

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Reviews of Books.

**MENS CREATRIX.** An Essay by William Temple. London: *Macmillan and Co.* Price 7s. 6d. net.

By a singular paradox Mr. Temple commences a constructive essay in philosophy by a pre-supposition which is inimical to exactitude of thought. "The great bulk of our thinking is sub-conscious . . . it is only with consciousness that the philosopher can deal." The position is perilous and futile—perilous, for such stress on sub-conscious thinking enables intellectual laziness to plead that indolence is conducive to sound judgment—futile, for the sub-conscious becomes a vast receptacle into which convenience may consign a multitude of awkward facts, or where a limited knowledge may place unexplained phenomena. It is the duty of philosophy to attack the sub-conscious and bring it into the light. Perhaps, like the morning mist before the Sun, it will vanish before fuller thought. This sub-conscious realm reappears before the close of the book. "The sphere of the action of one spirit upon another is chiefly that region of the sub-conscious where most of our thinking takes place." But, as we shall see, Mr. Temple's thought upon the fundamentals of religion is deficient in respect of precision.

Philosophy is nothing if it is not consistent. It is obvious to the point of a truism that "the reason why different people are able to rest satisfied with different convictions about the same subject is often that they have asked different questions, to which different answers are needed." Religious people are entitled to the benefit of this consideration, and not too hastily to be corrected as ostensibly in error. "Our forefathers believed that the world was made in a week, precisely in order that men might dwell upon it; the heavens were spread as a canopy over men's heads, and the Sun and the Moon were designed to give light upon the earth. But Astronomy came and . . . made our world a tiny thing in infinite space; Geology made our whole history a moment in infinite time; Biology made our boasted faculties an incident in a process whose beginning and end are alike unknown." Yet our forefathers were right, for they interrogated the universe for religious purposes; Astronomy, Geology and Biology are mainly physical studies. Modern science, even if we include certain recent speculations respecting the spirits of the dead, is materialistic in thought and expression. The spiritual character of religion is lost if its anthropo-centric nature is overlooked. The first chapter of Genesis is true, though it be not the whole of scientific truth.

Philosophy is beset by the danger of an excessive individualism. To counteract the difficulty the suggestion has been made that a third category, the Tu, be inserted between the Ego and the non-ego. But the Tu both merges into the Ego and is an instance of the non-ego. Mr. Temple offers substantial help. He maintains that the finite faculties of the Ego hinder a perception of the total of Reality, and that to this end a "Society of Intellectuals" is demanded. The argument is sound, but to appreciate it more must be known than is yet available of "the action of one spirit upon another."

The burden of the essay is that Science, Art, Ethics and Religion, working upon lines which do not intersect, reach a point at which the Christian Faith comes to their aid and completion. The discussion is always readable, often brilliant, frequently discursive and finally inconclusive. The theme may be cordially accepted, but details are open to criticism. The attribution of timelessness to Mathematics and Art does not appear to be justified. The

appearance is imparted to *pure* Mathematics (the retention of the usual adjective would have indicated the reason) by the divorce of its symbols from realities : while, if Art is timeless, the imagination of the artist must be capable of producing the unimaginable. Nevertheless "the Society of Intellectuals" already alluded to, a kindred "Society of Artists" (which is all that Art can legitimately be said to require), the ethical responsibilities of the individual to the whole human race, and the hope of religions to conquer evil render the postulates of the Christian revelation both credible and not unreasonable. A Supreme and Holy Person accomplishing our redemption is just what all human search is looking for though it can never attain to it.

Here the method of investigation should be radically changed. Theology is not a sphere contiguous with Science, Art and Ethics, but overlaps at every part. It is not sufficient to bring a few protruding wires of isolated fact together for the electric current of Truth to flow. Portions of Revelation separated from the whole may convey erroneous impressions. The contents of Revelation must be fully studied not only to confirm, but also to enlarge and correct, the results of more secular reflection. The natural man discovers that there is good in the over-coming of evil : theology appreciates the fact and lays bare, as nature never can, the true character and destructive potentialities of sin. "It is conceivable that Judas Iscariot should become so wholly delivered from all self-concern that he may pass through the shame of his treachery and be able in perfect self-abnegation to rejoice that he was allowed to play a part, although a shameful part, in completing the manifestation of his Lord's glory." This is the outcome of natural thought : if theology cannot add to it and correct it, sin is not so very evil ; we had better "continue in sin that grace may abound."

The insufficiency of Mr. Temple's theology is evidenced by the fact that its explanation is accomplished in sixty pages contrasted with the two hundred and ninety-two needed to unfold the conclusions of the human mind. The acceptance of modern criticism of the Scriptures leads to statements which might have caused hesitation, though they are irrelevant. If the monotheism of Abraham was only partial and that of Moses doubtful, if the Yahweh who spoke to Israel on Mount Sinai was "apparently the God of Mount Sinai," if "to the people of that period Yahweh was of course one god among others," if "no doubt the God of Sinai was an austere Deity to be worshipped with an awful reverence and in complete detachment from all licentious rites," historical inquiry should show whence the conception of the God of Sinai arose, and theology must be interrogated whether there was any revelation to thought from God apart from an ordinary growth of intelligence within man. In the one case faith is reasonable ; in the other unwarranted assumptions are made, when this tribal god became in later times the one God of the whole earth. In either event Genesis is valueless, for it comes nowhere near to this "God of Sinai." If the Unity and Holiness of God were first directly revealed to the prophets, why did they call upon Israel for religious reformation rather than attempt to make all things new ? The Christian missionary does not attempt to reform the creeds and ritual of the Mohammedan, Buddhist, or Confucianist. But the whole matter is too discursive and alien to the general argument.

For the faith of the humble the Atonement of the Cross may be dogmatically presented as a revealed fact. But philosophy needs much more than comprehensive statements of the truth. Ethical instruction derives fresh conceptions and new powers from Christianity. Before a harmony of all branches of study can be undertaken, a satisfactory theory of the Atonement is a desideratum. In short, although the Christian will hold that Mr. Temple's doctrine is in itself reliable, he must also feel that his effort has come far short

of demonstration. Mr. Temple has provided a valuable stimulus to thought. The book bears signs of haste in its production. We may hope that the author will again return to the topic, for here we have abundant proof of his ability to carry us much further in a philosophy which shall be a genuine *apologia* of our Christian faith.

THE HEBREW-CHRISTIAN MESSIAH, or the Presentation of the Messiah to the Jews in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. By Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., with an Introductory Note by the Bishop of Ely. London: S.P.C.K. Price 10s. 6d. net.

It is being increasingly felt by students that, without some knowledge of Rabbinic literature, the force and significance of many passages of the New Testament are missed. Among Gentile Christians in this country there is none better qualified to guide us through the maze of Rabbinic theology than the Rev. Canon Lukyn Williams. Dr. Williams is not only a first-rate scholar, but also one who has made a life-long study of everything pertaining to Jewish history and theology. Further he is *au courant* with the best writings of continental scholars. When the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn invited him to deliver the Warburton Lectures in the years 1911-15, Dr. Williams wisely chose for his subject "The Hebrew-Christian Messiah" as He is presented in the Gospel according to St. Matthew. These Lectures are now given to the public in a handsome volume, well printed and on good paper.

In the Preface, we are told that the aim of these Lectures is threefold: Firstly, to understand the motives with which the author of the First Gospel composed his book; secondly, to expound the teaching of St. Matthew in its relation to ourselves; and thirdly, to advocate the cause of presenting Christ to the Jews of to-day. The Lectures deal with the Birth of our Lord; the Jewish Parties in the time of the Messiah; the Messiah as the Healer of disease, as Teacher, as the Son of David, as the Son of Man, as the Son of God, as Victor; the Messiah and the Cross, and the Messiah and the Apocalyp-tists. It will be seen that the whole life and work of our Lord, as He is revealed to us in St. Matthew's Gospel, is here dealt with.

Throughout the book, Canon Williams makes use of his intimate knowledge of Jewish thought to elucidate passages which would otherwise be obscure or altogether fail to attract the notice of the ordinary English reader. Take, for example, the genealogy in the first chapter of St. Matthew. The Evangelist begins his Gospel thus: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the son of Abraham." He then proceeds to give the genealogy in three divisions of fourteen names each. Why? To the Hebrew-Christian, for whom the Gospel was primarily written, the name of David would suggest that God's glorious promises to David had not failed. David's line did not die out, but "the direct line of heirship was continued in that family of humble circumstances into which the Christ was born." The plan of the genealogy is thoroughly Jewish. "St. Matthew has arranged his matter by the Hebrew letters of the word David. As David in Hebrew has three letters, so in the genealogy there are three divisions. As these three letters make up fourteen by numerical value, . . . so the writer arranges his matter in fourteens" (p. 16).

Canon Williams has a good deal to say about the Parties in the time of our Lord. As it is well known, our Lord severely denounces the Pharisees. Josephus, on the other hand, speaks of their "virtuous conduct," and the description, in the Talmud, of some of their leaders is by no means unpleasant. How are we to reconcile these divergent verdicts? Canon Williams dis-

cusses various theories advanced. Prof. Chwolson and several modern Jewish scholars are of opinion that in some passages the original reading was only "scribes," or "Priests" or "Sadducees," and that later copyists added or substituted "Pharisees." Canon Box thinks that our Lord's invectives were not aimed against the Pharisees as a class, but only against comparatively few of them. In the *CHURCHMAN* of September, 1911, he suggested that our Lord's denunciations were directed against the followers of the stern and narrow Shammai, and not against those of the peaceful and tolerant Hillel. Dr. Williams's own explanation is that our Lord sometimes used the word "hypocrite" in a somewhat different sense from that which we ordinarily attach to it. See, for example, St. Matt. vii. 5; xv. 7-9; Luke xii. 56. "Our Lord," he says, "seems to use the word hypocrite in these cases when the life is inconsistent with the profession made, but without any connotation of wilful and conscious deceit" (p. 90).

In the chapter on "the Messiah—the Son of God," Canon Williams asks, How came St. Matthew, a strictly monotheistic Jew, "to believe that Jesus of Nazareth was divine, and yet to show no sign of any consciousness that he was committing blasphemy in this belief, or idolatry in worshipping Him?" He answers: "During the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth, St. Matthew received the impression of Him as a unique personality" (p. 327). "The Resurrection must have enormously increased the belief of the disciples in the supernatural origin of Jesus." Yet it was only after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost that St. Matthew came "to the amazing conclusion that Jesus was not only the Son of David, and the Son of Man, but even the Son of God, in the highest meaning of that supreme title" (p. 328).

"Can we, then, as thinking men, believe in the Divinity of Jesus? I answer that the question is rather: Can we help believing in it, if we accept the Gospel narrative as substantially correct? And treat the narrative as critically as you may . . . the residuum is that One stands out before us unique in history for the powers He displayed over disease and nature; for the holiness He exhibited in every place and in all circumstances; for the continuous communion He enjoyed with His Father in heaven; for the love which prompted Him to give at last His very life for others; for the triumph He gained after death—One Who claimed to be above angels, and even to be on an equality with God; One upon Whom the earliest Christian Church, the society of the first believing Jews, was built, and in Whom, as they affirmed, they obtained pardon and peace and power, in a word, eternal life. Who or what is He, this irreducible minimum of the Gospel story?" (p. 331).

All through the book, Dr. Williams uses modern critical methods and comes to eminently orthodox conclusions. It is delightful to find him justifying St. Matthew in his use of the Old Testament prophecies. He has laid Bible students under a deep debt of gratitude. To read, mark, learn and inwardly digest this volume in itself constitutes a liberal theological education.

KHODADAD E. KEITH.

---

CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC? By the Rev. T. J. Hardy, M.A. London: Robert Scott. Price 2s. 6d. net.

The Sub-title is "Twelve letters to one unsettled in the English Church." We gather that the person in question holds most Roman doctrines, including some very advanced worship of the Blessed Virgin and a belief in the Immaculate Conception. The point at issue is whether he shall also swallow Papal Infallibility and go over to Rome. The first five letters refute the Petrine claim. These are well written and will be generally useful. (It might have

been well to refer to Salmon's classical work in giving a list of books on the subject.) The other letters deal with the alleged causes of dissatisfaction in the English Church. They will no doubt be extremely useful for a certain class of very advanced "Anglo-Catholics." The present writer finds it utterly impossible to accept many of the statements and arguments in them. On these points Mr. Hardy is entitled to his own opinion, even to his implied denial to non-Episcopalians of a place in the Holy Catholic Church. We would, however, suggest the desirability of verifying references. For instance, on page 54 he writes, "Cranmer, who was mainly responsible for the English Ordinal, knew that he was thus preserving the old 'intention,' for he wrote in 1551 that he 'never intended to deny that the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice.' In fact, the word 'Sacrament' covers and 'intends' the word 'Sacrifice,' so that when we use the former we include the latter." Now with this "quotation" from Cranmer (on the Lord's Supper, p. 369 ed. Parker Soc.) we have two grounds of quarrel. First, the words alleged to be quoted are not found on that page at all. We doubt if they are found anywhere else. Secondly, the meaning which Mr. Hardy intends them to suggest as being Cranmer's opinion, by the context in which he "quotes" them, is exactly opposite to what Cranmer does in substance say on the page in question. Cranmer affirms a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving on the part of all Christian people. Mr. Hardy ascribes to him a desire to perpetuate "intention" to sacrifice in the sense of the Roman Ordinal! Truly there is still need of Bishop Dowden's famous advice to verify references.

C. H. K. BOUGHTON.

CAN WE KNOW JESUS? By Henry Wallace, with Introduction by the Rev. W. L. Walker, D.D. London: Robert Scott. Price 3s. 6d. net.

We must say frankly that we do not like the title of this book; nor can we follow the learned author in all his reasonings and contentions. With this caveat we are free at once to say there is much in this volume of thought-compelling interest. Mr. Wallace, who is Minister of Parkhead Congregational Church, Glasgow, draws a distinction between "knowing" and understanding, and he sets himself to show that we have not understood Christ or His teaching. He disposes, somewhat summarily, of what he calls "theological prepossessions," but we should be inclined to maintain that some of those "prepossessions" are more nearly in accordance with the Truth than Mr. Wallace's interpretations. The chapter on "The Moods of Jesus and His Counsels" and that on "His Social Relations" are of interest, but we differ from any view that would put the emphasis on what is often called the "humanness" of Jesus, as we believe that in the present day the great need is for a clear and still clearer witness to the Divinity of Christ. We know that Mr. Wallace accepts the fact of the Virgin Birth and other fundamental truths of the Christian faith, but we wish he had dealt with these great themes in a more robust tone. In proceeding he sets out what he regards as "Christ's own Ideas and His Mission," "Christ's Ruling Ideas" and "Christ's Idea of God and the Kingdom," and in this section we have some beautiful and uplifting thoughts. So, too, in the chapters on "Justice and Righteousness," and "Grace and Love," there is much that is pure and bright and true. The chapter on "The Sacredness of the Soul" shows us the infinite value our Lord placed upon it; and the two final chapters, "The True Society of Jesus" and "Faith and the Kingdom of God," show the writer's true Catholicity of spirit and broadmindedness. The Church and Christianity—which are not necessarily convertible terms—are passing through a time of testing, which will undoubtedly grow fiercer in the months

and years immediately ahead of us, and it is important, nay it is necessary, that there should be the sternest examination of foundation principles. But in the process we must be careful not to undermine the position. Mr. Wallace's view-point is somewhat "modern," and we are sufficiently old-fashioned to believe that what is new is not always true, and what is true is not always new. We have, however, nothing but praise for the earnestness with which he insists upon the fact, to quote Dr. Walker's words, that "it is Christ *in the life*, in our own actual circumstances, that is so greatly needed—that is, in fact, the essential thing in Christianity." The work is marked by reverent care and deserves close study.

THE WAR, GOD AND OUR DUTY. By the Rev. W. L. Walker, D.D. London : Robert Scott. Price 2s. net.

Dr. Walker has given us a very useful book. He first examines the struggle "in the light of the reality of God," and if his treatment is sometimes drastic and severe it is always essentially just. The opening chapter, on "The War as a trial of Faith and Fidelity" puts the case very fairly, and many who have become uneasy will find much in Dr. Walker's arguments to settle and steady their faith. Then follow two most helpful chapters on what the trial says (1) to the nation and (2) to the Church. The truth is powerfully enforced that if, as a nation, we would have God with us, we must be wholly with Him, and in regard to the Church it is pointed out that it is called to self-examination and revival. The failure of the nation and the Church is pointed out, and Dr. Walker says much that has long wanted saying and says it well. On the national side of the question he treats of the conscientious objector—slightly in the text and more fully in the appendix—in a way that should give that class of person furiously to think. The chapter on "The Help of God" is important as showing the principles which must ever govern a righteous war, and Dr. Walker's plea for "Prayer in the Present Crisis" is strong and powerful, not only by reason of its insistence upon prayer as the prelude to a righteous peace but also because it sets great importance upon prayer as a means by which the eyes of the nation may be opened to all that is wrong in the national life. This leads up naturally to the next chapter, "The Ending of the War and the Call that comes to us," in which we are reminded that whether the new era will be a better one depends largely on ourselves. But Dr. Walker's volume is not confined to the discussion of these and kindred questions. He has comfort to offer to the sorrowing and hope for the slain. He will not carry every one with him in his discussion of the destiny of those who die in battle who are not Christian believers, but the point on which he lays stress, that "the spirit which moved a man to be willing to give up his life in a worthy cause shows that there is something in him of real value, capable of being raised to the Divine Ideal," is one that should not be overlooked. Altogether we may well thank Dr. Walker for an inspiring and stimulating book.

