

ESSEX HALL LECTURE

Jm

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN WORLD RELIGIONS

BY
RABBI LESLIE I. EDGAR, M.A.

LINDSEY



PRESS

Price 2s. net

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN WORLD RELIGIONS

BY

RABBI LESLIE I. EDGAR, M.A.

THE ESSEX HALL LECTURE, 1952

THE LINDSEY PRESS

14 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

NOTE

The Essex Hall Lecture was founded by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association in 1892, with the object of providing an annual opportunity for the free utterance of selected speakers on religious themes of general interest. The delivery of the lecture continues under the auspices of the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Christian Churches, as a leading event during the course of the Annual Meetings of the Assembly. A list of the published lectures, including those still obtainable, will be found at the end of this lecture.

*14 Gordon Square,
London, W.C.1*



www.unitarian.org.uk/docs

**Scanned by
James Barry
as a volunteer**

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN WORLD RELIGIONS

PREDOMINANT among the effects of science upon human life are an extension of inter-communication between men and nations, and an increased inter-dependence, on a scale unprecedented in human history. The result, on the one hand, is an increase of friction and tension as diverse peoples are brought into closer and closer contact. On the other hand, the integration of humanity into a world-community—though anything but reality—has now, at long last, become a genuine, and not necessarily an exceedingly remote, possibility. Can there be any doubt that, unless catastrophe and chaos intervene, and perhaps even then if we take a long enough view, Dr. Julian Huxley is right in asserting that “we can already see the inevitable outline of the future—the emergence of a single world community. Even the barriers to exchange which have recently been set up are symptoms of the trend, reactions against its force” ?¹

In this situation, it is surely unnecessary to emphasise the imperative need for men and women of all religious faiths to co-operate in support of every course of action which is at all likely to promote a greater degree of unity among mankind. To co-operate, for example, in efforts to further international understanding, to diminish poverty and suffering and to eliminate racial and religious prejudice and discrimination. Such common action is so clearly of inherent excellence, and so manifestly a necessity, that—though it would be almost impossible to exaggerate its importance—I do not propose to elaborate upon it. An incidental outcome of such combined activity—incidental but of considerable significance—would be the growth of a

¹ “The Process of Evolution, VI. The Human Phase” (*The Listener*, 22nd November, 1951, p. 880).

sense of fellowship among men and women of different faiths which would help to remove the true 'scandal' of religion (and one to which I shall return later)—the discord, amounting often even to bitterness, among adherents of religion itself.

There are now two influences which are, or ought to be, impelling religious men and women to strive for greater unity among mankind; and, more especially, among themselves as an example to mankind. First, there are the ideals which are common to the higher religions; the ideals of harmony, peace, love, justice, brotherhood. In the three great monotheistic faiths—Judaism, Christianity and Islam—these ideals receive their ultimate and compelling sanction in the belief in the one God of all humanity, who requires harmony and brotherhood among his children. These ideals and convictions are now, however, powerfully reinforced by the transformed circumstances of human life which demand, with extreme urgency, this higher degree of unity. For it is increasingly apparent that either this higher degree of unity will be attained—and be attained fairly speedily—or, instead of movement forward to a world-community, there can only be immeasurable disaster for humanity.

Underlying the whole of the present situation is, however, a question difficult and far-reaching. What are the implications, *for religion itself*, of this transformation in the circumstances of human life? This question is closely connected with the requirement of increasing common action among adherents of different faiths. For common action among religious men and women requires an understanding of their relationship on the religious plane if their common action is to be soundly-based and fully effective; if, indeed, it is to be more than solely empirical. The deeper question is: "Are we not now in a situation which is impelling us to a new stage in religious development, an advance in the religious outlook itself?"

World-religions—by which I mean, religions which have a conviction of a universal message and, most often

also, of a universal mission ; religions, moreover, which—in greater or lesser degree—embrace men of different nationalities, races and social classes ; which ‘over-span’, as it were, distinctions of nationality, race and social position—having come into existence, it is a not-unnatural assumption (and, certainly, one being made by many) that the present situation, wherein men are groping toward a greater integration of humanity, will result in the emergence of a single world-faith ; one religion for all humanity. I believe this to be an entirely false assumption. Moreover, I believe that any endeavour to construct such a single religion is wholly undesirable, and that those who are engaged in it, no matter how excellent their intentions, are, in fact, hindering—not helping forward—the probable next stage in mankind’s religious development.

In the first place, there is no area of agreement among the world-religions substantial enough for the creation of a ‘religion for humanity’. If we consider all the world-religions, ranging from pantheistic Hinduism and non-theistic Buddhism, to the world-monotheistic faiths of Judaism, Christianity and Mohammedanism, the agreement amounts to little more than a recognition of ‘the reality of the spiritual’. Even their moral demands are too diversified to provide an effective universal standard of conduct and their conceptions of the nature of the Absolute so contrasting as to provide no basis for an effective universal philosophy. The eclectic process can only result in a religion so ‘eviscerated’ as to be of no real significance and no substantial help to mankind. ‘Highest-common-factor’ (which is, of course, ‘lowest-common-denominator’) religion cannot provide a living faith for anybody. Those who persist in trying to secure men’s allegiance for eclectic religion—vague and ‘flabby’ as it must necessarily be—are, however splendid their intentions, in reality misleading men and diminishing the likelihood of their coming under effective religious direction.

Even among the world-monotheistic faiths (Judaism,

Christianity and Islam), incomparably greater though the area of agreement is, differences of conviction are also so profound, and relate to such major religious issues, that any fusion is wholly out-of-question. Clearly, there can be no integration of two religions, however much they have in common, when one regards the Incarnation of Jesus as the central point, and the supreme religious fact, in human history; while the other denies not only the centrality of the Incarnation but its reality. Integration could only be achieved by ignoring differing convictions of ultimate importance. That is certainly not the way of spiritual integrity; and truth is even more important than unity.

A no less serious objection to attempts to create a 'world-faith', a single 'religion for all humanity', is that the whole process of artificially constructing a religion is, in the conviction of many, basically unacceptable. It conflicts with the nature of religion itself. It can only be approved by those who take a purely humanistic view of the nature of religion, regarding religion as a solely 'natural' phenomenon; the product of the unaided human intellect and emotion. Religious advance is, on this view, determined exclusively by human endeavour. Obviously, such a view is entirely unacceptable to those who regard religion as predominantly, and essentially, 'transcendental', rooted in a supernatural revelation. From this transcendental point-of-view, religious advance (if it means more than merely a fuller understanding of the revelation and an enlarged opportunity to apply its teachings) is never possible without a further irruption of the Divine into human life. For my own part, as a Liberal Jew, I hold neither a purely humanistic nor a solely transcendental conception of the nature of religion. I do not believe that outstanding advances in religion—the conviction, for example, that there is but One God of the whole Universe and that his supreme demand is righteousness and holiness—were achieved by the unaided human intellect and intuition. Is it not improbable that such advances, were they solely the

product of intellect and intuition, would have been confined to so limited a section of humanity? There would seem to me to be no justification for doubting, and every reason for accepting, the statements of the Prophets that they had an experience of 'compulsion' and were a channel of communication from a Higher Power. Moreover, the solely humanistic interpretation of religion involves, for my belief, too passive a conception of God's relation to the Universe and to man. Consequently, I hold that the most substantial religious advance is always rooted in, or closely related to, a prophetic message; the reception of inspiration from 'on high'. On the other hand, I do not believe that we ordinary men and women are meant simply to 'wait upon' the coming of Prophets. *Some* religious advance has to be achieved by us ordinary men and women, even though not the most substantial and illumining advance. In religion, as in all aspects of life, man is—so I hold—to regard himself (to use a famous Rabbinic dictum in a wider sense than was originally intended) as a "co-partner with God in the work of creation". This, I believe, applies to development of religious knowledge and practice as to aught else; even though the very core and heart of religion is not a 'human construction' but the 'given' element, the element of 'inspiration', the gift of God over which man has no control.

On this conception of religion my whole lecture is based and it excludes, for me, the solely humanistic endeavour of artificially constructing a new religion, and, equally, the Barthian attitude which would deny that we are capable of effecting any real religious advance, even though a religious advance is manifestly demanded, as I believe, by the new situation in human affairs.

Before we leave this whole matter of a single world-faith, let us just note that there is no real evidence even of the desirability of an integration of world-religions. To eliminate diversity would not mean spiritual advance but spiritual impoverishment. The

mysterious and profound complexity of truth demands diversified expression, at least until man ceases to be man and is capable of the apprehension of absolute truth in all its fullness and immensity. Quite apart from the emotional values in diversified traditions and historic attachments, uniformity is not the way to truth, any more than to the enrichment of human life. The term 'world-faith', which implies uniformity in religion, and which is something very different from universal perception of the spiritual and universal ethical aims, has—I believe—to be used with the utmost caution. It certainly has no applicability or value at the present stage of human development. The only value of the term 'world-faith' is as an expression of an ultimate ideal applicable to the time when the fullest truth will be known to men and "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea". The present reality, problem and need is concerned, not with the creation of a 'world-faith', but with the relationships between those world-religions which, not only are in existence but, in any foreseeable future, will continue to exist.

"Cultural interchange", writes Julian Huxley, "does not necessarily result in cultural uniformity. The world community which we envisage and hope to bring to birth is a variety-in-unity. In the useful phrase of the American writer, L. K. Frank, it involves an orchestration of cultures."¹ A corresponding activity in the religious field—'an orchestration of religions'—the beginning of serious co-operation between world-religions which, by no means, need, or will, lead to religious uniformity, but rather to a unity consistent with variety, is a process entirely free from all the objections involved in the artificial construction of a 'world-faith'. It is, I hold, the next stage in mankind's religious development; intrinsically desirable and a clear demand of the present human situation. The transformed circumstances of human life—the process of convergence, of inter-communication and

¹ *The Listener*, loc. cit. p. 880.

extended interchange promoted by science; and the hopes and dangers inherent therein—are impelling world-religions to consider most seriously their relationship to one another. Resistance to the process, in an evident hardening in some quarters of dogmatism and exclusiveness, is no more, I believe, than a “symptom of the trend”, a “re-action against its force”. The age of religious isolationism and exclusiveness is dying and is, indeed, almost dead.

The first steps in this process toward co-operation between world-religions have long since been taken. The very first steps were taken when extended facilities for travel and inter-communication made an increasing number of men aware that there were, in the world, other significant and advanced religions beside their own. The result was the emergence of that very important, though still somewhat young, branch of knowledge: the comparative study of religions. Thus was made the very first breach, on any considerable scale, in the wall of religious isolationism. It was followed, or accompanied, by a second movement of even greater significance. A number of scholars of high religious integrity, moved by profound devotion to truth, were not content merely to study other religions but were determined to eliminate those misrepresentations which were an evil heritage of history and of past conflicts. They were determined to make their juster estimate and appreciation of another religion as widely-known as they could. On the Christian side, scholars like Travers Herford and George Foot Moore—to mention only two out of many—did more than achieve a remarkable knowledge of Judaism and of the very difficult Rabbinic literature. They became interpreters of Judaism to Christians. We owe them an infinite debt for having undermined the current idea that, since the emergence of Christianity, Judaism had lost its vitality and significance, and for having removed serious misconceptions, and combatted deliberate misrepresentations, of the character of Judaism.

On the Jewish side, a similar beneficent process was taking place. In this country Claude G. Montefiore, especially, made himself—not only a great interpreter of Judaism to Christians—but also a great interpreter of Christianity to the Jew. In a whole series of scholarly studies,¹ he valiantly made breaches—and very substantial breaches—in the thick wall of isolation which had, for centuries, barred the Jew from virtually any knowledge of, and certainly any just appreciation of, Christianity. Courageous, indeed, was Montefiore's determined endeavour to present Christianity, fairly and appreciatively, to Jews who—because of past, and even contemporary, persecution and suffering—most often regarded Christianity as something not even to be mentioned.

These first two stages toward co-operation between world-religions were, in themselves, of great importance. The comparative study of religions, the attempt to remove misconceptions, to overcome misrepresentations and to produce, instead, an appreciation of the virtues of other religions has made possible a movement toward fellowship among men of different religions, a recognition of common ground, despite large areas of deep divergence, and even a movement toward combined effort for the promotion of common aims. A further advance, however, is needed before co-operation can become fully creative and accordant with the demands of the present world-situation. The advance involved is, indeed, so bold that, even now, only few are willing to make it. It is the frank acceptance, not simply of the possibility of mutual understanding and respect, but of the even greater possibility of *mutual contribution and enrichment* among the various world-religions.

I shall, a little later, discuss the pre-suppositions which must underlie such an advance and the conditions which have to be fulfilled if this mutual contri-

¹ "The Synoptic Gospels"; "Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus"; "Judaism and St. Paul"; "Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teachings."

tribution is to be a true enrichment and not the weakening of a religion or an undermining of its character and power. First, however, let us note that daring religious thinkers have already paved the way for this advance. Thus, on the Jewish side, Claude Montefiore wrote: "Liberal Judaism seeks to fashion a Judaism which shall be broad enough and humble enough to believe that its own truths, its own treasures, can be enriched and added to from the truths and treasures which may have been vouchsafed to other than Jewish teachers."¹ He urged that we should seek to enrich Liberal Judaism by "finding out what the great minds of other religions have thought and taught, and how much is consistent with Judaism, and valuable and worthy of adoption and incorporation, and how much must be rejected; how much can be translated into Jewish terminology (for, after all, what a large amount *is* a question of terminology!), and how much is untranslatable, undesirable, and untrue."²

Not content with generalisation, Montefiore drew the specific conclusion regarding the possibility of Judaism being enriched from Christian tradition and experience. "Let us not then", he urged, "persist in keeping to a poorer Judaism than we need. Why should we not make our religion as rich as we can? Jesus and Paul can help us as well as Hillel and Akiba. Let them do so. What is good in them came also from God."³

Not since the rise of Christianity had any Jew before Claude Montefiore, as far as I know, and I mean a Jew within the tradition of Judaism, suggested that Judaism had something to learn from Christianity and could, and should, while remaining faithful to its unequivocal monotheism, be enriched from Christian teaching and experience. "We need philosophic theologians", he said, "who shall neither be afraid of Christian doctrine on the one hand, nor be on the constant search for contrasts upon the other."⁴ Amazingly daring was such an injunction after the

¹ "The Old Testament and After", p. 590.

² *ibid.* p. 561.

³ *ibid.* p. 291.

⁴ *ibid.* p. 560.

centuries of separation, misunderstanding and, most often, even hostility between Christianity and Judaism. The shock still reverberates! Nor is it surprising that, after the long isolation of Judaism, and particularly after persecution in the name of Christianity, it should be so. Of course, like all daring thinkers, Montefiore was misrepresented. That is the price of daring. But those who have misrepresented him should read his perfectly clear statement that Liberal Judaism "does not attempt to fashion a Judaism which shall be a mere medley of pretty notions gathered from every source. But it attempts to make its own doctrines still richer and fuller, and no less harmonious and consistent, by *selected* garnerings from without".¹ For, of course, Montefiore insisted that harmony and consistency with fundamental doctrines had to be preserved. He also held (and this we shall discuss later) that much in Christian experience and tradition is indeed "separable from those doctrines and theories in the New Testament which we reject as inconsistent with our faith".²

Nor are there lacking examples of equally bold religious thinking on the Christian side, though—not unexpectedly—only, as far as I can discover, among Christians of the most 'liberal' wing; though I think that it could be shown that several orthodox Christian theologians, because of their revised attitude toward the Old Testament, are moving nearer to this position. Quite as unequivocal as Montefiore's statements—though the points-of-view are not exactly the same—are those of the Unitarian scholar whom I have already mentioned and whose name is as deeply honoured by Jews as by Unitarians. Travers Herford has written that, in his conviction, Judaism "has kept its vitality alongside of Christianity as a continual reminder that no one religion, and not that particular religion, exhausted all the possibilities of revelation, summed up the whole of the divine purpose toward mankind. Christianity held up one ideal, Judaism held up another;

¹ "The Old Testament and After", p. 590.

² *ibid.*, p. 291.

and both ideals were visions of what God had shown to human souls".¹

Travers Herford stated categorically his conviction that "if Christianity is vindicated as a living religion, a true revelation to the human soul of divine realities and a true interpretation of those realities to human thought and apprehension, so in like manner Judaism is vindicated as another true revelation of those same divine realities, another true interpretation of them to human thought and apprehension."² "Each, therefore, has an independent right of existence; and while the adherents of each may, as they naturally would, find more satisfaction for their own spiritual needs in their own type of religion, neither is entitled to deny the validity of the other."³

Of course, Travers Herford was aware of the essential problem involved in this position. "That Rabbinical Judaism⁴ and Christianity"—he wrote—"are funda-

¹ "The Pharisees", p. 235.

² *ibid.* p. 235. For Travers Herford's justification of this assertion, the concluding chapter of "The Pharisees" would have to be considered in detail. He finds the justification in the fact that (a) Judaism did not die out, but retained its vitality, after the rise of Christianity. (b) Judaism contains permanent religious values complementary to those of Christianity. "Christianity is a religion based upon faith in a Person, and the main theme of its message is the offer of salvation through faith in Christ . . . the doing of the will of God took the second place and not the first among the objects to which the Church directed her efforts", while Judaism "put the doing of God's will in the first place, and faith in the second place, faith, moreover, not in a Person but in God himself". Consequently, Judaism preserved both a different ethical emphasis and a different conception of faith; and, Travers Herford held, the divine plan for the religious training of mankind required the presence and influence of the *two* types of religion, and not only one. (c) Judaism has been to the Jews "as true, real and effective a means of expressing their relation with God as Christianity has been to Christians"; it has "afforded them all that a living religion could afford", and one "by which Jews have lived and for which they have died".

³ *ibid.* p. 234.

⁴ Had he not been specifically concerned with *Rabbinical* Judaism, he would doubtless have written 'Judaism', *tout court*.

mentally irreconcilable, differing both in their standard of reference and in the terms by which their contents are described, is a fact plain to be seen by any competent and impartial student of both religions."¹ We shall consider this fundamental issue later. For the moment it is enough to notice that Travers Herford, like Montefiore, boldly asserted the value and validity of the other religion.

In one respect, however, Montefiore goes further than Travers Herford. Montefiore unequivocally asserts that Judaism, *here and now*, can be enriched by contributions from Christianity, provided they are consistent with its fundamentals. Travers Herford appears to assert no more than that, *ultimately*, Judaism—as well as Christianity—will make contributions to “the larger whole” in which both Judaism and Christianity will be taken up. “When the time shall come”, he wrote, “when Christianity shall have done all it can do, under the forms and conditions which it has hitherto adopted, there will then be a Judaism able and ready to offer its imperishable treasure, kept safe through the ages, to a world which will no longer scorn.”²

I myself hold to Montefiore's position and believe in the possibility and necessity of an *immediate* contribution of one religion to another and, in particular, of Judaism to Christianity, and vice versa. Nonetheless, it is good to note that Travers Herford approaches very near to, even if he does not wholly acquiesce in, Montefiore's position; and, at any rate, asserts without question the permanent validity and value of another faith and his conviction of its ultimate contribution to mankind's religious advance.

Dr. James Parkes, in his book “Judaism and Christianity”, has pleaded for “co-operation between the two religions” without undermining “the integrity of either”.³ He asserts that “the better the Jew or the

¹ “The Pharisees”, p. 236.

² *ibid.* p. 238. Martin Buber concludes his latest book, “Two Types of Faith”, with a very similar suggestion.

³ P. 12.

Christian understands the reality of the religion of the other the better his own task can be fulfilled".¹ Even though Dr. Parkes' interpretations of the meaning of the revelations of Sinai and Calvary be not accepted, it is nonetheless highly significant that the need for a 'dialogue' between the two religions is now being stated so fearlessly and the problems involved are at any rate, being seriously grappled with. Undoubtedly, a new outlook is developing and a new spirit is abroad.

This new outlook and spirit can, of course, have no appeal for those Dogmatic Religions which claim to possess a 'unique', 'perfect' and 'final' revelation. Such religions are necessarily exclusive and hold that their revelation wholly displaces, supersedes or takes precedence over all other revelation. In this category, strict Orthodox Judaism stands with strictly Orthodox Christianity.² Maimonides' famous estimate of the value of Christianity and Islam as "helping to bring perfection to all mankind, so that they may serve God with one consent", although it ascribes value to these other great faiths until the Messianic time when all will turn toward the full truth, does not, of course, include any conception that Judaism itself might be enriched from the other traditions. The position is the same as that of Christians who are willing to acknowledge that Judaism and Islam have a continuing value and purpose because they are 'approximations' to Christianity and prepare mankind for the

¹ P. 39.

² Both claim that the revelation vouchsafed to them was unique, perfect and final. And though both would acknowledge that a 'subordinate' revelation has been granted 'outside their borders', they necessarily hold that their revelation supersedes (or, in the case of Orthodox Judaism, takes precedence over) all other revelation. Both regard their revelation as *sui generis*; for Orthodox Judaism, a unique Divine declaration at Mt. Sinai; for Orthodox Christianity, a unique Divine irruption into human history through the Incarnation. But orthodox Christianity has also an additional exclusiveness involved in the doctrine of the "experience of Jesus" as *alive* and a source of continuing power.

full Christian revelation, but are not willing to declare that Christianity itself has anything to gain from non-Christian tradition and experience. This attitude provides a basis for understanding and respect between religions but not for full and creative co-operation. It admits of no serious 'dialogue'. The fact is that Dogmatic Religions make claims which are virtually totalitarian and there is, thus, a chasm between Dogmatic and Liberal Religions. If understanding and respect between religions are to develop into full and creative co-operation, men must decide firmly on which side of that chasm they stand.

I would, most certainly, not deny all value to a 'dialogue' between Dogmatic Religions and Liberal Religions. Centuries of religious experience and profound religious interpretation embodied in the dogmatic traditions have, of course, much to contribute. But such a 'dialogue' would, of necessity, be a one-sided affair. The Liberal Religions would engage in it, accepting the possibility of their enrichment. The Dogmatic Religions, whatever they might give, would not acknowledge that they had anything to receive.

The process of co-operation, in the full sense, is, therefore, essentially one for Liberal Religions or for Liberal elements within religions. These alone are prepared to acknowledge that, while they are themselves in possession of eternally-valid beliefs, they do not possess the fullness of religious truth vouchsafed to man. They are continually 'forward-looking', believing in religious advance and, even, in the possibility of radical development in religious knowledge. They accept (and this is really the fundamental condition for creative co-operation) the doctrine of progressive revelation which Montefiore so finely summed up as "the conception of the spirit of God giving light to all generations and to all mankind, so that no one religion, and no one stage of that religion, are in possession of perfect truth in all its fullness and completion."¹ It is the doctrine

¹ "The Old Testament and After", p. 556.

implicit in Travers Herford's assertion about Judaism and Christianity that "each has an independent right of existence; and while the adherents of each may, as they naturally would, find more satisfaction for their own spiritual needs in their own type of religion, neither is entitled to deny the validity of the other".

I wholly concur in the statement made by Professor Hocking in his Hibbert Lectures (1940), where he discusses the relationship between living religions, that "the proposition that Jesus Christ includes everything, however valuable as a postulate of faith to be made good by the thoughtful effort of the believer, when set up as an *a priori* basis for the intercourse of religions is simply unacceptable".¹ And while I rejoice in his further statement that "it is right, and indeed necessary, for the good of men, that the non-Christian religions should hold their own",² I respectfully dissent from his qualification "at least until they find themselves in fact understood, translated, and included in the growing power of a religion which in achieving its own full potentiality, achieves theirs also".³ I believe that Liberal religions must enter into the dialogue without any presupposition about a single religion (whether one of the existing religions or a new religion of the future) achieving the full potentiality of the various world-religions of the present and thus becoming a world-faith. It should be enough for us, at this stage of human development, to endeavour to enrich our own traditions without trying to exercise any prophetic insight whatsoever as to the ultimate outcome, in the 'farthest future', of such an immediately good and necessary endeavour.

For a 'dialogue' between religions, on the conviction that the great world-religions have something to

¹ Professor W. E. Hocking, Hibbert Lectures on "Living Religions and a World Faith", p. 262. Equally the proposition of Orthodox Judaism that the Torah contains everything is wholly unacceptable as a basis for the intercourse of religions in the fullest sense.

² *ibid.* p. 262.

³ *ibid.* p. 262.

give to each other for their mutual enrichment and development, to be a co-operative endeavour leading to sound and effective religious influence, there are a number of conditions to be fulfilled which are, I believe, indispensable.

The first is that each world-religion must not endanger its own 'particularity'; that definiteness of doctrine, that fullness of distinctive expression, that strong connexion with its historic background which makes it much more than a 'vague philosophy', which makes it, indeed, an effective and influential religious faith and tradition. Professor Hocking has set forth the three characteristics which a religion has to preserve: "Individuality, organic unity, consistency."¹

The requirement of consistency, as alone accordant with truth, is so obvious as to require hardly any comment. As Professor Hocking says: "What is thus entertained must be consistent with what is there. The chief complaint against the wide hospitalities of Hinduism has been that its adopted ingredients may be at war with one another, morally and logically."² We should, however, resist the assumption—frequently made—that, because one religion includes a basic conception (e.g. the Incarnation) fundamentally different from the basic conceptions of another religion, that belief must necessarily permeate all that religion's thought and experience *to such an extent* as to make impossible any consistent inclusion of *any part* of its teaching or experience in another religion. That, I believe, is not so. It necessarily provides a different *sanction* for all that religion's belief and experience, but there may well be parts of its doctrine and experience where the basic conception is not, inherently and inevitably, involved.³

It is the failure to make this important distinction which is, I believe, at the root of much unnecessary

¹ Hibbert Lectures, p. 183.

² *ibid.* pp. 183-4.

³ Jews are particularly inclined to fail to make this important distinction. Deeply conscious that they cannot include in Judaism anything that is inherently bound up with

opposition to an effort at mutual enrichment among world-religions. No religion has yet sufficiently laboured to test, convincingly, the truth or falsity of this cardinaly-important assumption. And there is certainly good *a priori* reason for accepting its soundness. For, if it were not sound, the whole past process, both in Judaism and Christianity, of absorbing from outside sources—from surrounding religions and philosophies—would have been fatal and would have led to nothing but internal inconsistency. On the contrary, the history of both religions shows that it has been most successfully done, accretions from without having been valuably absorbed and the religion enriched through the process.¹

The requirement of 'organic unity' means, in Pro-

the doctrine of the Incarnation, they tend to forget that a belief which has come to be associated with that doctrine is not necessarily and inevitably bound up with it. Montefiore asked Jewish scholars to remember that the very fact that they eagerly sought parallels in Rabbinic literature for many of the excellencies in the New Testament was, in itself, evidence that the searchers thought some New Testament teachings not out of harmony with the purest Judaism. And the fact that an exact parallel in Rabbinic literature cannot always be found by no means proves that the New Testament teaching is, therefore, bound up with a doctrine or theory that Judaism rejects. It is just as likely to prove that Christianity has added to religious knowledge and experience something which, for historic reasons, Judaism has missed but which could, with perfect consistency, be embodied in its tradition. And vice versa.

¹ Professor Hocking describes Christianity as having been "vigorously syncretistic" in the years of its early vigour and refers to "the well-known outline of these adoptions from the language and thought of the Greco-Roman world, from the philosophies and the mysteries". (P. 184.) Modern scholarship has shown that Judaism has also, throughout the larger part of its history, been "vigorously syncretistic". In both cases, the adopted elements became transmuted in the course of absorption; that is part of the process of enrichment. It would hardly be too much to claim that little more is being urged, in this lecture, than that a process which has long taken place *unconsciously* should now be undertaken *consciously*.

fessor Hocking's words, that " what is added must not remain extraneous, like an ornament or a piece of baggage, but must become part of the organism of the living religion ".¹ The accretion of doctrine has to be not only consistent but organically assimilable. Let me give an example. Montefiore, in his Essex Hall Lecture on " The Place of Judaism among the Religions of the World " (now, unfortunately, out of print), said: " No phase of Judaism could claim the title which did not press and cling to the doctrine of the divine unity and the divine fatherhood . . . that the divine unity is flawless and complete; that there is both kinship and eternal distinction between man and God—these, and similar, doctrines must surely always form part of any religion which calls itself by the Jewish name." ² Now, every accretion must obviously be consistent with these doctrines if Judaism is to remain Judaism and not be transformed into some other religion. But such consistency is not enough. The accretion of doctrines must also be introduced in such a way that a related aspect of Judaism, impressively stated by Montefiore, will not be weakened, still less destroyed. For, as Montefiore said, " If there is one direction, if there is one religious chapter, in which it (Judaism) is one-sided, and in which it must, perhaps remain one-sided, it is here—in a certain bias against Pantheism. And I can imagine ", he said, " that, as the fullest doctrine of God is very difficult for any one human being to grasp, one of the duties and one of the functions of Judaism—its ' place ' in the religions of the world—might for long ages be just to press and maintain this fundamental conception, that God is other than man, that He is ' without ' as well as ' within ', transcendent as well as immanent, our Father and our King, our Saviour and our Lord." ³ To achieve this organic unity is, obviously, not easy. But I hold that the history of religious development shows that it can be done and, with Montefiore, I am

¹ Hibbert Lectures, p. 183.

² Essex Hall Lecture, pp. 43-44.

³ *ibid.* pp. 44-45.

“ heretic and venturesome enough to believe that it is not true that you can never successfully pour new wine into old bottles. It depends upon the bottles: it depends upon the pouring—sudden or gradual; clumsy or skilful. It also depends upon the wine. . . .”¹

Likewise, and certainly not less important, is the preservation of ‘ organic unity ’ with regard to historic tradition, as well as with regard to doctrine. Again, let me give an example. Though it is true that Liberal Jews, at any rate, would wish to see the universal doctrines of Judaism take on, more and more, predominance, it is also true that, as with all world-religions, Judaism has to remain a religion with “ all the strength and the power of a long inheritance, of a rich and varied history, of a long succession of great personalities ” and that new embodiments and enrichments must be so organically associated as not “ to break with our history, to cut the thread of our development, to lose our connexion with so rich and remarkable a past ”.² This ensures that a religion has, and retains, ‘ character ’, remains an effective emotional, as well as intellectual, influence and ensures that, even when there is a very near-assimilation in doctrine—as, for example, between Liberal Judaism and the most liberal form of Unitarianism—the distinctive character of each religion remains strong, through the strength of the distinctive and impressive historic tradition.³ The maintenance of a distinctive historic tradition does not limit, still less exclude, co-operation, in the fullest sense of mutual enrichment. It increases the possibility and value of such mutual enrichment. For there are intangible values in an historic tradition which, quite

¹ Essex Hall Lecture, pp. 49-50.

² *ibid.* pp. 37, 38.

³ It is important, however, to notice that, while the maintenance of “ organic unity ” with regard to historic tradition is of high significance, the insistence on historic tradition must not be carried too far. As Professor Hocking says: “ The soft sensitivity which cannot endure losses and farewells for the sake of better things can have no place in the stern business of establishing truth in a moving world-order.” (P. 147.)

as much as the more tangible values in specific doctrines, are part of the contribution and the enrichment.

The above two requirements—"consistency" and "organic unity"—guarantee the perpetuation of a religion's "individuality". It seems to me unnecessary to make "individuality" a separate criterion, as Professor Hocking does. Fidelity to the two other requirements will, in itself, ensure that a religion which grows by accretion, as well as by inner development, retains—throughout the process—its "recognisable being and character" so that "the borrowed elements" do not "efface or neutralise that character".¹

In order that co-operation between world-religions shall be thoroughly sound and truly creative, and the 'individuality' and, therefore, the intrinsic values of both distinctive doctrine and distinctive tradition in each world-religion may be preserved, there is another precedent condition for such co-operation which cannot be too forcefully insisted upon. It is that those who engage in the act of co-operation should be thoroughly well-versed in both the teachings and traditions of their own religion; that they should have a thorough knowledge and appreciation of its concepts, values and history; that they should have a deep fidelity to it and a conviction, not only of its irreplaceability for themselves, but also of its power to contribute to the religious development of mankind. This eliminates that fear of "losing one's own faith" which often holds men back from religious co-operation. This strong sense of the primary importance of one's own religious conceptions, values and traditions guards against that 'fainéant', or 'laissez-faire', attitude which an over-impulsive striving for unity in religion is liable to beget and which is little distinguishable from an indifference to truth. It protects against vacuity or weakness in religion and the failure to see the point at

¹ Hibbert Lectures, p. 187.

which there must be a "virile intolerance".¹ We have—apart from an affirmation of faith—the test of experience in life, thought and history; but this test will not prove so decisively the primacy, in all respects, of a single religion.

We should, I think, regard each world-religion as a circle with a perfectly definite centre-point or focus, and with a clear, well-delimiting circumference. But we should each be striving to extend the radius of our own circle, without any moving of its focus or any blurring of its enlarging circumference, so that the distinctive 'individuality' is retained and yet parts of the various circles, more and more, tend to overlap. These over-lapping sections are the areas of enrichment, and of increasing harmony, which co-operation brings into being. We must most certainly act on our faith that the focus of our own circle is as near to the centre of Truth as we can get and endeavour to make the area of our own circle cover as much of the truth as we can see. But we cannot tell, absolutely, which of the circles covers the greater area of Truth. It is also beyond our range to know, with certainty, why, within the totality of religious knowledge and experience, there are many circles based on different foci, having different 'centre-points' or 'fundamentals', and yet each containing a special measure of truth. Doubtless we may surmise that only in this way can the limited human mind grasp various facets of truth, just as we can only see different sides of a building if we take up a number of different positions. Even

¹ There is a very important section in Professor Hocking's Lectures in which he points out that, while Christianity, "in the years of its early vigour", was vigorously syncretistic, enriching itself by adoptions, it was also "highly intolerant, in the sense that it was unwilling to compromise or to adulterate its worship with any element it deemed inconsistent therewith" (see pp. 184-85). Exactly the same can be said of Judaism. In all cases, however, the indispensable condition for this combination of "breadth" with "virile intolerance" is a thorough knowledge of, and deep attachment to, one's own religious doctrines and traditions.

more beyond our range is the prophetic function of trying to envisage how far these several expanding and overlapping circles can ultimately (or how far they will ultimately) be encompassed within the totality of religious knowledge and experience. All this is an impossible inquiry beyond our perception at the present stage of religious development. Moreover, it cannot, I think, be sufficiently stressed (and it is not stressed often enough or with adequate candour) that religion is just as entitled to its unsolved problems as any other branch of human knowledge and experience. And just as Science is strong, not weak, through candid acknowledgement of what it does *not* yet know, but is weak when it pretends to more than it knows—and is, in no wise, lacking in certitude concerning truth already discovered or attained—so should Religion not fear to acknowledge its present ignorance while, at the same time, proclaiming boldly its convictions.

I would, however, say one further thing about this problem. It is presumptuous, it seems to me, to assert that the present irreconcilability of beliefs in the various religions, *necessarily and in all cases*, involves permanent irreconcilability. Some of the irreconcilability, complete and inevitable as it seems to us, may not be real when viewed from fuller knowledge. Terminology may play a greater part than we imagine. Truth (so great is its complexity) has its surprises and brings into reconcilability assertions previously held to be completely incompatible. Thus the discovery of X-rays revolutionised hitherto accepted contrasts between 'solidity' and 'penetrability'. It was then seen conclusively that these were not absolutely opposed conceptions but only relative, and reconcilable, positions; that a table could rightly be asserted to be 'solid' with reference to a man's hand and, equally rightly, be asserted to be 'penetrable' with reference to an X-ray. In religion also, further knowledge may have some equally surprising, and happily reconciling, adjustments in store for us. I am not, of course,

suggesting that all the diverse beliefs in religion could be thus reconciled. That would be to assert that we have no *final* and *certain* knowledge of religious truth. And that I most emphatically do not believe. For the test of experience in life, thought and history—quite apart from an affirmation of faith—does, I hold, give us complete assurance that some doctrines (e.g. monotheism) are indubitably true and that others (e.g. polytheism) are indubitably false.

However, our right course and duty is, then—I am convinced—to work *within*, but to strive constantly to enlarge, the circle of our own religion. To cling steadfastly to our own fundamentals; to regard them, with passionate conviction, as the nearest we can get to truth; but—most emphatically—not to resist, rather to be eager to promote the enlargement of the circles; to rejoice when they overlap and not even arrogantly to shut out the possibility of some reconciliation (now having all the appearance of impossibility) through the revolutionary effects of new religious knowledge and increased religious experience. On these lines, and on these lines only, can the ‘dialogue’ between world-religions, full co-operation between them, productively and soundly proceed. But immensely productive and creative, I am indeed convinced, such an increasing ‘dialogue’ and increasing ‘co-operation’ would certainly be.

There is nothing in this process of co-operation which, as far as I can see, weakens—still less, excludes—a sense of duty to proclaim vigorously and to witness passionately to one’s own religious convictions. I hold that there is no inconsistency in believing that one’s own convictions are true and that—in totality—they contain most of the truth; and to hold this passionately and to want to convince others of their truth and yet, at the same time, to believe that others see—not only some part of truth—but often some part which one has not seen oneself and from which one’s religion can be enriched. This sense of duty to proclaim and to witness—without any desire forcibly to convert—there

must always be in a 'living' and 'effective' faith. It cannot, of course, be the same as the missionary fervour of those who, convinced of the wholly transcendental character of their religion, believe themselves to be possessed of the sole means of human salvation. But it would be comparable to the missionary element in the sense that—rooted in a conviction that our religion is, generally speaking, nearer to the totality of truth, and, most certainly, nearer to some aspects of truth, though not to all—our religion has to be vigorously upheld and proclaimed.

Contrary to the conviction of many, I do not myself believe that the process of co-operation between world-religions will be accelerated—I believe, on the contrary, that it will be retarded—by embarking, at the outset, on a 'dialogue' covering *all* the great religions of the world. This is only possible, without danger to religious conviction, in the highest circles of religious leadership where there is both great knowledge and eminently clear discernment. *There*, indeed, a dialogue of the widest range can not only be engaged in but would have immeasurable value in bridging the unhappy and perilous gap between the Eastern and Western world. But such a dialogue is not for the *generality* of men. The Far Eastern religions and the Western religions are fundamentally too diverse for such an extensive dialogue to be creative among the generality of men—at least, until a much later stage. The results have to be mediated, to us ordinary men and women, from the highest levels. It is, to me, almost inconceivable that such an extensive dialogue can be conducted—except by the most eminent few—without inconsistency of belief creeping in somewhere, or the organic unity of the various religions being weakened, if not indeed destroyed, and an 'eviscerated', 'highest-common-factor' religion emerging, however contrary to all intention. In my experience, such an extensive dialogue, beyond most men's present power, leads almost invariably to confusion, uncertainty and contradiction, and the introduction—by the 'back-door',

as it were—of an 'invertebrate' religious outlook and a somewhat 'laissez-faire' or 'fainéant' attitude toward truth.

Therefore, I would urge that co-operation would be far sounder and, ultimately, far more productive, if—in the initial stages—the range were considerably more limited. Adherents of the Far Eastern religions should conduct *their* dialogue. Adherents of the great Monotheisms of the West should conduct *theirs*. But, except at the highest level, the dialogue between Asian and Western religions must wait, if very real dangers to religious effectiveness are to be avoided, until restricted dialogues between each set of fundamentally similar religions have been further advanced and much greater clarity, within a limited range, has been achieved. It is, to my mind, a case of "less haste, more speed".

Because I hold this view of the advisability of limiting, for the present, the range of the 'dialogue' or 'co-operation', the final question which I shall attempt to answer will not be what we expect, or hope for, from co-operation between all world-religions, but from co-operation (and may it be whole-hearted, courageous and adventurous) between the great Monotheistic faiths of the West: Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

Two immediate consequences there would be, the importance and beneficence of which are beyond all exaggeration. Three great world-religions would appear before mankind (and ultimately all world-religions would appear before mankind) as engaged in a co-operative effort directed toward harmony and truth. There would be an immediate, and an immense, heightening of the prestige and influence of religion. For I am convinced that few things are so disturbing to men or so detract from their estimate of religion, as the record of world-religions in having inculcated at least as much (and possibly even more) discord than harmony among mankind. It has been, and still is, a most serious barrier to religious influence, and, more especially, at the present time, when so many are

striving to promote harmony, when some factors (at any rate) in human affairs are tending toward integration, and when thoughtful men—very understandably and rightly—resist whatever does not help, but rather hinders, this movement toward the integration of humanity. In a world where a paramount necessity is unity among mankind, religious communities do not impress men as influences making for unity. Majestic would be the effect of a clear and impressive demonstration to the world that great world-religions were moving, strongly and effectively, toward co-operation and the promotion of unity, without being led astray down the mistaken path of uniformity. It would be seen clearly that no longer did world-religions regard themselves as antagonists, virtually perpetual enemies. They would take on, more and more, the character of allies in the striving for truth and righteousness and the knowledge of God. Even though, in some sense, they had to remain rivals, it would be a rivalry to get nearest to truth and would have in it no element of antagonism or hostility. There would be a great growth of intangible fellowship and 'sense of relationship' which understanding and co-operation would, without any obscuring of the deep differences between religions, be bound to produce and which would displace hostility. The change from discord to co-operation among world-religions would have an influence on the 'standing', prestige and impact of religion such as it is difficult to over-estimate. Indeed, even the present most modest beginnings of co-operation have, I am convinced, already had an inestimably beneficial effect on many men's estimate of religion. An extension of co-operation would have effects which might well be dramatic in their excellence.

The second immediate effect—certainly not less important or beneficent—would be an immeasurably more effective assertion of the common message of Ethical Monotheism shared by the three great Western Faiths. The gravest danger to our civilisation is not, I believe, the threat from without, grave though that danger

may be. The gravest danger is degeneration from within—the complete secularisation and dehumanising of our society—from the loss of a spiritual outlook and an effective religious philosophy. Co-operation among the monotheistic faiths, with the inevitable enhancement of the proclamation of our common message, and—let me repeat—without any obscuring of the deep divergencies between the religions, would be an immense step toward the re-inspiring of our civilisation with a religious outlook. On that achievement, the whole future of our civilisation depends. And such a combined proclamation would, while eschewing uniformity, be at least one step forward toward a *basically unifying* philosophy among men which is the indispensable foundation for all movement toward world-order.

Nor do I think that these two majestic virtual-certainties exhaust the possibilities. The 'dialogue', the 'co-operation', would almost certainly, I think, lead to some *increase* in the areas of agreement between these three world-faiths and, coincidentally, some development in religious understanding among them. It would require a further lecture to examine, in detail, in which areas we could most likely expect this increase of agreement. I will only briefly indicate my own conviction in relation to Judaism and Christianity, omitting Islam of which my knowledge is far too superficial.

It would seem to me that, with regard to Judaism and Christianity, we might well hope that—as a result of a serious dialogue based upon the possibility of mutual enrichment—the following 'conflicts of conviction' (or, perhaps, it would be more accurate to say 'diversities of emphasis') might come nearer to being resolved. And let us notice that it is just in these very 'areas' of religious thought that development is essential if there is to be restored, to religion, the power to 'alter the world'. They are the critical philosophic questions of our time; the ones to which men most urgently need answers; and, indeed, ones to which clearer and more complete answers are

essential if mankind is to receive effective religious guidance.

First, there is the difference of conviction or emphasis between Judaism and Christianity concerning faith in man and in human history. Judaism has—in the most remarkable way, considering the Jews' experience of suffering and catastrophe—retained an almost unlimited faith in man and in the human future. Christianity has, sometimes at least, tended to become wholly sceptical about the possibility of human progress and the future of mankind on this earth. But it is not really scepticism or despair about the human future which is characteristic of Christianity. It is rather, I think, a much deeper perception of, and study of, the tragic element in human existence and in human history. That 'tragic element' is a reality; as 'confidence in man and history' is a necessity. Somehow between these two extremes or 'over-emphases', the truth must lie. And a dialogue between Judaism and Christianity concerning these two valid and vital conceptions might well bring forth a reconciling conception which would be of inestimable importance as a convincing and guiding conception for the human future.

The second critical question of our time, closely related to the first, concerns the nature of man himself. Judaism, while deeply conscious of the reality of sin in man, has always emphasised the essential goodness and greatness inherent in the human spirit; and has also been free from all despising of the physical and material aspects of human life. Christianity—while, of course, by no means unconscious of the potential goodness and greatness in man—has, I think it will be agreed, tended rather to emphasise (or to be more deeply concerned with) the profundity of sinfulness and the depth of frustration in human nature. Christianity has also—more than Judaism—been conscious of the corrupting influences in the physical and material aspects of human existence. Here again, there is undoubtedly truth and reality in both religious tra-

ditions and teaching. Somewhere, I feel, between the two extremes or 'over-emphases' lies a fuller truth which a dialogue based on such long and profound religious experience, on both sides, might well bring forth.

Finally, to give but one further instance which seems to me to be of paramount importance (though, unquestionably, further instances could be found), there is a salient difference in emphasis—partly due to historic causes but equally to differences in religious conceptions—between the Jewish and Christian assessment of, and interpretation of, the personal and social expression of religion. Each religion, of course, stresses both the personal and social elements in the religious life and both have deeply studied their relationship. Yet it is undoubtedly true that Judaism—with its traditional emphasis on the life here on earth even more than on the life hereafter; and on social relationships and the social unit even more than on the personal and individual expression of religion—has a greater body of teaching concerning social questions, and the general social implications of religion, than has Christianity. On the other hand, Christianity—always particularly concerned with personal salvation and with this life as a preparation for the life everlasting—has, I think it is true to say, a profounder knowledge and experience of man's innermost and most intimate struggle and the life of prayer and devotion. Here again, there is surely much that each tradition can contribute to the other and the possibility of a most important advance in religious thought and guidance.

When we contemplate the extraordinary advances due to science in the past 300 or so years and its profound influence on almost every aspect of human life—advance and influence incomparably greater than anything in the religious sphere in modern times—we ought to ask ourselves to what have these remarkable achievements of science been due.¹ I would suggest

¹ It should not be forgotten that science itself is a kind of 'world-religion' in a limited sense. Though, as far as we can

that there are three major causes. First, a most fortunate succession of men of genius in the scientific field. From Newton onward, the list is majestic. This, the major factor in all advance and achievement, is completely out of human hands. There is, second, the essentially 'forward-looking' attitude of scientists. They have an attitude of confidence in man's power to go onward to the discovery of new truth. They rejoice in new discoveries and are ready to revise their conceptions in the light of such discoveries. They value highly the achievements of the past but are never content solely to look back to them. Religious men and women have, in my conviction, to capture something of this forward-looking, confident and yet in no wise arrogant spirit. While reverently evaluating the past, they must look beyond it into the future. The liberal-minded, among the various religious traditions, are, at least, endeavouring to fulfil this condition.

But there has been another, and hardly less important, reason for scientific advance and achievement. It is the very high and impressive degree of co-operation achieved among scientists in their search for truth and in its application to life. Co-operation between innumerable scientists the world over, men of every 'school of thought' and race and nationality, has been—can it be questioned?—a potent source of scientific achievement and advance. When has there been a comparable co-operation and inter-communication in the religious field? Have we not here one explanation why religion has been—so dangerously and so disastrously—outstripped?

If, in the religious field, we adopt a 'forward-looking' attitude, and if, in addition, we have the courage to initiate a process of co-operation among world-religions, on a level profounder even than that of mutual respect

now see, it does not touch the deepest realities of existence—the spiritual realities—it is nonetheless a kind of 'world-religion' with which other world-religions must be in constant intercommunication.

and mutual understanding, we may, indeed, well hope for great developments. If we do not desist from this part of our duty and our task, we may be deemed worthy of the granting of the men of inspiration upon whom, in the last resort, the uttermost depends. The attempt at co-operation among world-religions is, I am firmly convinced, a duty required of us by God, demanded by the universality of his Fatherhood. And no less as it demanded of us by the impelling circumstances of to-day and the deep gravity and profundity of the human need.

LIST OF ESSEX HALL LECTURES

1893. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY AS ILLUSTRATED IN ENGLISH POETRY, by Stopford A. Brooke, M.A., LL.D. (Out of print.)
1894. UNITARIANS AND THE FUTURE, by Mrs. Humphry Ward. (Out of print.)
1895. THE RELATION OF JESUS TO HIS AGE AND OUR OWN, by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A., D.D., D.Litt. (Out of print.)
1897. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE TEACHING OF JESUS, by R. A. Armstrong, B.A. (Out of print.)
1899. THE RELIGION OF TIME AND THE RELIGION OF ETERNITY, by Philip H. Wicksteed, M.A., Litt.D. (Reprinted.)
1902. SOME THOUGHTS ON CHRISTOLOGY, by James Drummond, M.A., LL.D., D.Litt. (Out of print.)
1903. EMERSON, by Augustine Birrell, K.C. (Out of print.)
1904. THE IDEA AND REALITY OF REVELATION, by H. H. Wendt, Ph.D., D.D. (Out of print.)
1905. THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL IN THE POEMS OF TENNYSON AND BROWNING, by Prof. Henry Jones, LL.D. (Out of print.)
1906. THE MAKING OF RELIGION, by Samuel M. Crothers, D.D. (Out of print.)
1908. DOGMA AND HISTORY, by Prof. Dr. Gustav Kruger. (Out of print.)
1909. EVOLUTION AND RELIGIOUS PROGRESS, by Prof. F. E. Weiss, D.Sc. (Out of print.)
1910. THE STORY AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNITARIAN MOVEMENT, by W. G. Tarrant, B.A. (Reprinted.)
1911. RELIGION AND LIFE, by Rudolf Eucken. (Out of print.)
1913. HERESY : ITS ANCIENT WRONGS AND MODERN RIGHTS IN THESE KINGDOMS, by Alexander Gordon, M.A. (Out of print.)

1914. THE RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY OF PLOTINUS AND MODERN PHILOSOPHERS OF RELIGION, by W. R. Inge, D.D. (Out of print.)
1918. THE PLACE OF JUDAISM AMONG THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD, by Claude G. Montefiore, M.A. (Out of print.)
1920. CHRISTIANITY APPLIED TO THE LIFE OF MEN AND OF NATIONS, by Charles Gore, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (Out of print.)
1921. THE LOST RADIANCE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, by L. P. Jacks, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (Out of print.)
1922. ORTHODOXY, by the Rt. Hon. H. A. Fisher. (Out of print.)
1923. THE MORAL BASIS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, by Viscount Cecil, K.C. (Out of print.)
1924. THE CHRISTIAN WAY OF LIFE AS ILLUSTRATED IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION IN NEW ENGLAND, by W. W. Fenn, D.D. (Out of print.)
1925. SOME PHASES OF FREE THOUGHT IN ENGLAND IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, by the Earl of Oxford and Asquith, K.C. (Out of print.)
1926. MAN IN THE LIGHT OF EVOLUTION, by Arthur Thomson, M.A., LL.D. (Out of print.)
1927. THE DIVINE RETICENCE, by Willard L. Sperry, M.A., D.D. (Out of print.)
1928. CHRISTIANITY AND THE RELIGIOUS DRAMA, by R. H. U. Bloor, B.A.
1929. THE MESSAGE OF THE MIDDLE AGES TO THE MODERN WORLD, by S. H. Mellone, M.A., D.Sc.
1930. THE IDEA OF GOD, by the Rt. Rev. A. A. David, D.D.
1931. MAN AND THE MACHINE, by Sir E. John Russell. (Out of print.)
1932. LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR EVERYBODY, by Sir Michael Sadler.
1933. SOME ANCIENT SAFEGUARDS OF CIVILISATION, by R. Travers Herford, B.A., D.D.
1934. HUMAN PERSONALITY AND THE FUTURE LIFE, by G. Dawes Hicks, M.A., Ph.D., Litt.D.

1935. CHRISTIANITY AS A NEW RELIGION, by Canon Percy Dearmer, M.A., D.D. (Out of print.)
1936. LIBERAL CHRISTIANITY AND MODERN CRITICISM, by Herbert McLachlan, M.A., D.D., F.R.Hist.S.
1937. VERACITY, by Sir Richard Livingstone, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D.
1938. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE UNITARIANS, by J. H. Weatherall, M.A.
1939. THE STATE AND THE SOUL, by St. John Ervine, LL.D.
1941. THE IMMORTAL SOUL IN DANGER, by Jan Masaryk, C.B.E., LL.D.
1943. RELIGION AND HISTORY, by Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt.
1944. IDEALISM AGAINST RELIGION, by John Macmurray, M.A.
1945. IDEALISM AND REALISM, by R. Nicol Cross, M.A.
1946. FOREIGN OCCUPATION AS AN ETHICAL PROBLEM, by L. J. van Holk, D.D.
1947. AN APPROACH TO TRUTH, by F. J. M. Stratton, M.A., LL.D., D.Phil., F.R.S.
1948. HUMAN FORGIVENESS: ITS IMPLICATIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, by Alfred Hall, M.A., D.D.
1949. THE CONTRIBUTION OF PLATO TO FREE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT, by Dorothy Tarrant, M.A., Ph.D.
1950. REASON IN RELIGION, by W. R. Matthews, K.C.V.O., D.D., D.Lit.
1951. SCIENCE AND THE QUEST FOR GOD, by Alister C. Hardy, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.