



Reconciling Memories

Alan D Falconer

In 1980, the Irish School of Ecumenics embarked on a study of what came to be called the ‘reconciliation of memories’.

The project started out, however, as an exploration of the reconciliation of histories. It was clear that the different communities in Ireland appealed to different versions of Irish history, and celebrated these versions of history in song, poem, and in annual commemorations at particular sites of consequence (e.g. the siege of Derry) or the annual orations at the gravesides of significant political figures (e.g. Pádraig Pearce). In a number of schools in the Republic of Ireland there were calendars on the classroom walls identifying for each day of the year individuals who had died, or events which had shaped the identity of the communities. In all of this, however, there was no attempt to interrogate or interpret the history. Each of the communities in Ireland was identified with a particular stream of historical events, and their identity was phrased in terms of a particular historical consciousness.

In conversation with historians (particularly Professor Theo Moody and Dr Margaret MacCurtain), it became clear that while there was an appeal in the different communities to dates, places and persons deemed to shape identity, the historical events cited were often taken out of context or exaggerated. Throughout the twentieth century historians from the different communities had collaborated to produce revised understandings of Irish history – versions which in fact entered the curriculum of the schools throughout the island. Despite this, such a new understanding seemed to have had little impact on the identity question.

What was at stake was the way in which the communities’ memories were shaped in opposition to the others. Irish scholars had identified two prevailing mentalities which differentiated the communities: a ‘siege mentality’, which was associated with the Protestant communities; and a ‘coercion mentality’ which expressed the experience of the Roman Catholic community.¹

Protestants tended to remember those occasions in their history when they had come under siege from Roman Catholic forces. Thus the history lessons emphasise 1641 when the Earls rose against the Protestants to try to reclaim the land given to the incomers by the Crown; and subsequent dates highlight those occasions when a similar situation arose and when a state of siege ensued, e.g. the siege of Derry (1688–89). The siege mentality arose from the perception of the repetitiveness of history. Such informed the rhetoric and politics of Northern Ireland. The memory imprisoned the community and made it difficult to pursue a more open attitude to other communities.

While there was a ‘siege mentality’ among Protestants, there was a ‘coercion mentality’ or ‘victim mentality’ among Roman Catholics in Ireland. They experienced a sense of being colonised and of having freedom limited by another community. Within this coercion mentality there has been the strong memory that independence and freedom have had to be sought through force of arms. The Proclamation of the Republic on Easter Monday 1916 refers to six previous occasions when this pattern of history had occurred – 1916 being the seventh. As the historian Oliver MacDonagh notes:

There is a constant relationship between the oscillation of coercion and conciliation on the part of the overlord and the oscillation of negotiation and the threat of violence on the part of the subjected.²

Here also there is a cyclical attitude to history – a sense that the same forces are at work constantly in the story, and thus in the memory of the community – a memory which shapes identity.

The different catalogues of places and personalities seem to be a relentless litany.³ The communities were held captive by their memories. Recent events simply reinforced an old story – you could not trust the other lot. Such memories were carried in the culture, traditions, songs, religious commitment, political ideals; embodied and embedded in the literature and poetry of the different communities, in their ‘history

lessons’ and in their cycle of political speeches given at the gravesides of the ‘martyrs’.

Through the study process at the Irish School of Ecumenics it became clear that the churches of the different traditions had identified with the different communities, and had provided a theological framework which differentiated the communities and which nourished their identities in separation. Thus the Protestant siege mentality was reinforced by a theology of the covenant community which saw itself as the chosen people with a particular mission – not to let go of the ‘truth’. (This of course translated into political terms as ‘Ulster says No!’) The Roman Catholic coercion mentality was reinforced by a victim theology (which was translated by some into ‘the blood of the martyrs’).

These theological paradigms which sought to account for the experience of the different communities were reinforced by the development of theologies and catechisms-in-opposition. If I may take an example from the Church of Ireland, one of the catechisms still in use in the mid 1960s in Clogher Diocese was entitled *How we differ from Rome*.⁴ The churches therefore reinforced the different traditions of memory in the communities.

Such a culture of memory, however, while it gave shape to the identity and attitudes of different communities, seemed to give an impression of a story which did not take others into account. Iain Crichton Smith in his poem, *The Legend*, put it well:

The anthology of memories of the other
is a book I hadn’t reckoned on.⁵

The identity of each community has been shaped by the actions, attitudes and declarations of the other community. Both siege and coercion mentalities are reactions to the actions of others. The identity of each community is inextricably bound up with that of the other. Each had created the other-in-opposition.

How then, could one unlock this cyclical process of action and reaction? Irish identity was formed by memory. But that experience of memory was one that held captive. However, a *leitmotif* throughout the scriptures is a constant appeal to ‘remember’. Indeed this comes to full expression every time the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is celebrated. For the authors of the Bible, ‘to remember’ is to be liberated. What is the difference between the Irish understanding of memory and that of scripture? How might the activity of remembering become a liberating one for the communities?

Through the analysis of *lezikkaron* and of *anamnesis*, it became clear that the biblical understanding of ‘memory’ is of a dynamic process, which involves a process of forgiveness. Throughout the scriptures there is a poetic parallelism between remembering and ‘remission of sins’. Remembering for the people of Israel and the early Christians involved the recognition of bondedness with others and of the importance of forgiveness as the only way to be freed from the past and the effects of the past and to be open to a new future with other people.

In the study process, it was clear that the process of forgiveness was a costly one, and involved a number of stages:

- naming the hurt
- acknowledging and feeling the pain of the other through story
- taking responsibility for inflicting the pain – or at least for continuing the memory of the pain in such a way that it determines contemporary relations (someone in the present cannot change the past or seek forgiveness on behalf of predecessors)
- seeking to make amends by writing a common account of the conflict – not a rewriting of history but an attempt to locate those places where the pain and conflict arose and was perpetuated
- committing to a contemporary work to establish justice and right relations
- staging a symbolic event heralding a new relationship between the communities.

Such a process of identifying the stages and dynamics of forgiveness emerged from both study and from consultations where groups comprising members of different communities told their stories – and were heard. Such a process takes seriously the interdependence of identity and the process of action, reaction and separation which is an indication of the effect of the problem.

Such a perspective had been evident in the work of various individuals in Ireland as they sought to cross the divides in Irish society and act as reconcilers.⁶ Such a perspective also emerged in a verse drama which the poet John Hewitt wrote for BBC Radio on the killings at Islandmagee in 1641 under the title *The Bloody Brae*. The drama turned into a plea for forgiveness and generosity between communities.

It became clear, however, that such a process of community definition and process of reconciliation was even more important for interchurch relations. While it was clearly evident that the communities which had developed in opposition required such a costly process of forgiveness and reconciliation, it was no less true for interchurch relations themselves.⁷

At times it seems as if churches identify themselves as autonomous entities and traditions, yet theology, liturgy, pastoral practice and relations with communities of different traditions emerge from a similar process of action, reaction and separation. It has been argued⁸ that the tension between Anglicans and Reformed on the issue of episcopacy is precisely an example of action, reaction and separation – we have created each other's theologies of episcopate through assertion, and through the experience of bad practices of the exercise of episcopate. This provides but one example of an area where theology has been developed in opposition on the basis of a confessional differentiation – another might be Reformed silence on Mary. It is of course clear that Reformed theology is able to account positively for a correct exercise of the personal office of episcopate.

How might this emphasis on the reconciliation of memories affect Reformed-Roman Catholic relations in Scotland? Because the process

of reconciling memories is specific to place, the above has concentrated on the Irish situation – largely since that was where the initial process was explored. What would the issues be in such a reconciling process in Scotland? What are the underlying issues and theologies that determine the posture of the churches to each other?

To take this discussion further let me explore relations between churches of the Reformed tradition and the Roman Catholic Church. In doing so, it is helpful to examine the international dialogue between Reformed and Roman Catholic Churches since this topic appeared on the agenda of the dialogue.



Towards a Common Understanding of the Church, 1984–1990

A first phase of this dialogue had taken place from 1970 to 1977.⁹ The Reformed tradition had on the whole sought to participate in multilateral dialogues rather than in bilateral conversations, but saw the necessity of engaging bilaterally with the Roman Catholic Church, in the hope of promoting positive relations particularly in respect of situations where there still existed negative relations between the two communities. That series of conversations resulted in the report *The Presence of Christ in Church and World*. By exploring this important theme it was able to give attention to such issues as the relationship of Christ to his Church, the Church as a teaching authority, the Eucharist and the ministry. Considerable common ground was discovered. The second phase of conversations concentrated more directly on the doctrine of the Church. Certain ecclesiological issues touched upon in the earlier series of discussions were further explored. As the report acknowledges:

We have discovered anew that the Roman Catholic Church and the Reformed churches are bound by manifold ties. Both communions confess Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, affirm the Trinitarian faith of the apostolic church through the ages, and observe one baptism into the threefold Name.¹⁰

The dialogue was conducted with a particular methodology which was new to bilateral processes. A core group of members of the Commission was appointed by the respective authorities of the Churches – through the Pontifical Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC). This group planned the themes, the agenda and were the drafters of the report. On the basis of the outline of the study as developed by this group, theologians from both traditions were invited to attend one session of the conversations and make a presentation on the topic under discussion. The core group tried to maintain a symmetry in the presentations through the issue being addressed both by a Reformed and a Roman Catholic theologian – although this did not always occur. At each session of the dialogue, there was also a presentation by Reformed and Roman Catholic group members of the actual nature of the relations between them in a particular situation.¹¹

For one session, I was invited to make a presentation on the issue “How far have the Reformed modified their view of the Roman Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation?”¹² In this presentation I explored the complex issue of whether there was a Reformed view of the Roman Catholic Church at the Reformation – or whether it was more accurate to speak of ‘views’. It is clear that there is a diversity of views evident in the Reformed churches of the time, and this differentiation depended on social, political, economic and religious factors, and on whether the Reformed church in question emerged from the First or Radical Reformation (both terms are used within WARC), e.g. Jan Hus, the Czech Brethren, the Waldensians; from the Reformation, e.g. Huldrych Zwingli; or the second generation of the Reformation, e.g. John Calvin and John Knox. The spectrum of attitudes depended on the particular experience that the Reformed had of the Roman Catholic Church in each time and place.

In exploring how far that had changed, it was clear that there was a variety of attitudes to the Roman Catholic Church. An examination of these also suggested that the attitude was crafted in response to the experience of the community in particular places of the way in which

they were regarded by the Roman Catholic Church. Thus when the report of the first phase of the Reformed-Roman Catholic dialogue was sent to the Reformed churches for response, many Reformed churches could not ‘listen’ to it, and certainly could not hear what had been agreed. Why was the Reformed family in conversation with a church which had persecuted them in their situation? Could the Reformed trust the Roman Catholic Church? Did it really mean what it said at Vatican II? After all in the past whenever agreements had been brokered, e.g. the Edict of Nantes, they had with church collusion been rescinded and persecution followed – the experience of the Huguenots – an experience which had an important effect on the ability of Reformed churches in Europe to have positive relations with the Roman Catholic Church.¹³

The attitude of the Reformed to the Roman Catholic Church was shaped by a number of factors – cultural, political, social, and theological. These perceptions were in fact borne out also in the case studies of the particular situations presented. Dialogue therefore was and is a complex process, which involves facing up to those factors – often called ‘non-theological factors of unity and division’ (though I prefer to name them ‘non-doctrinal factors’, as they are also theological at root) – which have helped to determine attitudes, postures, and theologies in respect of each other. The most erudite agreed theology is insufficient to change our relations with each other. Therefore a process of reconciling memories is essential if we are really to move towards communion and unity, and this must be undertaken in each specific situation.

In the light of this therefore, the international dialogue decided to include in their report a considered and considerable section on the reconciliation of memories (paras. 12–63). For this section, each representative, in consultation with their church, wrote an account of the relationships in his or her situation. A nuanced account is given of the relation between memory and history, and the importance of historical investigation affirmed:

Historical scholarship today has not only produced fresh evidence concerning our respective roles in the Reformation and its aftermath. It also brings us together in broad agreement about sources, methods of inquiry, and warrants for drawing conclusions. A new measure of objectivity has become possible. If we still inevitably interpret and select, at least we are aware that we do and what that fact means as we strive for greater objectivity and more balanced judgement.¹⁴

The report then goes on to begin the process of writing an account, from the perspective of each of the traditions involved in the dialogue, of the 450 years of action, reaction and separation of the churches, naming the various factors which have contributed to the relationship and thus opening the way for the possibility of writing a common history. It is worth quoting one of the conclusions of this section of the report:

We see more clearly how our respective self-understandings have been so largely formed by confessional historiographies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These differing self-interpretations have, in turn, fostered the establishment of whole sets of different values, symbols, assumptions and institutions – in a word, different religious and ecclesial cultures. The result is that today, as in the past, the same words, even the same biblical expressions, are sometimes received and understood by us in quite different ways.¹⁵

Ecumenical dialogue thus involves the painful (and at times in these conversations the dialogue was very painful) process of seeking to address the memories of the communities in dialogue.

This report has been sent to Reformed churches and to the Roman Catholic Church for their particular processes of reception. The

theme of reconciling memories was also important, however, for the international multilateral conversations of the churches as expressed in the work and life of the Faith and Order movement.



The Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order, 1993

This theme of the reconciliation of memories also emerged at the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order at Santiago de Compostela in 1993. Both the Roman Catholic Church and Reformed churches were represented there – though the membership of the Reformed participants was of persons nominated by their respective churches, rather than through the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, as in the international bilateral dialogue.

In seeking to lay the biblical and theological foundation for *koinonia*, the importance of the reconciliation of memories was highlighted:

The dynamic process of *koinonia* involves the recognition of the complementarity of human beings. As individuals and as communities, we are confronted by the others in their otherness, e.g. theologically, ethnically, culturally. *Koinonia* requires respect for the other and a willingness to listen to the other and to seek to understand them. In this process of dialogue, where each is changed in the encounter, there takes place the appropriation of the stories of action, reaction and separation whereby each has defined himself or herself in opposition to the other. The search for establishing *koinonia* involves appropriating the pain and hurt of the other and through a process of individual and collective repentance, forgiveness and renewal, taking responsibility for that suffering.

Confrontation with the other, individually and collectively, is always a painful process, challenging as it does our own lifestyle, convictions, piety and way of thinking. The encounter with the other in the search to

establish the *koinonia*, grounded in God's gift, calls for a *kenosis* – a self-giving and a self-emptying. Such a *kenosis* arouses fear of loss of identity, and invites us to be vulnerable, yet such is no more than faithfulness to the ministry of vulnerability and death of Jesus as he sought to draw human beings into communion with God and each other. He is the pattern and patron of reconciliation which leads to *koinonia*. As individuals and communities, we are called to establish *koinonia* through a ministry of *kenosis*.¹⁶

Once again for Roman Catholic and Reformed communities an ecumenical dialogue in which they were engaged emphasised the importance of reconciling memories for the process of moving to the expression of fuller communion and unity. In this exploration at Santiago de Compostela, the theme of *kenosis* – self-emptying – entered as a key to the process, as an imperative for pursuing this way.

Resonance with the development of reconciling memories in the Reformed-Roman Catholic Church Dialogue and in the work of the Faith and Order Commission is also seen in the Encyclical Letter *Ut Unum Sint* of Pope John Paul II. Central to his exploration of the development of positive relations between Christian communities is his focus on the 'purification of memories' and the 'healing of memories'.



Ut Unum Sint

Throughout his pontificate, H.H. John Paul II had engaged on his various travels in expressions of regret for the division of the Church and had sought forgiveness of those communities which had been hurt by the attitudes and actions of the Roman Catholic Church of the day. While this was controversial within the Roman Catholic Church,¹⁷ it was strongly supported by H.E. John Cardinal Cassidy, at that time President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity.

In his Encyclical *Ut Unum Sint*, John Paul II reflected on our theme in his exploration of ‘Dialogue as an examination of conscience’ and called for a process of the ‘purification of past memories’ (para. 2) as essential to the ecumenical enterprise.

Throughout this Encyclical there emerges a positive appreciation of the other, and a desire to listen to other traditions. This is even yet the only Roman Catholic Encyclical which cites documents which have not been produced within the Roman Catholic Church. Extensive citation and awareness of the work of the Faith and Order movement is evident, and the whole discussion of unity is enfolded within an awareness of the implications of all the baptized of whichever communion being bonded together. There is a consciousness of Christian interdependence, and that churches can learn from the witness and insights of others.

This is particularly evident in the opening of the Encyclical where the grounding of the reflections is on the holiness of the Church, and the awareness of the courageous witness of the martyrs of all ecclesial traditions.

This concern with processes of forgiveness and the purification of historical memories came to fullest expression in the millennial year of celebration in Rome. The Pontifical Biblical and Theological Commission had, in preparation for an act of penitence and confession, been asked by John Paul II to prepare a significant statement on the reconciliation of memories. This they did, and it provides a further and helpful impetus to the awareness that ecumenical dialogue, if it is to lead towards communion, can only do so on the basis of the reconciling of memories.¹⁸



The cloud of witnesses

Clearly one of the very difficult issues for our churches is how can the different traditions learn from each other in their growth towards the fuller realization of *koinonia*. John Paul II, following Vatican II, emphasised the bondedness of Christians in and through baptism into

Christ. Reformed theology makes a similar affirmation.¹⁹ How do we express our appreciation for the faith and witness of members of the other churches?

The witness of the martyrs and doctors of the various churches *de facto* finds recognition beyond the boundaries of individual confessional traditions. Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Oscar Romero, for example, are a source of inspiration not just for their own churches, but for the whole of Christianity. How do the churches celebrate those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice for their faith? This issue was the subject of a prolonged debate and discussion at the 1978 Faith and Order Commission in Bangalore. The report notes:

In the martyrs the Church discerns Christ himself, the very heart of its faith, beyond all interpretations and divisions. That is why the martyrs of the early Church and some great witnesses in the later history of the Church are the common property of all Christians. In the tapestry of Christian history, the ever-renewed succession of the martyrs is the golden thread.²⁰

While the Faith and Order Commission did not follow through that Commission meeting's recommendation that work be undertaken on this to produce an ecumenical calendar of the saints and martyrs, the challenge was taken up by the ecumenical Comunità di Bose. As a first phase of the project they produced a version in 2002,²¹ and have since then been working with the Faith and Order Commission to produce a more inclusive and comprehensive list. As part of this process they have invited all the churches to nominate those whom they conceive as having a formative influence upon their identity, and those who had been martyrs for the truth.

But to compile such a calendar is not an easy task, because the martyrs of one tradition may have been put to death on the instructions of the leaders of another. Such a compilation requires a process of the reconciling of memories and the appropriation of the story of the other. However, it is an important aspect of the capacity to reconcile memories. Are we open to the insights of those whom in the past

have been persecuted by the community with whom we engage in dialogue? Are we prepared to learn from the doctors of the Church and the witness of communities who have sought to be faithful to the Gospel in periods of separation between the communities?



Conclusions

In the above I have outlined the parameters of the reconciliation of memories, and the costliness of the process. Both Reformed and Roman Catholic traditions affirm the importance of this for moving towards the fuller expression of *koinonia*. From the Reformed-Roman Catholic dialogue it is clear that such a process needs to take account of the particularity of place and time, and thus ideally should be conducted in each place. The various stages of such a process have been delineated. Is it possible for the churches in this land to embark on such a journey?

Such a pilgrimage together would take place on the basis of our common baptism into Christ and our bondedness to each other. Such a pilgrimage will involve the preparedness to be changed in the process. Such a pilgrimage would be promoted by our theological colleges ensuring that they draw positively on the contribution, life and witness of the other. Such a pilgrimage would be enhanced by our common prayer giving thanks for the contribution of the doctors, saints and martyrs of each other's communities. Perhaps by pursuing such a venture the continuing blight of sectarianism would be addressed. It requires honesty, transparency and commitment to work together for change. What are the fears and the issues of the different churches and traditions in Scotland which inhibit an ability to move generously and humbly together to give expression to our being together in Christ?

The necessity and challenge of such a process has been well expressed by the distinguished twentieth-century theologian, H. Richard Niebuhr:

Where common memory is lacking, where [people]
do not share in the same past there can be no real

community, and where community is to be formed common memory must be created ... the measure of our unity is the extent of our common memory.²²

Together may we seek the power of the Spirit to guide us, sustain us and inspire us for the journey to manifest visibly our unity in Christ.

(This paper formed the basis of a discussion in the Joint Commission on Doctrine of the Church of Scotland and the Roman Catholic Church.)

- ¹ See Padraig O'Malley, *The Uncivil Wars: Ireland Today* (Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1983).
- ² Oliver MacDonagh, *States of Mind: A Study of Anglo-Irish Conflict, 1780–1980* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1983), 9.
- ³ See for example John Hewitt's poem "Postscript 1984" in *The Collected Poems of John Hewitt* (ed. Frank Ormsby; Belfast: Blackstaff Press, 1991), 387-8; and also the work of the members of the Field Day group – Seamus Deane, Seamus Heaney, Brian Friel, etc.
- ⁴ For further examples and analysis see Alan Falconer and Joseph Liechty, eds., *Reconciling Memories* (2nd expanded ed.; Dublin: Columba Press, 1998), 19 §7.
- ⁵ Iain Crichton Smith, *The Exiles* (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1984), 36.
- ⁶ For the account of some of these see Falconer and Liechty, *Reconciling Memories*.
- ⁷ Throughout the period when the study was being undertaken, the churches were in denial about their complicity in the situation of community tension, conflict and opposition. During the period of what was called by some 'the Troubles', whenever victims were identified as 'Protestant' or 'Catholic', church leaders were at pains immediately to emphasise that this was not a religious

conflict. My colleague, Dr Joseph Liechty in speaking of the roots of the conflict used to identify some twelve causes which were at work at different times – political, economic, social, etc – among which was ‘religious’. The churches were slow to recognize that they provided a language and mechanisms for sustaining division, and identity in opposition and that they were part of the problem as well as the solution.

- ⁸ See my article in Falconer and Liechty, *Reconciling Memories*.
- ⁹ “The Presence of Christ in Church and World: Final Report of the Dialogue Between the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity” (1977), in *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level* (eds. H. Meyer and L. Vischer; New York-Geneva: Paulist-WCC, 1984), 434–463.
- ¹⁰ “Towards a Common Understanding of the Church: Reformed-Roman Catholic International Dialogue, Second Phase” (1984–1990), para. 4, in *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982–1998* (eds. J. Gros et al.; Geneva-Grand Rapids: WCC-Eerdmans, 2000), 780–818.
- ¹¹ For a discussion of this and other ecumenical methodologies see my “Towards Unity Through Diversity: Bilateral and Multilateral Dialogues” in *One in Christ* 29 (1993): 279–285.
- ¹² See *One in Christ* 26 (1990): 51–67.
- ¹³ See Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter, eds., *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and Its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts, 2003) – including my own reflections on “Towards a Culture of Tolerance”.
- ¹⁴ “Towards a Common Understanding of the Church,” para. 14.
- ¹⁵ “Towards a Common Understanding of the Church,” para. 62.
- ¹⁶ T. F. Best and Gunther Gassmann, eds., *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report, Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order* (Geneva: WCC, 1994), 263 ff.
- ¹⁷ See Luigi Accattoli, *When a Pope Asks Forgiveness* (Boston: Pauline, 1998).

- ¹⁸ See International Theological Commission, “Memory and Reconciliation: The Church and the Faults of the Past,” published in *L’Osservatore Romano* (English Edition), 15 March 2000.
- ¹⁹ See particularly the writings of John Calvin.
- ²⁰ See Lukas Vischer, ed., *Sharing in One Hope: Bangalore 1978* (Geneva: WCC, 1978), 195–202 (the quotation is taken from p. 200).
- ²¹ Comunità di Bose, *Il libro dei Testimoni, Martirologio Ecumenico* (Milan: Edizioni San Paolo, 2002).
- ²² For a development of this see H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: MacMillan, 1941), 115; 120.