through Christ. We have already seen that to be given a sense of the Absolute, Eternal, Powerful, and Infinite, is not necessarily the same thing as to worship a personal God, still less the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; and we can add that there are noble attitudes of mind that are not Christian attitudes of mind, and there is estimable teaching that is not Christian teaching. Art of itself is religious rather than Christian, and it can only be made suitable for Christian worship by incorporating into it Christian ideas and attitudes.

Sometimes, as we have seen, this has to be done by the worshipper. Architecture and instrumental music cannot of themselves be made to communicate a specifically Christian message; they would not speak of Christ to a man who knew nothing about him to begin with. But if the man were a Christian (and we have said that that is the kind of man with whom we are primarily concerned) he could find in them a meaning which was so much a part of his Christian experience that the two things would be inseparably linked.

---

1 Temple - "Mone Creatrix" p.127.
2 Ibid. p.123.
3 Coleridge - "To William Wordsworth, composed on the night after his recitation of a poem on the growth of an individual mind."
in his mind, and he would both read more content into this art than it actually held, and find that it expressed for him a more precise experience, than it actually embodied.

In the other arts, the intellectual subject matter and the attitudes towards it are a part of the work itself. No one, we suppose, in a Christian service would give an aesthetic dissertation on Nature instead of preaching a sermon about God, nor would they commend the pagan attitude of "nothing in excess" in place of the fulness of Christian love; and yet it is not entirely unnecessary to insist that ecclesiastical art must embody Christian subjects and Christian attitudes.

It has not always been clear, for example, that the symbols of paganism are out of place in a Christian church, and Crouch was making a justified protest when he said "The cherubs, the inverted torch, the votive wreath, masks and fauns, were forms of decoration that were understood by the Greeks and Romans, but are meaningless when employed by men professing the Christian faith."1 It was one of the weaknesses of Wren that he abandoned Christian symbolism in favour of pagan, and it is to be hoped that his error will not be repeated.

It is in our monuments and customs connected with death that wrong or inadequate symbols have most frequently been found. The inverted torch of pagan despair is no fitting thing for a Christian church, and the suggestion that the voyage of this life ends in a Greek Temple is equally out of place.2 Even the symbolism of skulls and crossbones, hour glasses, scythes, and cadavers (sometimes being eaten by worms), although they

1 Crouch - "Puritanism and Art" p.209. See also Pugin - "Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture" p.39.
2 See Flaxman's monument to Professor Sibthorp in Bath Abbey.
represent one essential part of the truth about death, say nothing of the fundamental Christian faith about it; and to speak of death in a Christian church and leave out all mention of the Christian hope is surely inexcusable. How much more fitting are the memorials of the catacombs which speak of deliverance! In a different way memorial tablets also often fail to suggest Christian attitudes. We may or may not believe in entreaty the prayers of the living for the dead, but inscriptions that request them show more religion than assertive catalogues of all the merits, successes, and honours of the deceased; and images with hands folded in prayer before God are more seemly than those leaping on one elbow and affably regarding the spectator. Perhaps those precise mistakes are now seldom perpetrated, but if we do not today go in very much for that kind of memorial, we still retain some customs of doubtful merit. Sidney Heath says, "the throwing of three handfuls of earth on the coffin of the dead, together with the words 'dust to dust' is a custom the origin of which is lost in Egyptian mythology,"¹ and there still hangs about it a feeling of paganism, a sense of futility or despair, which is unfitting in the face of the triumph of a Christian death.

Less obvious, but even more serious, is the use of material that has the colour of religion while at the same time contradicting Christian truth. Musicians are apt to suppose that if a song mentions the name of God it is therefore a "sacred song" and suitable for use in the worship of the Church; and so it is not unknown for a congregation to be told that they are "nearer God's heart in a garden than anywhere else on earth"; a statement which, if they really believed it, would result in their going home to do the gardening instead of remaining in church. Gordon Daviot's play "The Stars bow down"

presents the story of Joseph in a most remarkable and vivid way. But it completely omits the Old Testament (sense of the ever-present controlling power of God and the supernatural ordering of human destiny for the majesty of the divine purpose; and so, although in one way it is an extremely good Biblical play, it has little to do with religion and nothing at all with worship. Similarly Fra Filippo Lippi's "Coronation of the Virgin" in the Florence Academy is a charming picture, but it has no trace of devotion about it, nor has its real subject any close connection with religion; and Veronese's "Feast in the House of Levi" (which brought him before the tribunal of the Inquisition) embodies delight in worldly splendour and luxury rather than delight in Christ.

b) In ecclesiastical art the various complementary aspects of our religion must be shown, and they must be shown in their right relationship with one another. It is sometimes thought that the only art suitable for a church is that which is weighty, serious, and majestic. But there is nothing in life with which God is not concerned, and therefore there is nothing in life which can be shut out of the worship of the Church, neither the majestic nor the homely, neither the vast nor the infinitesimal, neither the spiritual nor the material, neither life's richness nor its austerity. If our art is to be a fitting medium of worship, it will have to reflect something of the paradoxes of God and the rich variety of the world he has made; we shall make very grave mistakes in our worship, both about God himself and about life in his Kingdom, if our art shows only one side of such double truths, or if, showing both, it does not maintain their proper balance.

One of the most difficult things to manage is the proper combination
of the majestic and the homely. The great, towering, awe-inspiring building often presents us with one side of the truth, and the little, unpretentious, friendly village Bethel often gives us the other; but what we really need is a building that combines both, and it is fatally easy so to over-emphasise one quality that it quite blot's out the other. There is many a building which says in architecture what a northern England church notice-board recently said in words - "Drop in and have a little chat with your heavenly Father" - and which thus misrepresents God by taking away the conception of his majesty. But there are other buildings which affirm his majesty in such a way as to deny all the warmth of his love. Church art of all kinds must somehow manage to do what Isaac Watts does so supremely well, to combine that which befits "the sovereign King of Glory" with that which befits "our Father and our Friend."

When we mention together the vast and the infinitesimal, our first impulse is to say that we have here an exception, and that there are some things too trivial to find a proper place in worship. But we are mistaken. God's Kingdom includes not only the worlds in the sky but the hairs on our heads, and everything that he has given is, in its own place, rightly precious. The necessity here is to give each thing a place commensurate with its importance. It is decoration that can deal with little things best. The amount of time in a service is very limited, and to give even a small amount of it to little things may be to stress them unduly. But the amount of space in a church is very considerable, and it is possible to use some of the many surfaces for the little things of life without over-emphasis. Moreover, the arts that take place in time, such as music and oratory, demand attention to their every part; but the arts of space are not so exacting,
and, except for those works that are placed prominently in front of the
eyes of the worshippers, they need not claim our attention. The trivialities
of life, therefore, may fittingly be represented in a gargoyle or a misericord,
but they ought not to be placed over a chancel arch, or played as a voluntary
before the service, or find their way into any dominating position.

A third contrast is between the things of matter and those of spirit.
Here again art must present them in their proper relationship to one another,
helping the worshipper to feel that the things of the spirit are supreme.

In representations therefore of the saints, the main interest should lie in
their character, action, and relation to God, rather than in the shapeliness
of their limbs. A comely Madonna is well enough, but one who found favour
with God should be revered for her qualities of personality and devotion
rather than for her pretty face. The relationship of the saints to God is
best suggested by showing them performing some service for him, or worshipping;
and if they can be grouped with other figures, that is an advantage. In
these ways one can avoid the impression that a single inactive figure
sometimes conveys, that it represents one whose importance lies altogether
within himself, and that he appears before the spectator in order to receive
homage.

A fourth combination is that of the richness and austerity of God's
ways. Our church art should make men feel both the incredible and
inexhaustible riches of the divine treasury, and also the nature of him who
for our sakes became poor; both the joy of possessing all things, and the
blessedness of possessing nothing. Our buildings should therefore be at
once both austere and rich. Mere barrenness is unfitting in a Christian
church; but opulence is even more so, and we need not regret the twenty-six
cartloads of gold and jewels that Henry VIII took from Canterbury Cathedral. The richness should be of that kind which is due to loving workmanship rather than to expensive materials, and even that richness ought to be united with large spaces of plain austerity that suggest self-denial. To hold, as Professor R. Sencourt does, that the distinguishing mark of Christian art ought to be "a sense of glory" is to be one-sided. No doubt God's temple should say "glory", but that should not be the only thing it says.

c) We have seen that the artist is concerned with many things at the same time, - with his subject, purpose, pattern, material, skill, audience, his own self, and his attitudes to them all. For an ordinary work of art no rule can be made about which of all these various interests should take the first place. But in art addressed to a Christian congregation, and intended to be used directly as a means of worship, the primary interest must always lie in the subject; indeed the subject must be so much of the first importance that some of the other matters should not be consciously present in the mind at all.

Thus a speech for a social occasion may, in its way, be an admirable work of art, even when it is more concerned with epigram and elegance of phraseology than with its supposed subject; but the main concern of a sermon must be the truth that is being proclaimed. Balance and good phrasing, Balance and good phrasing,
though necessary, must remain subsidiary.

The main value of a picture or statue made for ordinary purposes may lie in its pattern of lines, harmony of colours, or understanding of paint or marble; but not so with one in front of which men are going to kneel and pray. There is a clear moulded glass figure of a Madonna and Child, designed by a Dutch artist in the 1930s that is occasionally seen in a children's corner of an English church. Its charm lies in its appreciation of the nature of glass and the possibilities of moulding. The joints of the mould are used to form lines in the drapery, the whole figure flows smoothly in one piece like an icicle, and there is a fascinating play of shadows and luminosities as the light falls on the various planes and surfaces. As an essay in glass moulding it is charming; as a piece of decorative background in a church it is entirely satisfactory; but if it were to be used as a direct means of devotion it would be disappointing. It does not primarily stir thoughts about the Incarnation but about moulded glass, and so it would actually hinder devotion by leading the mind in another direction.

One of the points of interest in ordinary vocal music is sometimes the skill with which it is sung. An opera singer may delight in the flexibility of her voice and the incredible heights to which she can soar. If there is nothing else of greater importance to be done at the time, there is no harm in that; skill is a wonderful thing, and it is right enough that it should be enjoyed. But displays of vocal gymnastics are out of place in the worship of God; in worship the subject that is being sung about is of the first importance, and nothing else must be allowed to compete with it.

There are some forms of art where it is not offensive to find one's self noticing from time to time the means by which the artist is producing
As affects. For example in a theatre, where one often has to get bold effects by strong contrasts and sudden changes, it is permissible and often necessary for the producer to reveal quite frankly the mechanism by which these results are obtained. In worship, however, the mechanism should not be noticeable at all. As Colonel Bertram Shore says, "anything that gives the suggestion of theatrical striving, and especially anything that reveals, to some extent, the mechanism of a theatrical effect, should be avoided at all costs." Especially does this apply to the use of coloured and changing lights. Spot lights in a theatre may be very effective, but the American custom of throwing on the preacher lights that change colour according to the moods of the different parts of his sermon has (to say the least) nothing to commend it.

All those who perform in any way in public worship are in danger of putting in the first place of interest the relationship between the congregation and themselves. The concert performer seeks to win from his audience their personal approval and applause, and there is no reason why he should not. But the organist and the singers in a Christian service are not seeking that sort of personal relationship with the congregation. The congregation should not be thinking about them, but about the God of them both. The minister also is tempted to become an actor, and to stress...
overmuch his personal gifts and his relationship with the congregation. In preaching both those things are very important, for preaching is "truth through personality", and in preaching it is through the medium of personal relationships that God acts; but nevertheless they are only a means to an end, and it is God who must quite unmistakably occupy the first place.

The arrangement and furnishing of a building may easily suggest a wrong emphasis here. A church must be a good auditorium, but to make it look primarily like an auditorium, with the speaker and choir conspicuous in the middle, is apt to suggest not worship, but a mixture of a concert and a public meeting. The minister and choir are not the main centres of attention; the mind of the congregation must be fixed beyond both of them, and their right place is therefore at the side.

d) Just as art that is addressed to the congregation should have as its main interest its subject, so that which is to be used by a congregation should have as its main interest its purpose. It will in fact also be good to contemplate; but we have seen that one of the dangers of using art in worship is that the worshippers may contemplate when they should act. The only way to overcome this danger is to make the very appearance of the work of art stress the fact that it is there to be used.

So the main emphasis of a church building should be placed on its fitness for use rather than, for example, on the richness of its decoration. It should be clear that it exists not first of all to be beautiful in itself, but first of all to be used for some purpose beyond itself. Its actual purpose of course is to be a background against which a certain action can

1 P. Brooks - "Lectures on Preaching" p.3.
2 Parmer - "The Servant of the Word" p.28.
take place. It must therefore be the kind of building that naturally becomes a background, and not the kind that is continually self-assertive. It is true that our medieval churches once had designs painted all over the inside, but one cannot help but feel that they are probably much more suitable for worship in their present plainer state.

Churches, too, should emphasise the fact that the action for which they are intended to be used is co-operative worship in which all participate. For this reason galleries are of very doubtful merit. Those who use them are so clearly cut off from all communication with the minister, the Communion Table, and the body of the people below, that the tendency is for them to feel dissociated from the action; they are apt to become lookers-on, detached spectators rather than active and responsible participants. Similarly it is a mistake to hope that one building will serve the dual purpose of worship on Sunday and concerts and meetings during the week. If it is suitable for concerts it will suggest a relationship of entertainer and audience; but if it is to be suitable for worship it must suggest a different relationship altogether, namely that of co-operation between a minister and congregation who are engaging in common worship together.

The necessity for a work to stress its use rather than its pattern, skill, or anything merely within itself, is at its very strongest when that use is for addressing God. Prayers, for example, although they call for considerable literary technique in their composition, should entirely draw the users' attention away from it. It may be useful for certain reasons to make them alliterative, but when they are being prayed they must not be

---

1 The amount of conscious literary technique that has gone into the making of the Book of Common Prayer is very well revealed by J. Watson in "The Literary Qualities of the Prayer Book".
consciously so. We may say, "O Lord, make speed to save us. O Lord make haste to help us," or speak of "the changes and chances of this mortal life" or ask for "pardon and peace", but it would be a mistake to try to pray about the repentant prodigal who returned "from the puddle of pleasures and the swill of the swine." It is sometimes said that "there are prayers that are too perfect in their form and expression to be perfect as prayers offered to God." But that is to put the matter wrongly. If they are really perfect prayers they will be perfect in form and expression; but that aspect of their perfection will hardly be noticed because the main emphasis will be strongly placed elsewhere.

As we have seen, in ordinary art the gathering of many things into one whole is a great merit. But in art for worship it usually has the effect of suggesting that the work exists for contemplation rather than use. This is the quality which distinguishes what are usually called "literary hymns", and it makes them unsuitable as a means of direct address to God. For example, although some of George Herbert's verse is suitable for worship, much that is equally good is not. The verses "Teach me my God and King" are not a hymn, though they are on the verge of being one. The reason is that Herbert is here too much concerned with things other than the business of speaking with God. This combination of the service of God with an elixir, a man looking on or through a piece of glass, a servant sweeping a room, a tincture, and the famous stone that turneth all to gold, is too consciously a gathering of many impulses into one whole for an act of worship.

---

1 "Liturgyical Services set forth in the reign of Queen Elizabeth" p.564.
2 J. Bishop - "Methodist Worship" p.31.
Similarly, in ceremonial the emphasis needs to be very carefully balanced. The Greece Methodist Church in Williamsville, U.S.A. has a service based on the idea of Jesus as the light of the world. The congregation are all supplied with candles, and at a certain point in the service, light is taken from the altar candle, which represents Christ, and is passed from one member of the congregation to another, to symbolise the resolve of each to receive the light himself, to let it shine in him, and to pass it on to others. The symbolism is natural and good, but the main point of interest must almost inevitably lie in making a success of the ceremony, Unless in some way attention can be drawn away from that, and a strong emphasis placed on the purpose of the actions, the ceremonial will hinder the worship instead of serving it.

The sermon has already been dealt with as one of the things addressed to the congregation which must stress its subject. But there is another aspect of it that is relevant here. In so far as the congregation is intended to use it as a means of formulating beliefs and deciding upon actions, it must stress its use as a means of bringing those things about. As we have pointed out earlier, art does not convey beliefs unless the truth or falsity of the matter is actually brought in question, and neither will it make men act unless, as a part of its substance, it embodies the obvious intention of doing so. In a sermon, therefore, although what comes first in emphasis is the subject, the thing that is true whether men believe and act on it or not, what comes second is purpose. All other interests are entirely subsidiary. If there is only a little too much emphasis on shapeliness of expression or on the rounded completeness of the whole, members of the congregation are likely to leave the service saying "How beautiful!" instead of "How true!" and "How impelling!"
The prevailing tone of art that is used in worship should be one of peace and joy. Ordinary art may go through a great deal of turmoil and violence, and only after much struggle attain peace in the end; and its acceptance of life may be altogether lacking in enthusiasm, so that although there is reconciliation there is no joy. It may still be very good art, but it will not do for worship.

In all art for worship, peace must pervade the whole, and not merely be arrived at in the end. In the arts used in preparation for worship this pervading tranquillity is most obviously necessary. There, although emotion may be deep, it must not be allowed even the degree of excitement that may be proper in other parts of the service.

But it is not only in the preparation for worship that the believer needs to breathe peace. Throughout its whole course he should have a sense of dwelling quietly with complete confidence in the unshakeable security of almighty love; and this calm stability that underlies everything needs to find an adequate expression in all the arts that are used.

There must be nothing restless in church art, and nothing convulsive. Emotions may at times flow with great power, but they should not be wild or turbulent, nor give any suggestion that they might break out of control. Violent and startling contrasts are usually out of place in worship, and the kind of speech that we call in this respect "dramatic" may have a most disturbing effect. There are no doubt occasions when it can be rightly used, but it is generally better to maintain interest by other means. Similarly, "it may quite safely be laid down that violent or protuberant contrasts are unfitting in church music."¹ In music, indeed, the principle seems to be

¹ Davies and Grace - "Music and Worship" p.33.
particularly clear. Even strongly contrasted degrees of power in the
accompaniment of hymns is generally a disturbance; and one of the merits
of an organ for purposes of worship is its capacity for smoothly flowing
and sustained tone and broad effects, and its relative incapacity for
frequent, sudden, and violent changes.

We have already pointed out that architecture has a very great
influence upon the tone of worship, and it is clearly extremely important
that a Christian building should give a sense of stability and repose. It
has been usual, both for this reason and others, to recommend Gothic as a
particularly suitable style, and it has sometimes even been called the
Christian style.\(^1\) There is no doubt that good Gothic has been found
eminently suitable for a Christian church,\(^2\) but so have other styles also;
for there is no more a Christian style of architecture than there is a
Christian style of mathematics. Nevertheless stability and repose are not
the natural qualities of every style. They are not, for example,
characteristic of Baroque, and that is why, in spite of its recent enthusias-
tic commendation by such writers as R. Sencourt and E. L. Watkin, Baroque is
not a good manner of building for our purpose. The typical Baroque church,
with its twisted columns, its walls bent in and out, its violent and tortured
decoration, and its startling contrasts, is too disturbing to be a good

---
\(^1\) For example, the title of one of Pugin's books is "The Principles of
Pointed or Christian Architecture."

\(^2\) Two comments ought to be made here. First, that it is not a style
suited only to churches. In point of fact it is not a peculiarly
ecclesiastical style at all; in the Middle Ages churches were built
in Gothic only because everything was built in it. Second, as has
already been suggested elsewhere, a style which produced good churches
in the days when it was new and experimental is not likely to produce
them now when all its difficulties have long since been solved. Artists
are most inspired when (like the Gothic builders themselves) they use
the new style of their own day.
background for worship. It is too much of a riot.

If one necessary pervading tone of worship is peace, the other is joy. The keynote of the Christian religion is "rejoicing evermore". The true Christian accepts life with enthusiasm. Rejoicing is the very atmosphere of his being, and especially of his worship. A firm reconciliation with despair may produce great art, but not great Christian art. Christian buildings must not fill the mind with gloom, Christian music must not be a cry of helplessness, and Christian rhetoric and literature must not be miserable. Matthew Arnold's poet, in a mood of "resignation" leans on his gate and gazes with tears at Life

Whose secret is not joy, but peace;
That Life, whose dumb wish is not miss'd
If birth proceeds, if things subsist:
The Life of plants, and stones, and rain:
The Life he craves: if not in vain
Fate gave, what Chance shall not control,
His sad lucidity of soul.¹

He may be a very good poet, but a "sad lucidity of soul" will not produce art of a tone suitable for Christian worship; that requires a more joyful acceptance of life than mere "resignation".

The opening stanzas of Tennyson's "In Memoriam" are nowadays sometimes found in Christian hymn books, but they ought, if for no other reason than this, to be rejected. A tone of gloom hangs over them, and to the uncertain gropings of the thought is added a thwarting sense of incompleteness produced by the rhyme scheme. Perplexity at the mystery of life, pain in face of suffering and death, and a confession of bafflement before the ways of God, may very well find expression in Christian worship. They are all there most intensely in the book of Job. But how different is the way in which they are

¹ Matthew Arnold - "Resignation".
expressed! Even where Job complains, the poet cannot hide his contentment at the idea of a place where "the wicked cease from troubling", and "the weary be at rest", nor his delight in "hid treasures", in "Orion and the Pleiades" and in "marvellous things without number". Even where Job's friends are putting their false arguments, he cannot keep out of his mind those things that please him like "the gold of Ophir", "the swift ships", and "the eagle that swoopeth on the prey". When God himself speaks, the poet's underlying assumption is uncovered, and we hear almost casually that in the day when the foundations of the earth were laid "the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy"; and although there is seen to be even more mystery in the universe than we had realised in the beginning, yet the purpose and heart of reality is known to be joy. That underlying conviction has coloured the whole poem.

The same conviction should produce a comparable tone in all art used for Christian worship. There is obviously room in Christian services for the feelings of "mourners convinced of sin" and for a partaking in the shattering agony of the cross. But the Christian convinced of sin is one who confesses his sins that they may be forgiven, and the Christian who enters into the experience of the cross does so, like his Master, for the joy that is set before him, knowing that the cross is a part of the road that leads to the resurrection. Among the followers of Christ, those who mourn, those who are persecuted, those who hunger and thirst, are all blessed; those who fall into manifold trials count it all joy; and those who suffer rejoice.

1) Art that is to be suitable for corporate worship must, as a whole,

---

1 Matthew v, 3-10.  
2 James 1,2.  
3 Colossians 1,24.
express and communicate a sense of corporateness. It is not necessary for everything used in a service to work in this way, but some things must do so, and none must work against it. Some of the important ways of promoting a sense of corporateness have already been noted at various points in the discussion, but it will be best to mention them again here along with the new things that must be said.

The arts of public worship will include opportunities for the whole body of the congregation to do things together. Services in which they sing together are more likely to promote a sense of corporateness than those in which all, or nearly all, the singing is done by a choir. Similarly, prayers in which they audibly join from time to time are likely to be more corporate than those to which they only listen. Communion services in which they go to the Communion rail in groups will be more corporate than those in which they go forward as individuals; or, if the elements are taken to the people in their seats, there will be more corporateness if the whole assembly eat and drink together than if they do so separately.

Church buildings will best help to produce a sense of corporateness when the worshippers are grouped together in one body, and the worshippers include not only the congregation, but the choir and the ministers. To separate any one part of the congregation from another by great distance, screens, or the high backs of pews, is to suggest a breach of fellowship. The Elizabethans were wise in their re-arrangement of medieval churches in placing the minister's desk in the nave, because this not only ensured that the service would be audible to the congregation, but it prevented the screen from separating the clergy from their people. Our forefathers in the 19th century were unwise in moving the parish church choir into the chancel;
because the choir is a part of the congregation (though no doubt with a special function), and it ought not to be thus entirely separated from it. The earlier custom of placing the choir in a gallery at the west end was of course no better, and neither was that of making the singers perform from a rood loft. The best position is for them to be either behind the congregation, or at the front and to one side; but in either case sufficiently near to feel part of them, and slightly raised so as to denote their special function.

The question of light is of importance here. John Donne thought those "churches are best for prayer that have least light"\(^1\), and there are many that agree with him. But the medieval builders evidently did not think so. As their skill in building developed their windows grew steadily larger and more numerous until the walls were little more than frames for the glass. The fact is that this is one of the differences between the requirements of private and those of corporate worship; "a dimm religious light"\(^2\) is excellent for private and solitary use, but a building for congregational worship should be well lit.\(^3\)

As we have already said, arts for corporate worship will include, from time to time, references to other parts of the Church on earth and to the Church in heaven; because there is no way of producing a sense of unity with the whole Church except by referring to it. For, purpose of such reference, use may be made of sculpture, painting, and stained glass, but the

---

1 Donne - "A Hymne to Christ, at the author's last going into Germany".
2 Hilton - "Il Penseroso".
3 A building designed for a congregation may not lend itself very well to private worship, but there is no reason why it should. It is not necessarily a criticism of a church to say that it is not a place which invites one to say one's private prayers; it was not designed to that end. If we wish our churches to be used for private worship, it is best to have a special part of the building arranged for that purpose.
essential medium is words.

The fact that worship must be individual as well as corporate means that ecclesiastical art must have certain other characteristics. The phrasing of all those parts that are to be used by the congregation must be sufficiently general to carry and express any of the things that a Christian may wish to bring before God. Very few of them can actually be mentioned in detail in any one service, and there are certainly some so personal and intimate that it would be an affront to all seemliness to bring them publicly before the whole assembled Church. But if these parts of the service are general enough, as the Lord's Prayer is general, each worshipper will find that they mean for him that which he desires to express.

Not only must the thought be generalised, but in some sense the feeling must be as well. For each worshipper must be able to express any feelings that a Christian may have in the presence of God, whatever their kind or degree. Thus it would be a serious criticism of any form of service to say that it was not favourable to strong feelings; it ought to be able to express the strongest, and if we take the Psalms as example of good liturgy, we remember how intensely moving many of them are. On the other hand, it would be a still more serious criticism of a form of service to say that it was only favourable to strong feelings; for it can safely be said that most of the worshippers are not filled with overwhelming excitement. The arts in which the worshippers are to express themselves will therefore be of that kind into which the worshipper can pour whatever degree of excitement he is possessed of at the moment. If the general attitude is right, this is quite

---

1. On the dangers of the sort of service that is favourable only to strong feelings see Guardini - "The Spirit of the Liturgy" p. 19.
The art addressed to the congregation must be at once simple enough to be within the capacity of the elementary believer, and deep enough to satisfy the most advanced. This does not mean that it must avoid everything that the elementary believer cannot completely comprehend; it is reasonable enough to expect him to make himself familiar with the ordinary technical terms of the faith, to listen to passages from the Pauline epistles whose argument will not be lucid to his mind without some private study, and to familiarise himself with the ordinary hymns and prayers, music and ceremonial, that are in use in his congregation. But it is not reasonable to provide for a mixed congregation meat that will only suit the stomach of a full-grown believer, or milk that will satisfy only the appetite of babes. The whole should be fundamentally simple and at the same time deep, and much be made of the kind of art that appeals on different levels at the same time.

The fact that the service must suit the capacity and need of all the individual worshippers does not mean that every service must be perfectly fitting for every conceivable Christian, but that it must be fitting for those who may reasonably be expected to attend it. A service might obviously be perfectly adapted to people living in a London suburb that would serve little purpose in a church of recent converts in a village in India. Race, temperament, and standard of culture all have to be taken into account. There is nothing catholic in uniformity, and the worship of the Christian Church shows the widest diversity of custom and manner.

Bearing this in mind, we can say that the use of the dance as an act of worship may be commendable in some places and not in others. The history
of its use in worship shows that it is natural enough in primitive communities, but that it gradually grows less important as a race becomes more cultured. First it becomes limited to special occasions, then instead of being performed by the whole body of people it is confined to a few choir boys or young girls, and finally it dies out, leaving only gesture and procession by which to be remembered. Similarly the use of images as a direct means of worship (that is as distinct from their use as a background to it) is not suitable for all congregations; for it easily leads to superstition and idolatry. Where they are used, it is generally said that they are a help to the ignorant and primitive; but it would seem that those are the very people who are most likely to misunderstand and misuse them. If they are to be used in this way at all, they should be limited to congregations of the mature and well-instructed.

4. Conclusion.

We have seen that art in some form is a necessity in Christian corporate worship. If it is bad or unsuitable art it may do great harm, but if it is good and suitable it is of value at every point.

It can bring things home to the worshippers so that they not only think them but feel them. It has a natural tendency to convey a feeling of contact with the Absolute, Eternal, Powerful, and Infinite, recognised at the same time as good and acceptable; but it is obedient to embody any

---

1 Some kinds of representation are more likely to be used idolatrously than others. It seems true that men are less likely to be led astray by stained glass than by painting, and by painting than by sculpture (for another point of view see Bevan - "Holy Images" p.149); that a good work of art is less likely to be used as an idol than a poor one (See Tyrwhitt - "Art Teaching of the Primitive Church" p.30); and that a figure in action is safer than a single figure standing alone as though awaiting homage (See Berneer - "The Church at Prayer" p.119).
intuition that is real to its maker, and thus it can communicate a sense of the reality of things both temporal and eternal, a direct awareness of as much of the nature of God as the human mind can receive, an immediate sense of his presence, and an assurance of his forgiveness and love.

It is a means of communicating and expressing right attitudes of mind. It conveys, in particular, interest, sensitiveness, respect, sincerity, detachment from self, a sense of proportion, and acceptance. Even apart from any specific religious content, it moves towards the expression of reverence, and when it is given a religious content it can convey and express any attitude that worship requires.

If a man’s nature is dead and dull, it can communicate that movement of emotion which makes him live. If his excitement demands expression it can serve as its outlet, and at the same time discipline and order it so that it does not get out of control. It can still the mind that is restless and unquiet and bring it to tranquillity, and can communicate and express the joy that is the atmosphere of Christian worship.

It can become the medium through which the mind of God is revealed and taught to man, not only giving instruction, but bringing it home to the mind and making it acceptable.

By conveying to men right attitudes of mind it can put them into such a position that they can will and do. It can make good things desirable, men’s needs vivid, and God’s succour indisputably evident. It has a natural affinity with that faith by which men co-operate with God, and if the artist desires to express such faith he finds in art a willing instrument to embody it and communicate it to others. The enjoyment of it is contemplative and not active; but it can turn man from contemplation to
action, and can be itself the instrument by which they unite themselves with God in will and co-operate with his purposes in prayer. The use of it is, indeed, actually itself a real way of co-operation with God, though it is very limited one.

By its means a sense of corporateness can be given to the members of a congregation, so that they become conscious not only of their fellowship with one another, but of their fellowship with the Church throughout the world, and with all the company of heaven. And not only can it meet the needs of the Church as a whole, but it can at the same time express the mind of each several person, and bring home God's gift to each individual.

It is not by itself specifically Christian, but it can readily be made so. Christ himself used those kinds of art that were open to him; and when we examine those things that have been designed by men for the purposes of worship, we find that the most spiritually fruitful of them are all works of art.

Art is, in fact, an instrument by which, for those who use it aright, all the activities of worship may take place; by which men may unite themselves with God and one another, and by which he condescends to unite himself with them.
For the sake of convenience the bibliography has been divided into various sections, but it is obvious that many of the books listed really belong to more than one of them. Many books on Church Architecture also contain valuable chapters on such matters as carving, glass, painting, etc.; but they are listed under the heading of architecture even though they could equally well appear under that of Decorative Arts. There are many books which deal with both the words and the music of hymns, and it is therefore impossible when dealing with hymns to separate Church Music from Church Literature; hymns and Church Music have therefore been grouped together. In all other cases where a book deals with more than one department of our subject, it has been listed under the heading with which it is mainly concerned. Encyclopaedias and works of general reference have been grouped together in a section by themselves.
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<td>Puritan Architecture &amp; its Future</td>
<td>Lutterworth</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. F. Clarke</td>
<td>Church Builders of the 19th Century</td>
<td>S. P. C. K.</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. D. Dalton</td>
<td>East Christian Art</td>
<td>O. U. P.</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. H. Drummond</td>
<td>The Church Architecture of Protestantism</td>
<td>T. &amp; T Clarke</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. A. Hamilton</td>
<td>Byzantine Architecture and Decoration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.R. Lethaby</td>
<td>Westminster Abbey Re-examined</td>
<td>Duckworth</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Lowrie</td>
<td>Christian Art &amp; Archaeology</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Haufe</td>
<td>Modern Church Architecture</td>
<td>I.C.R.S.</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.B. Perkins &amp; A. Hearn</td>
<td>The Methodist Church builds again</td>
<td>Epworth</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.W. Pugin</td>
<td>The True Principles of Pointed Architecture</td>
<td>Bohn</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.T. Rice</td>
<td>Byzantine Art</td>
<td>Oxford University Press (O.U.P.)</td>
<td>1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Scotford</td>
<td>The Church Beautiful</td>
<td>Pilgrim</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.H. Short</td>
<td>The History of Religious Architecture</td>
<td>Philip Allan</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-war Church Building</td>
<td>Hollis &amp; Carter</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Strzygowski</td>
<td>The Origin of Christian Art.</td>
<td>O.U.P.</td>
<td>1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Whiffen</td>
<td>Stuart &amp; Georgian Churches</td>
<td>Batsford</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Volumes of the Royal Commission on Ancient Monuments.
The Reports of the Incorporated Church Building Society.
C. THE DECORATIVE ARTS OF THE CHURCH

(Carving, Painting, Glass, Mosaic, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.D. Anderson</td>
<td>The Medieval Carver</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Bevan</td>
<td>Holy Images</td>
<td>Allen &amp; Unwin</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. J. P. Cave</td>
<td>Roof Bosses in Medieval Churches.</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. H. Crossley</td>
<td>English Church Craftsmanship.</td>
<td>Batsford.</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Didron</td>
<td>Christian Iconography</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Vol. 2 contains the &quot;Byzantine Guide to Painting&quot; and the &quot;Biblia Pauperum&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. A. Esdaile</td>
<td>English Monumental Sculpture since the Renaissance</td>
<td>S.P.C.K.</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Church Monuments 1310-1840</td>
<td>Batsford</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Gardner</td>
<td>A Handbook of English Medieval Sculpture</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Gardner</td>
<td>English Gothic Foliage Sculpture</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrjo Hirn</td>
<td>The Sacred Shrine</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. D. LeCouteur</td>
<td>English Medieval Painted Glass</td>
<td>S.P.C.K.</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Meille</td>
<td>Christ's Likeness in History and Art:</td>
<td>Burns Oates</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. R. Morey</td>
<td>Medieval Art</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. St. J. Tyrwhitt</td>
<td>The Art Teaching of the Primitive Church.</td>
<td>S.P.C.K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Vallance</td>
<td>Greater English Church Seminars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D. THE LITERATURE, ORATORY AND HISTORIC OF THE CHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Brooks</td>
<td>Lectures on Preaching</td>
<td>Griffith Parran</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Brillieoth</td>
<td>Landmarks in the History of Preaching</td>
<td>S.P.C.K.</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. E. Burney</td>
<td>The Poetry of our Lord</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A. Dinsmore</td>
<td>The English Bible as Literature.</td>
<td>Allen &amp; Unwin.</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Dowden</td>
<td>The Workmanship of the Prayer Book.</td>
<td>Methuen.</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further Studies in the Prayer Book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Farmer</td>
<td>The Servant of the Word</td>
<td>Book Club</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. Gossip</td>
<td>In Christ's Stead</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Hewlett</td>
<td>Reading the Liturgy (3rd ed.)</td>
<td>Murby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. Jones</td>
<td>Preaching and the Dramatic Arts.</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Ker</td>
<td>Lectures on the History of Preaching</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. G. Houlton</td>
<td>The Literary Study of the Bible</td>
<td>Tafjister</td>
<td>1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. C. Metcalf</td>
<td>Preaching in Mediaeval England</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Smith</td>
<td>The Art of Preaching, 747-1936</td>
<td>S.P.C.K.</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Stewart</td>
<td>Heralds of God</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Watson</td>
<td>The Literary Qualities of the Prayer Book.</td>
<td>A.P.C.K.</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E. THE HYMNS AND MUSIC OF THE CHURCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Benedictine of Stanbrook.</td>
<td>A Grammar of Plainsong (2nd ed.)</td>
<td>Stanbrook</td>
<td>1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. F. Benson</td>
<td>The English Hymn</td>
<td>Holder</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Batch</td>
<td>The Hymns of Methodism (3rd ed.)</td>
<td>Epsworth</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd series.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Davies &amp; H. Grace</td>
<td>Music and Worship: 1st series.</td>
<td>Eyre and Spottiswood</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd series.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Douglas</td>
<td>Church Music</td>
<td>Scribner</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Dyson</td>
<td>The Progress of Music</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Feathers</td>
<td>English Cathedral Music</td>
<td>Methuen</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. J. Gilman</td>
<td>The Evolution of the English Hymn.</td>
<td>Allen &amp; Unwin</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Hadow</td>
<td>Church Music</td>
<td>Longmans Green</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collected Essays</td>
<td>C.U.P.</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Housman
(Contains Elerton's various papers on Hymns and Hymn Books)
A. Z. Idelsdhn
Jewish Music
E. D. Jones (ed.)
English Critical Essays (XIX Century)
John Keble - Sacred Poetry
J. T. Lightwood
Methodist Music of the 18th Century
" Stories of Methodist Music, 19th Century "
K. H. Macdermott
The Old Church Gallery Minstrels. S.P.C.K.
B. L. Manning
The Hymns of Wesley and Watts. Epworth.
M. Patrick etc.
Manual of Church Prasese C. of S.
M. Patrick
Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody
C. H. Phillips
The Singing Church
C. S. Phillips
Hymnody Past and Present
A. Riley
Concerning Hymn Tunes and Sequences
E. Routley
The Church and Music
G. Sampson
The Century of Divine Songs
A. Schweitzer
J. S. Bach. Trans. E. Newman
A & C Black
G. W. Stewart
Music in Church Worship
R. R. Terry
Calvin's First Psalter
Bonn
H. J. W. Tillyard
Byzantine Music and Hymnography
I. Watts
Works (Vol. 4)
J. & C. Wesley
W. T. Whitby
Congregational Hymn Singing in England.
B. Wibberley
Music and Religion
Epworth
E. Wellesz
A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography
J. W. Whitley
Music in Worship (Being the Report of the Archbishops' Committee)
Revised ed.
The Publications of the Church Music Society
E. Bloa (ed.)  Music & Letters, Vol.27, No.1, January 1945  
(Contains an Article by W.L. Smoldon on "The Easter Sepulchre Music-Drama")

E.K. Brown  The Production of Religious Plays. Philip Allan 1932

O. Cargill  Religious Drama Columbia Youth Trust

E.K. Chambers  The Medieval Stage O.U.P. 1930

C. Cross  The Religious Drama Novbray  1913

S.H. Elliott  Religion and Dramatic Art S.C.I.  1927

W. O. E. Casterley  The Sacred Dance O.U.P.  1923

E. Parsons  The Dramatic Expression of Religion Epworth  1947

A.W. Pollard (ed.)  English Miracle Plays O.U.P.  1923

F.M. Potter  Religious Drama and Worship Unwin  1942

F. V. Mays (ed.)  Everyman with other Interludes. Dent  1909

D.L. Sayers  The Man born to be King Gollancz  1943

J.W. Sheppard  Greek Tragedy O.U.P.  1920

M. Sims-Williams  Religion through Drama S.C.I.  1949


K. Young  The Drama of the Medieval Church O.U.P.  1933

Publications of the Religious Drama Society S.P.C.K.

4. Works of General Reference

The Encyclopaedia Britannica (11th edition and 14th edition)
The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics J. Hastings

Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians

The Oxford History of Music (with Introductory Volume)