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MacDonald’s Theology and his Fantasy Fiction

Colin Manlove
Though they have understandably received far less attention from literary critics than his fiction, George MacDonald’s theological works—he three series of Unspoken Sermons (1867, 1885, 1889), The Miracles of Our Lord (1870), The Hope of the Gospel (1892) and the twenty spoken sermons and addresses recently selected in George MacDonald in the Pulpit (1996) afford a fascinating insight into his mind, and throw considerable light on his fantasy. In these lectures I want to give a sketch of some of their more prominent features, and then suggest what they can tell us about his fiction.

The striking aspect of MacDonald’s theological work is the way he has come to his own understanding of Christianity without reference to churches or creeds. And this from his earliest days as a Christian; writing to his father in 1851 he declared,

We are far too anxious to be definite and to have finished, well-polished systems—forgetting that the more perfect a theory about the infinite, the surer it is to be wrong, the more impossible it is to be right. I am neither Arminian nor Calvinist. To no system would I subscribe. (GMDW, 155)

This determination, and his supposed heterodoxy, were to lead to his expulsion as minister of Arundel Congregational Church in 1853. But in MacDonald’s view, systems and beliefs could only talk about or define one’s relationship to God, they could not know that relation. Indeed he maintained that

One chief cause of the amount of unbelief in the world is, that those who have seen something of the glory of Christ, set themselves to theorise about him rather than to obey him. In teaching men, they have not taught them Christ, they have taught them about Christ. (US, 520)

MacDonald felt with all his soul that Christianity was not a collection of beliefs, but essentially a way of experiencing God. For him, coming into harmony with God’s love and purpose in both himself and the world was the key concern of a Christian. His Christianity is mystical and moral together, involving both loving knowledge of God’s ways, and walking in them.

Theologically MacDonald is a ‘deconstructionist.’ He wants to take away the fixed and hard edifices of doctrine, even the fixed and hard constructs that are churches themselves, to arrive at the living fire at the heart of Christianity. Declaring that ‘Theologians have done more to hide the gospel of Christ than any of its adversaries’ (US, 259), he calls fixed dogmas ‘the theology of hell’ (GMP, 41), and says, ‘The world in which you move, the place of your living and loving and labour, not the church you go to on your holiday, is the place of divine service’ (US, 592; see also 615 and LE, 30). MacDonald himself did not have a built or formal life as a Christian. He spent his whole Christian life undoing what he saw as the harmful forms and antagonisms man had over the centuries built on the plain ground of what Jesus was and taught. He believed in a creedless Christianity available to all men and women through a simple choice to love and follow Christ. Such a faith had nothing to do with sects of belief or churches, and its truth was no less real in his own time of scientific skepticism than in the time of Christ’s life and persecution on earth.

MacDonald’s view of the Bible is important here, for the Bible is the template of the Christian faith. For MacDonald the Bible is a central text by the light of which to know what God wants, to understand and to follow Christ, and to find out heaven. This purpose he finds contained within the Gospels, in the account of Christ’s life and His continually tested loyalty to God. All MacDonald’s thinking is founded on the Gospels and Christ: ‘I believe in nothing but the Lord revealed in Christ’ (GMP 20; see also 28). MacDonald has little to say in his writings of other books of the Bible, and indeed the Old Testament features only in an account of Job’s arguments with God, because it is a singular example of man trying to relate to God (‘The Voice of Job,’ US, 328-62).

And for MacDonald it is mistaken to give the Bible the authority of the Word of God: ‘It nowhere lays claim to be regarded as the Word, the Way, the Truth’; for ‘The one use of the Bible is to make us look [beyond it] at Jesus’ (US, 36, 37; see also 95-6). In any case, fogged as it is by two millennia of the varying psyches and understandings of its composers,
transliterations and translators, it cannot any longer claim to be the Word of God, even supposing it had once been so. And further, much of the Bible is for MacDonald, ‘only a way of putting it.’ Nothing can adequately describe God or Christ in their divinity (see for example ‘The Temptation in the Wilderness,’ US, 84-109; also US, 441, LE, 56)), though parables best glance at it (US, 86-9, 261). Even words themselves break under the weight of the profound meanings Christ gives them. The inarticulate child and the striving Christian are nearer to the truth, because the one sees the universe as a wonder, and the other understands by obeying: ‘It is he that runneth that shall read, and no other’ (US, 260). MacDonald sees God as caring for live things and truths, ‘not things set down in a book, or in a memory’ (US, 566). This view is reflected in MacDonald’s own little bibles, his mystical fantasies, where, to avoid all fixities, he makes their words and images suggestive rather than definite, and their meanings potentially as varied as their readers (ADO, 313-22). The truest word, and the profoundest book, is that which is continually fluid, or self-subverting.

This is also seen in MacDonald’s dislike of the analytic methods of the scientist, which he sees as probing beneath the divine surface of creation (US, 439, 469), as dividing one thing of God’s creation from another, and as turning living truth to dead particulars: ‘“What in the name of God . . . is the analysis of water to the babble of a living stream?”’ (US, 464). No words about Christ, or His work, or about Christian belief, are in themselves important (US, 350)—their sole use if any is in bringing us to do the will of the Father. This loving walking in God’s ways is the core of the Christian life and nothing else matters beside it. The only way to know God is to love and obey Him.5

In keeping with his rejection of Christian dogma and creed, and in common with other liberal theologians of his day such as F.D.Maurice, MacDonald tends to a ‘demythologised’ view of Christianity. That is, he does not assert—though he never openly denies—an objective pattern of events from the Creation, through the Fall of Man, and Christ’s life and death to the Last Judgement. Using the findings of science to spiritual purpose, he sees creation as ‘beginning’ far back in time, as evolutionary rather than simultaneous, and as not yet complete (US, 290,298); (Though since God continually thinks the universe into being (GMP, 106), that far-off time and our own are as one in His mind.) Nowhere in MacDonald’s work is there a sustained account of man having been once in a paradise, which he lost by giving way to an evil force called Satan. Rather, for MacDonald the picture is one of God repeatedly creating men as separate wills from His own, so that they may of their own choices turn their hearts towards or away from Him, (US, 117-18).

Evil lies in failing to do this, in preferring lesser goods before God. Therefore MacDonald does not see our nature as inherently fallen through Adam (US, 343,385), but views each of us as capable of enacting our own fall away from God in each moment of our spiritual lives. For Him evil does not lie in our past sins, but in our present choices: ‘It is not the sin that I have done, it is the sin that I am. No man was ever yet condemned for the sins that he has done, he is condemned because he will not leave them’ (GMP, 298).6

In the same way MacDonald does not tend to see evil as an objective force outside man, the product of a group of former angels who rebelled against God and were cast out. Rather he sees evil as the individual choosing the self before God, and hell as the experience of alienation from our own loving Creator.7 He views the Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness not as a piece of Christ’s biography, whereby He was tempted by an actual demon, but as a parable, a way of putting the spiritual conflicts that Christ experienced within Himself:

The form of the parable is the first in which truth will admit of being embodied. Nor is this all: it is likewise the fullest; and to the parable will the teacher of the truth ever return. Is he who asserts that the . . . [story] contains a simple narrative of actual events, prepared to believe, as the story, so interpreted, indubitably gives us to understand, that a visible demon came to our Lord and, himself the prince of worldly wisdom, thought, by quoting Scripture after the manner of the priests, to persuade a good man to tempt God; thought, by the promise of power, to prevail upon him to cast aside every claim he had upon the human race, in falling down and worshipping one whom he knew to be the adversary of Truth, of Humanity, of God? How could Satan be so foolish? or, if Satan might be so foolish, wherein could such temptation so presented have tempted our Lord? And wherein would a victory over such be a victory for the race? Told as a parable, it is as full of meaning as it would be bare if received as a narrative. (US, 87-8).

Although MacDonald’s last work of fantastic fiction Lilith has as among its main actors Adam, Eve, Lilith and the Great Shadow, they are present less as figures from Christian history than as certain kinds of relationship embodied within a revised myth. Adam and Eve are never presented as those who led all humanity into sin, but as conductors to eternity. Lilith is seen as a baby-killer, a destroyer of the new birth. And the Great Shadow, with his overtones of absolute evil, will in the end lie down to sleep and resurrection in Adam’s house. The Shadow is utter antagonism; Lilith furiously insists on her own self in opposition to all others; but Adam
and Eve together embody that perfect human togetherness which hints at the greater ‘at-one-ment’ all will feel in heaven. For MacDonald such atonement is the fundamental truth of the universe: ‘the work of Jesus Christ on earth was the creative atonement. . . . He brings and is bringing God and man, and man and man, into perfect unity’ (US, 515). By the end of the story Lilith has shifted out of her evil character and yielded up her self to the divine current of the universe. At every point MacDonald challenges and subverts the meanings we bring to these characters from the original biblical myth; even while at the same time he is making another series of mythic identifications of his own.

As for Christ’s life and death on earth, MacDonald accepts that as a historical fact, but his real interest in it is as a continuous event; ‘We use the past tense about Jesus Christ very foolishly and stupidly. . . . If Jesus ever was anything that He is now’ (GMP, 187). The Christ child is still with us; the life He lived is the perfect pattern of ours now; and He did not die once, but put His dying for ever into the universe. ‘There is no “was” with Him. He is the same. Just what he appeared on the earth He is now, and is in the earth still’ (GMP, 282; also 147,165). Do not fix on the Cross, or the picture of the dying body, MacDonald says (US, 515): rather think of the dying as the perfecting of the Son’s relation to the Father, now and always.

MacDonald has little to say of the Incarnation—except that in his view Christ was not really incarnated at all, since He was already the Perfect Man:

I believe that Jesus is the eternal Son of the eternal Father; that in Him the ideal humanity sat enthroned from all eternity; that as He is the divine man, so He is the human God; that there was no taking of our nature upon Himself, but the showing of Himself as He really was, and that from evermore. (GMP, 51; see also 201-02)

Nor in his death did Christ take upon himself the sins of man and pay the price of them through ‘sufficient sacrifice’ or ‘atonement’: MacDonald believes that ‘The idea that the salvation of Jesus is a salvation from the consequences of our sins is a false, low, mean notion’(US, 518). He sees Christ rather as showing in himself a perfect pattern of love and devotion to His Father for man to follow. In his view people are too ready to make destructive theories about Christ when they should know and follow Him out of love and obedience (US, 526-33).

And the Last Judgement? For MacDonald there is no such single event at the end of history. According to their choices men have the alienation from God that they want now, and the hellish suffering that entails. They judge for themselves whether they are for heaven or hell, and in a universe of love what else should their refusals do but give them pain? Nor is such pain final: it lasts only so long as men remain obdurate. For God creates and sustains in every man a deepest self which loves Him, and which awaits only its discovery to begin to return towards the heaven that is in Him: ‘We are made for love, not for self’ (US, 312). Such a heaven is no built and finished place, but is always a-making, so long as there are still men a-making to fill it: ‘We have had nearly two thousand years’ experience of the continued coming of the kingdom. He [Christ] then preached it: it is not yet come; it has been all the time, and is now, drawing slowly nearer’ (LE, 41).

As we have seen MacDonald does not, except occasionally and formally, allow the concept of a devil who tempts man. He is fundamentally not a dualist: he does not allow the existence of any absolute figure or force opposed to God: ‘In those . . . who believe that good is the one power, and that evil exists only because for a time it subserves, cannot help subserving the good, what place can there be for fear?’ (US, 326). Rather, he sees God’s creation of beings separate from Himself as allowing them to choose, for a longer or shorter time, in opposition to His will. This brings sin into being, and, as Creator, quite apart from his love for His children (US, 343), God is obliged to correct this and destroy evil (US, 510-12). He therefore plants Himself in man’s innermost soul to prompt his better urges and desires, makes His universe speak holy truths to him, and sends His Son into the world to ‘work . . . atonement in every heart’ (US, 515).

But if man will not turn to God, then he will find himself trudging into the teeth of a gale; or, in MacDonald’s terms, he will experience God’s love not as welcoming warmth but as fire. For such opposition, which is the choosing of lesser goods before God, produces a distance from Him which burns (‘The Consuming Fire,’ US, 18-33). But it is still God’s love, in another mode, and in the end it will win, because evil has no final reality. ‘Endless must be our terror, until we come heart to heart with the fire-core of the universe, the first and the last and the living one!’ (US, 322-3). MacDonald here breaks down the old notion of a two-natured God, one of love and one of just wrath (US, 534-5), which is sometimes carried so far as to suppose that the mildness of the Son intercedes on man’s behalf with the righteous anger of the Father. God’s love is a consuming fire and ‘love loves unto purity’ all things it beholds (US, 18):

It is not that the fire will burn us if we do not worship thus; but that the fire will burn us until we worship thus; yea, will go on burning within us until all that is foreign to it has yielded to its force, no longer with pain and consuming, but as the highest consciousness of life, the presence of God. (US, 21)
MacDonald can conceive of only two unforgivable sins that might shut a man out from the power of God’s love, and even then he is unwilling to see such exclusion as permanent (‘It Shall Not Be Forgiven,’ US, 45-66). Though he at times speaks of hell, the only true hell for him most usually is the experience of alienation from God, an experience so unendurable that it eventually drives man back towards God’s love. ‘The one principle of hell,’ he says, ‘is—“I am mine own’’ (US, 465). (MacDonald paints a terrifying picture of this at the end of ‘The Last Farthing,’ (US, 268-74). Hell is not a separate place eternally opposed to heaven, but a condition of more or less temporary resistance to divine love: this is true even of MacDonald’s picture of hell, oft-supposed an absolute one, in his preface to the translation of V.A.Thisted’s Letters from Hell (1884):

In these days, when men are gladly hearing afresh that ‘in Him is no darkness at all’; that God therefore could not have created any man if he knew that he must live in torture to all eternity; and that his hatred to evil cannot be expressed by injustice, itself the one essence of evil—for certainly it would be nothing less than injustice to punish infinitely what was finitely committed, no sinner being capable of understanding the abstract enormity of what he does,—in these days has arisen another falsehood—less, yet very perilous: thousands of half-thinkers imagine that, since it is declared with such authority that hell is not everlasting, there is no hell at all. To such folly I for one have never given enticement or shelter. I see no hope for many, no way for the divine love to reach them, save through a very ghastly hell. Men have got to repent; there is no other escape for them, and no escape from that. (vii-viii)

Even while he asserts the awful reality of a hell, MacDonald sees it both as non-eternal and as part of the operation of God’s love: ‘For hell is God’s, and not the devil’s’ (HG, 15). Since God is the only reality, universalism is here theoretically inevitable.

Central to MacDonald’s Christian outlook is the idea of relationship. He believed that as Christ is Son to the Father, so should we be, and that our best experience of the duties and loves in family relationships on earth is what God our heavenly Father offers and asks of our relation to Him: ‘The true idea of the universe is the whole family in heaven and earth’ (LE, 61). The belief that the heart of Christianity lies in growing closer to the Father is the most frequent subject of MacDonald’s theological writings. ‘The light of our life . . . is simply God—God—God—nothing but God’ (US, 586); ‘The profoundest truth of the universe is the relation of the son to the Father’ (GMP, 311; see also US, 428). For MacDonald Christ’s story is that of a perfect relation of love and trust we hope one day to enter ourselves. Whatever sufferings Christ experiences He still willingly and lovingly submits Himself to the purposes of His Father; even when He is on the Cross, when He is in the deepest pit of apparent alienation, it is still ‘“My father, my father’’ to whom He cries (US, 111-14). Christ’s life is a witness to the perfect relationship, the At-one-ment, we should try to emulate as we grow in love of God.

The work of Jesus Christ on earth was the creative atonement, because it works atonement in every heart. He brings and is bringing God and man, and man and man, into perfect unity: “I in them and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one.” (US, 515; see also 510-11, 536-40)

The whole universe is a network of relationships and correspondences. Oxygen is related to hydrogen to produce water; the sun is related to the earth to produce heat and light. These are not mere causal or scientific relations: since God is the Creator and Sustainer of the universe, they are metaphysical bonds too. And the relation is always two-way: the Son could not love the Father if the Father did not love the Son (US, 476-7), and so too with the relations between man and God (‘The upstretched meets the downstretched hand’ (ADO, 72).

MacDonald saw this perfect relationship, between Son and Father, man and God and nature, demonstrated in Christ’s miracles, on which in 1870 he published a whole separate study. For most of MacDonald’s contemporaries the miracles of Christ in the New Testament would seem simple marvels, breaking natural law, and designed only to increase evidence and awe of Christ’s more than human power. To Victorian scientists, on the other hand, believing in the pre-eminence of natural laws, they would seem more or less suspect. But for MacDonald they are signs of the deeper laws of nature that become open to all who grow close to God at any time. They are in Christ the expressions of a perfect relation of creature and Creator, which then incorporates the other creature that is Nature: MacDonald even suggests that when we become really close in our relation to God, we too will be capable of such miracles as walking on water (US, 285). Miracles are in this view not more wondrous than anything else, for all things come from God:

[Christ’s] miracles in bread and wine were far less grand and less beautiful than the works of the Father they represented, in making the corn to grow in the valleys, and the grapes to drink the sunlight on the hillsides of the world, with all their infinitudes of tender gradation and delicate mystery of birth. (MOL, 13; US, 244)
And, from another view, miracles are not violations of the laws of nature, but ‘at least a possible fulfillment of her deepest laws’ (MOL, 13): at the deepest level they are in harmonious relation with nature. Into this idiom come the changing of the water into wine, the healing of the lunatic child with the unclean spirit and the very Resurrection of Christ himself. Into this idiom too, at a lesser level come the ‘fantastic’ worlds of Fairy Land or the Region of the Seven Dimensions that MacDonald has created in his own work, for their seemingly marvelous natures witness in their own degree to the new and much larger Nature that is revealed through the man-God relation.

MacDonald makes separation from others one the great enemies of the divine universe: ‘We so often choose death, the thing that separates and kills; for everything that parts us from our fellow, and every thing that parts us from God is a killing of us’ (GMP, 87):

Every one will, I presume, confess to more or less misery. Its apparent source may be this or that; its real source is, to use a poor figure, a dislocation of the juncture between the created and the creating life. This primal evil is the parent of evils unnumbered, hence of miseries multitudinous. (LE, 35)

The enemy is the self, which leads a man to ‘cut his own stem from his root that he might call it his own and love it’ (US, 486, 619). Contrasted to this is the creation of man as a free and separate agent by God: for this was done so that out of it there might grow a new coming together or atonement and an enrichment of love’s power (US, 299); or, as MacDonald puts it, ‘Two at least are needed for oneness’ (US, 298, 428).

There is nevertheless a vein of Platonism running through MacDonald’s work. He believed that the universe is a thought in the mind of God; 13 that the world is a mirror of God and an analysis of the spirit of man; 14 that the soul makes the body; 14 and that on this earth God has his special dwelling place in the innermost spirits of men. 15 This tendency emerges in MacDonald’s theology also in the way that almost all of it is directed not at helping others in this world so much as in preparing them for the next, by getting into the right individual relationship with God. MacDonald does sometimes insist on love of one’s neighbour as an essential part of the Christian life, but when he comes to speak of it we feel the change of gear to the needful rather than the desired (GMP, 110, 155-6; US, 126-8, 379). Indeed his account of Christ is much more concerned with Christ’s relation to the Father than to man. As we have seen, he scarcely remarks the Incarnation whereby God became mortal; actually he says that ‘I don’t believe that Jesus became a man by taking our body. . . . He was the Man from all eternity’ (GMP, 201). MacDonald’s view of the Crucifixion rather misses Christ’s dying out of love and sympathy for man: Jesus, he tells us, loved His Father before us (GMP, 86), and came here not out of love of man, but to make us love God more (US, 162, 430). The emphasis is always away from earth, towards the Father. The direction is not downward, but upward, one of MacDonald’s favourite prepositions.

It is that note of ecstatic anticipation of God and Heaven that runs like a great wave under MacDonald’s theology. What he wants above all, as his God wants, is oneness. That oneness can be glimpsed on this earth through the childlike vision of the holy world, through love, and through walking in God’s ways; but in the land beyond death it will grow towards perfection:

This life, this eternal life, consists for man in absolute oneness with God and all divine modes of being, oneness with every phase of right and harmony. It consists in a love as deep as it is universal, as conscious as it is unspeakable; a love that can no more be reasoned about than life itself—a love whose presence is its all-sufficing proof and justification, whose absence is an annihilating defect: he who has it it cannot believe in it: how should death believe in life, though all the birds of God are singing jubilant over the empty tomb! The delight of such a being, the splendour of a consciousness rushing from the wide open doors of the fountain of existence, the ecstasy of the spiritual sense into which the surge of life essential, immortal, increate, flows in silent fullness from the heart of hearts—what may it, what must it not be, in the great day of God and the individual soul! (US, 309) 16

Notes
1 MacDonald ‘preached perhaps more than a thousand sermons over the course of his life’ (GMP, preface.
2 The best account so far is in William Raaper, George MacDonald (Tring, Herts.: 1987), ch.24, pp.237-63.
3 See e.g. GMP, 48-9, 87, 307, 321; US, 79, 275-6, 328-62, 384-412, 450, 500-40, 577-92. In MacDonald’s view different churches and doctrines produce ‘separation, repulsion, recoil between the component particles of the Lord’s body’ (GMP, 48-9). Also, the dogmatic habit leads to considering human beings as masses, rather than as the individuals with each of whom God has a unique relationship (‘The New Name,’ US, 67-78).
4 ‘What in the name of God is our knowledge of the elements of the atmosphere to our knowledge of the elements of Nature?’ What is the analysis of
water to the babble of a running stream?’ (US, 350-1); see also 439, 452, 462-9. On the inability of science and the intellect either to prove or to disprove the existence of God—a side-swipe at contemporary loss of belief in the face of scientific discovery—see GMP, 71. MacDonald often widens his attack to one on the unfettered intellect itself (GMP, 135-6, 145, 218; US, 206, 259, 452-3, 468-9, 532-3, 589. The view is that ‘Your theory is not your faith, nor anything like it. Your faith is your obedience’ (US, 532). It has to be strange to see a man once destined for a career as a scientist so repudiating what must still be part of his nature and mental habit.

This is a mantra of MacDonald’s thought. See GMP, 73, 79, 171, 211, 296, 322; US, 185, 206, 211, 226, 259-61, 390-403, 437, 471-2, 504, 520, 533, 588.

6 See also GMP, 254, 309-10; US, 500-40, 550-3; LE, 15-16.

Thus he views evil more as a mental than a physical event: ‘Our wrong deeds are our dead works; our evil thoughts are our live sins’ (LE, 16).

7 GMP, 162, 184-90; US, 284, 286, 424-6, 429-30, 490, 537-8.

8 GMP, 48, 188, 278; US, 284, 422.

9 See also LE, 79; GMP, 90, 93, 94, 307. ‘The child-relation is the one eternal, ever-enduring, never-changing relation’ (LE, 71).

10 US, 424, 429-31, 470-5, 490-1, 537-8: ‘The highest truth is the relation in which man stands to the source of his being’ (US, 475).

11 GMP, 19, 100, 106, 328; US, 200, 291-2, 302, 456.

12 US, 463, 467; MOL, 92; ADO, 4-10.

13 MOL, 52-3; US, 291-2, 302, 456.

14 GMP, 9, 105; US 118, 161, 255-6; LE, 26.

15 See also US, 295, 312-3, 612-9; LE, ‘The Hope of the Universe,’ 91-102.
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