CHARLES FREDERICK D'ARCY

1859–1938

CHARLES FREDERICK D'ARCY was born in Dublin on the 2nd of January 1859. His father, John Charles D'Arcy, was assistant cashier in the Great Southern and Western Railway. His mother was the eldest daughter of Thomas Brierly, of Rehoboth House, Dublin. The home life was quiet, cultured, and marked by sincere religion. The strong evangelical piety of the mother was the dominant religious influence; but the Tractarian school was not unrepresented there. One of his father's brothers, a frequent visitor at the house, was a High Churchman, who had such an objection to the revised Irish prayer book that he left instructions in his will against the use of it at his funeral. The disestablishment of the Church of Ireland which took effect in 1871 inflamed the religious situation. Young D'Arcy at an impressionable age became familiar with the controversy; he heard the arguments of both sides, and learned to appreciate the merits of both parties. No doubt he owed his liberal outlook and his deep interest in religion in large measure to these stirring events of his boyhood.

From 1870 he attended the High School, Dublin. He was known there as a quiet, determined boy who never wasted time, who dabbled in science in his spare hours, and possessed an electrical machine of his own invention. In 1877 he entered Trinity College, which for seven years was his intellectual home. His course was distinguished, but not brilliant. His classical attainments were those of the passman. A schoolmaster had killed his budding taste for classical learning by damning as a mortal sin the use of a key. He made his mark in mathematics and philosophy, winning Foundation scholarship in Science (mathematics) in 1882, and graduating B.A. in Logics and Ethics with a

Senior Moderatorship in the same year. There was a three years' course of lectures then in philosophy, covering in metaphysics Locke, Kant, Hamilton, Mansel, and Mill, and in ethics Aristotle, Butler, Kant, Mackintosh, and Mill. D'Arcy found the course uninspiring; it was Mill for logics, Mill for metaphysics, and Mill for ethics, but no Plato, no Descartes, no Leibniz, no Berkeley.

Perhaps he missed the Berkeley without knowing it; for that *genius loci* was at work in his subconscious mind. He tells us that a learned uncle had expounded to him in his school-days the principles of Berkeley's system, and, to quote his own words, 'The extraordinary thing is, that I followed these arguments with a perfectly clear apprehension of their force, and, quite unaware of what had happened, I became a convinced Berkeleian at about the age of twelve years.' In spite of the defects in the prescribed course, his university at any rate gave him his mental equipment, formed his love of truth and free inquiry, trained him in logics, ethics, and metaphysics, taught him the argument of Kant, and laid the foundation of his reasoned idealism. What was missing his own reading would supply; the superstructure his later experience would build.

The unusual length of time that he spent in college had one great advantage; it enabled him to take his two years' course in divinity (1882–4) in complete detachment from his arts course. Most divinity students take the two courses concurrently in part, to the detriment perhaps of both; but D'Arcy was now able to give his undivided attention to theology. The Divinity School was completely devoid of the narrow life and stifling atmosphere of a theological college; theology was taught as the great thing, but not the only thing; it was taught on a philosophical, not authoritarian, basis, and it made a profound impression on the young philosopher. Gwynn's genius for friendship won his heart; the lectures of Salmon and Lee won his mind. D'Arcy's reason was convinced; he was intellectually convinced of the truth of Christian theism. Trinitarianism

took rank with him as the highest response man's mind could make to the truth of things. From that point he never looked back; that creed he never doubted. Neither philosophy nor science nor the cares of life nor the Great War could shake him. Faith must be reconcilable with true philosophy; faith must be reconcilable with true science; those two convictions dominated his mind. He strove to express and justify them both, the former in his pre-war writings, the latter in his post-war writings.

Could any one have discerned in this modest young student, now leaving college, the seeds of his future greatness? Not first in his year even in philosophy, not exceptionally promising even in divinity, no athlete, not prominent in the college societies, he had given little or no indication of the resources of his spirit. He was destined to occupy five episcopal sees, and to be the ruler of his church, responsible for her affairs in a dark and dangerous period. He was to be a leader of men and a man of action; yet he had given no proof of possessing leadership. He was not even an official of the College Theological Society. He was to be a leader of thought, a writer of books, eminent in the learned world; yet from his academic record most tutors would have predicted that his first curacy would terminate his reading and his intellectual ambitions. Perhaps his college had no chance to do her perfect work in his case; living in Dublin, no doubt he was much at home. Perhaps it was just a case of late development. Travel did much to make amends, and the first curacy, as we shall see, was a stimulus and not a sedative. But external influences in his case were only influences. The true cause of his success in life was latent in the man's own spirit, touched by religion for the highest. His eye was single; his powers were consecrated. They said of him in his family that he never saw a mountain, but he wanted to climb it; the saying was true literally and metaphorically; he climbed the Dublin mountains and the cliffs of Antrim and the Alps; he climbed the heights of philosophical speculation, and he

climbed the mount of spiritual transfiguration. From the hills his help came; his vigour remained; his eye never grew dim; his mind kept its freshness, and his will its strength. Age never withered his sense of the wonder of life, his sense of the grace of knowledge, of the glory of wisdom.

In 1884 began his long ministry of fifty-four years; sixteen years were spent as curate and rector, three years as dean, and thirty-five years as bishop and archbishop. He was ordained deacon, and in due course priest, for St. Thomas's, Belfast. There he remained for six years, and there he met the lady who became his wife, Harriet Lewis. In 1889 they were married; it was an ideal union of heart and temperament. They had four children—one son and three daughters. Belfast was rich in intellectual life and learning; a spirit of free inquiry was abroad there. D'Arcy soon attracted a circle of cultured friends, some of them agnostics; for Herbert Spencer was then in vogue. Discussion stimulated study. He began to read Hegel and Lotze and T. H. Green. Green was the most congenial to him; for if ever there was a man who understood self-realization, who traded his talents and became what he had it in him to become, that man was D'Arcy. In 1890 he became rector of the charming village of Billy, near the Giants' Causeway. Here his college tutor, Anthony Traill, afterwards Provost, was his squire. The Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Gwynn, warned him that Traill 'would sit under him on Sunday, and on him all the rest of the week'. Only the former half of the prediction came true. While at Billy he perfected his theological attainments, completing the long and laborious course for the B.D., and taking out the degree in 1892. He was now marked out for ecclesiastical preferment, which came his way with monotonous regularity every four or five years. In 1893 he was moved to the busy industrial town of Ballymena. By using the early morning hours, he was able to make time for philosophical study without neglecting his ministerial duties;

and in 1895 he published his first book, *A Short Study of Ethics*. This work laid the foundation of his reputation as a thinker. His university was quick to recognize its merits and the author was appointed Donnellan Lecturer in 1897. He was to hold this appointment a second time, in 1913, a rare honour. His first series of lectures issued in his *Idealism and Theology*, published in 1899. His reputation as a public man and a leader of thought was now firmly established in his own country. He returned to Belfast in 1900 as vicar of the city and dean of the newly founded cathedral. In the same year he received the degree of D.D. for his recent book. He threw himself into the practical task of cathedral-building, but his career as a dean was cut short by his elevation to the Bench in 1903 as Bishop of Clogher, and the first of his twelve enthronements took place.[1]

He was translated in 1907 to the more important see of Ossory, and the ancient fortress-palace of Kilkenny was his home for four years. Here he gained an insight into the ways of a southern diocese, and learned to understand the problems and needs of the gallant little communities of southern Protestants. His short experience at Ossory was invaluable to him when later on he was called to supervise the affairs of North and South alike. At this time he began to be known beyond the shores of Ireland. He attended and addressed church congresses in England. In 1907 he preached in Westminster Abbey for the first time; in the same year he was Select Preacher at both Oxford and Cambridge, and he delivered a course of lectures at Cambridge on the problem of suffering. He attended in 1908 the Pan-Anglican and Lambeth conferences. In 1911 he was again translated, this time to the great and populous northern see of Down and Connor and Dromore. In the same year he was a representative of the Irish Bench at the Coronation of His Majesty King George V. Then came an anxious time for Ulster and all Ireland. The agitation

[1] Most of the Irish dioceses are unions of the ancient dioceses. Hence the large number of enthronements.

for and against Home Rule reached its peak. Civil war loomed on the horizon. The solemn Covenant was drawn up by Sir Edward Carson and the Ulster Unionist Council; after some searchings of heart Bishop D'Arcy signed it, fourth on the list. The Ulster Volunteer Force was formed and drilled, and, after the Larne gun-running on the 24th of April 1914, was armed. Then came the outbreak of the World War, and civil war was averted. Personal anxiety was mingled with his care for the churches and with his anxiety for the Empire. His son was at the front, and was twice severely wounded in the Great War, and a third time in the Indian frontier fighting. The Bishop lifts a corner of the veil and shows something of his feelings at that time in the Preface of his book, *God and Freedom in Human Experience*, published in 1915. He writes of the consolations of philosophy almost as if they were a luxury forbidden in those days of universal privation.

The post-war period of his life now comes under review. He was in his sixtieth year at the Armistice; but he was as vigorous as ever, and as active as a young man. He was an outstanding figure in Ireland; he had held three sees with distinction and to the satisfaction of the dioceses. Further preferment was inevitable. In 1919 Dr. Bernard resigned the archbishopric of Dublin to become provost of Trinity College, and Dr. D'Arcy was elected to the vacant throne. Thus he returned to his native city as archbishop; but only for ten months was he to rule there; for in 1920 he reached the highest office in the Church, becoming archbishop of Armagh, Primate of all Ireland, Coarb and successor of St. Patrick. They were troubled days in Dublin, and the translation to the comparative quiet of Armagh must have been welcome. The removal thither was not accomplished without incident; for a van containing the more valuable part of the furniture was held up *en route* by the battle of Balbriggan, and was only saved by the driver's presence of mind.

D'Arcy's eighteen years' tenure of the Primacy was un-

eventful, in the sense that it was not marked by any positive action on his part of a public and memorable nature; and on that very account it was a great pastorate by a great and wise pastor. Self-effacement and abstention from prominent public action were required by the public situation. Politically those were anxious times; the problem confronting the Primate was how to keep an undivided church in a partitioned land. An injudicious policy, indeed a single unwise action, might have done irremediable harm. Precedent was no guide; there were two young parliaments in the land, a border, two civil jurisdictions, two political sentiments becoming rapidly more and more estranged and antagonistic. Habitual differences of religious opinion were accentuated and complicated. Partition in the reformed church of St. Patrick used to be prophesied, and was to be feared; but that danger has now passed. There is one prayer book, revised, and containing state prayers suitable for use both in North and South. The General Synod meets annually in Dublin, and knows no border; matters affecting the religious welfare of north, south, east, and west are amicably discussed. Church sentiment is recognized as a uniting force amidst a host of separatist tendencies. Much credit for averting the disruption and animosity that might have been, and for fostering the amity and unity that are, must be given to D'Arcy's unobtrusive statecraft. In the 'troubles' of seventeenth-century Ireland men spoke of the 'judgement of Usher' as they spoke of the judgement of Solomon; he was *the* Ardmachanus, the scholar-Primate; and for his able presidency during the 'troubles' of the twentieth century the Church of Ireland has reason to be grateful to another wise Ardmachanus, her late philosopher-Primate.

The chief biographical interest of D'Arcy's tenure of the Primacy lies in the growth of his cross-channel relationships and interests; a new period of authorship ensued, a new theme mastered his mind. As head of the Church of Ireland he was drawn more and more into the ecclesiastical life of

England. Contacts with English theologians, philosophers, and scientists were made. He became known in the learned societies. His thought was stimulated afresh; a second harvest of the mind was reaped. In his earlier period of authorship he sought the reunion of religion and philosophy; in his later period he sought the reunion of religion and science. 'He that would make a real progress in knowledge must dedicate his age as well as youth, the later growth as well as first-fruits, at the altar of truth.'[1] D'Arcy dedicated age as well as youth, and his 'later growth' was no mean offering at the altar of truth.

He may be seen as he was at a joint meeting of the Aristotelian, Psychological, and Mind Associations at Bedford College in July 1919. There he was protagonist in a battle of words that has found its way into literature. Dr. Rashdall was his friend, the enemy. The two divines had already crossed swords; for in his *God and Freedom in Human Experience*, D'Arcy, while paying a high tribute to Rashdall's *Personal Idealism*, criticized the work on the grounds that it virtually denied personality to deity, and excluded finite spirits from the orbit of God's knowledge and providence. On this occasion the issue was similar; the question for debate was set forth in the terms, Can Individual Minds be included in the Mind of God? D'Arcy said, Yes; Rashdall said, No. Sir Francis Younghusband[2] gives a spirited account of the discussion in considerable detail. The following extract may be quoted:

> Canon Rashdall was of the more massive type, powerful in argument and of great sincerity. Bishop D'Arcy was more of the rapier type, who might penetrate deeper. In neither was there any heat of animosity. They both recognized that they were in the presence of a problem which has engaged men's attention for thousands and thousands of years, and which would engage it for millions of years yet, and never meet with final solution, for the simple fact that God is infinite. So with all their greatness of intellect each was humble enough to recognize that he himself could not be absolutely right and his opponent absolutely wrong, but that by frankly

[1] Berkeley, *Siris*, sec. 368.

[2] *The Light of Experience*, pp. 234–7.

discussing, each might help the other to a little fuller understanding of the great mystery of God.

The Primate attended his second Lambeth conference in 1920, and his third in 1930; at both he was a notable figure, and at the latter he was chairman of the committee which produced the report on the Christian Doctrine of God. In 1920 Oxford University conferred on him the degree of D.D. *honoris causa*. Further recognition of his learning came to him in 1927, when he was elected a Fellow of the British Academy. He was particularly proud of this distinction. His own university once again recognized his attainments by conferring on him, in 1934, the honorary degree of Litt.D. He was also an honorary D.D. of Belfast and Glasgow universities, and a member of the Royal Irish Academy. He assisted in the foundation of the Dublin University Metaphysical Society, and he took the chair at the opening meeting of the session of 1930. In 1932 he took part in the celebration of the fifteenth centenary of the coming of Patrick. In the summer holiday cruise that followed, the blow fell that shadowed the closing years of his life; his wife died suddenly on their outward voyage. The Epilogue of his autobiography is a rare tribute to her memory. In the autumn of 1934 he attended a celebration dear to his heart, the bicentenary of the opening of Berkeley's episcopate. In the ancient cathedral of St. Colman's, Cloyne, he preached an eloquent sermon, tracing with evident pride and pleasure the growing influence of Berkeley's philosophy upon modern thought.

His last extended journey was a fitting conclusion to his public career. On the invitation of the Archbishop of Sydney he attended in 1936 the Bishop Broughton centenary of the Australian Church, as representative of the Church of Ireland and the Anglican communion. During a stay of some five or six weeks he visited most of the big cities of Australia and New Zealand; incidentally he took an aeroplane flight of 1,000 miles—the first of his life, in his seventy-eighth year—and he wrote enthusiastically of

the experience. He addressed the centenary Congress, preached sermons, gave many addresses, assisted in an episcopal consecration, and lectured on 'The Philosophy of Bishop Berkeley in Relation to Modern Criticism', before the university of Sydney. His interesting record of this trip was published serially in the *Church of Ireland Gazette*.[1] In the summer of 1937 his health began to fail, though his faculties were unimpaired. He had thoughts of resignation; but he rallied his forces; health in a measure returned, and he presided with his accustomed dignity at the diocesan synod, and he remained primate to the day of his death, which occurred at Armagh on the 1st of February 1938.

His writings must be considered at some length. They possess, and will continue to possess, considerable historical interest. He was a representative public figure in touch with contemporary movements, who wrote fairly continuously for the best part of half a century. His books reflect the thought of his times. Accordingly a complete list of his writings will be placed on record here, with brief comments on those of subsidiary importance, and a somewhat fuller appraisement of his three major works.[2]

It is the content of his books and not their form that matters. D'Arcy was not a leisured writer, like a college don; he had not time to be a littérateur. All his writings were, in a sense, *parerga*; several of them were done in the early hours of the morning, in time snatched from sleep and from the claims of a crowded life. He wrote easily, too easily perhaps; his first two books are in the academic manner; the remainder have the freshness and vigour of extempore speech, but for the most part they want the file, the pruning knife, and the *summa manus*. His style has the clearness and precision of the mathematician, but lacks the finish that

[1] 14, 21, 28 August, 4 September 1936, and 20 August and 3 September 1937.

[2] His *God and Freedom in Human Experience* is a large book, but it adds little to the argument of the previous works, and it is not discussed at length here.

classical scholarship can confer. He sometimes rises to eloquence; but generally he is content to convey his meaning, without aiming at literary effect. His illustrations abound; they are always apt, and often happy, and they are culled from a wide field, from art, nature, history, and literature.

A preliminary word must be said about his philosophy, apart from which the clue to his main literary labours would be lost. D'Arcy's distinctive philosophy found expression in his first two books, which were both published within the last *quinquennium* of the century. Fortunate in most things else, he was not fortunate in the *time* of their appearing. He had a message to deliver which is not tied to any one school of thought; but he chose idealism as the vehicle of his message, and he published it just as the sun of idealism was setting. His idealism was conceived, expressed, and applied to ethics and theology just before the tide of philosophical thought began to turn against idealism and in favour of realism. How far D'Arcy regretted the coming of realism would be hard to say. He began to write as an idealist, and nominally he always remained an idealist; the nerve of the argument of his early books is specifically idealist, and does not sound convincing to-day. Yet he wrote those very books just because he was not satisfied with the idealism he found current. He wrote and argued as a reformer of idealism. No doubt the reformation when it came went far beyond his wishes; but there are several indications that he too felt the turn of the tide, and that as time went on he swung a considerable distance from his early moorings. Philosophical technique was not his *métier*. Like Berkeley, he despised 'that dry, formal, pedantic, stiff, and clumsy style, which smells of the lamp and the college'.[1] In his young days it was Hobson's choice; a theist had to be an idealist then; the only alternative philosophy was materialism. But when later on realism made good, D'Arcy was prepared to go a long way with it. In the finale of his paper read before the Aristotelian Society in 1919 he

[1] Berkeley, *Alciphron*, dial. v, sec. 20.

would steal part of the thunder of realism, when he writes, 'The knower is everywhere in direct relation with his object. This seems to me the very essence of all true idealism.' Whether idealism of that type is on all fours with the idealism of, say, Kant or Bradley may be doubted. Probably he moved even farther from his original moorings later in life. For instance in 1932 he wrote,[1] 'A generation ago, philosophers of the idealist persuasion assumed, perhaps too readily, the fundamental unity of the self.' That statement does not match well with his earlier thesis. In his first book the assertion of the self is the heart of his argument against materialism; and the self asserts itself as a unity, as a focus and centre of experience against the meaningless multiplicity of material things.

No doubt D'Arcy's central message could be expressed with equal force in terms of realism to-day; but that fact does not detract from the courage and the performance of his early books. Idealism in the last decade of the nineteenth century was not so much a theory of knowledge and existence, as the defender, almost the sole defender, of the values of life; idealism was the sole available weapon against triumphant mechanism. That was the heyday of the closed Newtonian system; the conservation of force or energy or matter was taken as axiomatic. Laplace's calculator, iron necessity, the death of freedom and of hope seemed irresistible corollaries, *unless idealism was right*. Of course young D'Arcy had to be an idealist. But what was the general tendency of the idealism in vogue? On the whole it was anti-religious. Idealism stood for the values, and for uplift and culture and art; but it opposed the claims of institutional religion, or at best tolerated them. Two years before D'Arcy published his first book, the recognized exponent of idealism in England wrote a terrible word about our orthodox theology; he called it 'the mutilation of our nature'.[2] The young rector of Ballymena had the

[1] *Providence and the World Order*, p. 131.

[2] Bradley, *Appearance and Reality*, Introduction.

courage of a great conviction when he took up the idealist position and tried to show that it is seriously deficient, that it needs our orthodox theology to crown its speculations and to complete, restore, and satisfy our nature.

LIST OF ARCHBISHOP D'ARCY'S PUBLICATIONS

with comments

A Short Study of Ethics, 1895, 2nd edition, 1901, repr. 1912. As a treatise on ethics the book was useful in its day; it is an ethic along the lines of T. H. Green's *Prolegomena*, containing little that is distinctive. It rejects intuitionism, evolutionary criteria, hedonism, and utilitarianism, and accepts desire as the man's determination of his own possibilities, making self-realization as a member of a community the ultimate criterion and goal. The point of interest in the book to present-day readers lies in Part I, which gives the metaphysical basis of his ethics. He takes Green's starting-point, but goes far beyond Green's conclusion. Adopting the favourite argument of his day that everything is relations, and that relations exist only for the mind, he infers that 'the world is dependent for its very existence upon the thinking subject'. But if the argument stop there, we are left in solipsism; and that way madness lies. No sane man can hold that each mind makes its own private world. Therefore the idealist argument must be supplemented by the belief that there is a common world with a spiritual substance; there is therefore a Supreme Spirit, a God who is at least personal, able to sustain the world and to unite into a spiritual community the finite spirits which have access to our common world.

Idealism and Theology, 1899. This was his best book and was regarded as such by himself. He takes up the metaphysical theme of the earlier work and pursues it into the realm of theology in a very striking way. More explicitly than before he contends that the qualities of sensible things, both primary and secondary, are the work of the mind, and that therefore the old dualism of mind and matter cannot stand; but if we stop here a new dualism arises to take the place of the old; instead of the dualism of mind and matter we have the dualism of self and society. Idealism alone cannot bridge that gulf. Even theism cannot bridge it satisfactorily. Only Trinitarianism can do so. God must be personal; for his relation to the common world must be analogous to a human person's relation to the private

world of his experience; but the divine substance must be supra-personal; for personality as men understand the term could not bind finite spirits into a society. Idealism thus points to a God who is both personal and supra-personal, that is, to the God in three Persons. Therefore the central conception of Christian theism agrees with the dictates of speculative philosophy. Thought at its height is one with the highest and truest faith.

Ruling Ideas of our Lord, 1901, 2nd edition, 1902. A brief and summary sketch of the ethical and religious teaching of Christ.

Christianity and the Supernatural, and 2nd edition, 1909. A compressed but masterly summary of Christian theology. Opposing authoritarian theology and one based on 'texts', he desiderates a rational theology that is not rationalist. He criticizes Moberly on the Atonement and Sanday on Miracles, and defends the historicity of the Incarnation and the reasonableness of Trinitarianism.

Christian Ethics and Modern Thought, 1912. A slight sketch, developing the notion of the Kingdom of God as conformity to law, as the *summum bonum*, and as the kingdom of ends.

What is the Church? (Kikuyu tract), 1914. Against defining the Church in terms of rigid ecclesiastical logic; for 'no human soul that loves Christ can be really outside the Church'.

God and Freedom in Human Experience, 1915. His second series of Donnellan lectures. The book takes a wider field than *Idealism and Theology*, but is not so well constructed, nor so closely reasoned. His professed aim is 'to show that the new investigations due mainly to Bergson supply the means of a further advance along the idealist path'.

Science and Creation, 1925. His first considerable work dealing with the effect of scientific discovery upon the Christian conception of life. Creation is still going on, and creative purpose is discernible in the formation of the physical world, in the evolution of life, and in the emergence of the values.

The Christian Outlook in the Modern World, 1929. A fuller but discursive treatment of the same theme. A plea for a theistic science and a liberal theology.

God in Science, 1931 (Lambeth series). Compresses the argument of the two previous works under the heads, science, art, and religion. Clearly and forcibly written, with a notable sketch of the growth of primitive art.

Providence and the World Order, 1932 (Alexander Robertson lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow). The most systematic of his books on science, and his last speculative work. It is comparable, *longo post intervallo*, to *Siris*, Berkeley's last work. It ranges from the amoeba to the Trinity, as *Siris* ranges from tar-water to the Trinity. Both philosophers attempt to see all created things in God by means of a chain or graded scale of being throughout which the power of the Omnipresent is immediately operative. D'Arcy boldly conceives evolution as 'the splendid epic of creation'. He writes under the influence of Smuts's Holism, only he wants to christen it, as in his early days he had tried to christen idealism. Materialism looks to the part to explain the whole, whereas in truth only the whole, the all, the All in all, can satisfactorily explain the part. Orders of reality have come into existence by means of a systematic series of successive changes. What to God is creation, to man is evolution. Like the seven days of creation, seven orders may be distinguished: the physical, the biological, the psychical, the historical, the moral, the spiritual, the providential. Men of science, especially those who interpret to the public the work of their departments, are extending man's knowledge of the works of God. D'Arcy holds that modern science has put new meaning into the old faith, and he stands out as a defender of the spirit of science. He begs theologians not to treat Darwin as the medieval church treated Galileo. In a retrospect (pp. 34–5) he compares the present situation of theism to that in his youth. What T. H. Green and the Cairds (he might have added Mahaffy, Abbott, and Bernard, of his own university) did to meet the menace of materialism, philosophical theology and idealistic science can still do, and are still doing, to meet the same menace. D'Arcy is not now so ready as he was to take the world into the mind; but he argues that on a comparison between the orders of creation and the processes of the mind, the mind appears as akin to the Power that moves in creation, and his speculations take a distinct turn towards a Christian monadology indebted to Lotze and to his friend Wildon Carr.

The Adventures of a Bishop, 1934. His autobiography, to which this memoir is much indebted. Written in a pleasant and easy style, interweaving *personalia* and matters of public interest. Gives a good picture of Dublin church life in the disestablishment period, also of the Ulster agitation against Home Rule.

His *other publications* include articles in Hastings's *Dictionary of*

Christ and the Gospels, sermons and articles in the *Church of Ireland Gazette*, and a paper on 'Can Individual Minds be included in the Mind of God?' in *Problems of Science and Philosophy*, Aristotelian Society, suppl. vol. ii, 1919, pp. 148 ff. He was part-author of *God and the Struggle for Existence*, 1919, *Anglican Essays* (Christian Liberty), 1923, and *The Atonement in History and in Life*.

D'Arcy's liberal views found expression in the pulpit as well as by the printed page. On the whole he was a good preacher. His sermons for special occasions read well; but he was no orator; he did not sway the hearts of men by the power of emotional eloquence; instead he made a quiet and dignified appeal to mind and conscience. He was an impressive figure in the pulpit, with his erect, soldierly carriage, his trim beard, his resonant voice, his restrained gesture, and his flashing eye.

In private life he was kindly, courteous, and unassuming, more ready to ask your opinion than to give his own. His disposition was mild and accommodating. He had a strong sense of humour, and a talent for friendship. His conversation was interesting and informative, and stamped by the humility of greatness. His temperament was balanced and equable, a due blend of thought and will and feeling. To these goods of the mind were added the 'external goods', long life, health, high rank, public honour, and a happy home.

One rises from considering his life and works with a feeling of satisfaction. He makes human life seem a good thing, and a complete thing. Aristotle's ideal of happiness and virtue in a complete life was exemplified in him. Perhaps consciously he set himself to achieve T. H. Green's ideal of higher self-realization. His was the harmonious, completed personality, the socialized *ego*. A man of thought and action, he lived a full life, and neglected no portion of his endowment. The range of his intellectual interests was wide. He studied the principles of several sciences; he honoured the spirit of science, and valued all its branches

(except sexual psychology, which he hated). He loved books and libraries, but he was equally at home in garden, in field, and in moorland, and he was well versed in their varied lore. He had a competent knowledge of the fine arts, especially architecture, and he was appreciative of beauty both in art and nature. History and pre-history attracted him. But in all these fields he was at heart the philosopher. Philosophy always came first with him. And by philosophy he did not mean knowledge of abstractions or of 'systems of thought', but wisdom with regard to the great uncertainties. Philosophy to him was that group of reasoned beliefs which man may attain about the marginal conditions of human life; therefore his philosophy and theology went hand in hand, and he could not think of them apart. He was a great ecclesiastic who loved liberty and truth.

A. A. Luce