

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

THE CHURCHMAN

October, 1927.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

The Church with Two Voices.

IN July the Church Assembly adopted the new Prayer Book drawn up by the Bishops. This has been described as the most momentous decision in the Church of England since the Reformation. It may well be so. We doubt if the full significance of the decision will be realized for a considerable time to come. Whatever action Parliament may take the Book has been adopted by the Church Assembly, the representative body of the Church. The primary result is that our Church becomes a Church with two voices. There are two great outstanding conceptions of Christianity. They are poles apart in character. Each contains elements contradictory of the other. Any weekly issue of such organs of religious opinion as *The Christian World* on the one hand, and *The Tablet* on the other, reveals the lines of deep cleavage between the two. The Sunday services in Brooklyn Tabernacle or St. Peter's at Rome, or to come nearer home, the differences in the worship in the City Temple and Westminster Cathedral show the practical working of these two conceptions in their approach to God. The one may be an extreme type of the Reformed Church, and the other an equally extreme type of the unreformed Church. But here is no possibility of mistaking the fact that they are distinct types with irreconcilable features. The attempt of the Bishops which has received the sanction of the Church Assembly is, to put it bluntly, to combine these two types in the Anglican Communion. In the past it has proved impossible to combine them and there is little reason to believe that the future will belie the experience of the past.

The Conflicting Types of Christianity.

In a sermon at Westminster Abbey the Bishop of Birmingham emphasized the nature and origin of "the two conflicting types of Christianity now struggling for mastery." He pointed out that "Catholicism, as we see it in its full development in the Roman Church, is a Christianized mystery religion. Evangelical Protestantism represents a repudiation of accretions from paganism and a return to the faith taught by Jesus in the Gospels." The foundation of Evangelical faith, he pointed out, was belief in God with a resultant personal relationship to Him through Jesus Christ. Therefore "we need no priest to bring us to His presence. . . . Our worship is that of men free and equal before God; we are

joined by Sacraments which express our unity, one with another, in dependence upon God alone." The "Catholic" system grew up "in a period when the progressive deterioration of human thought was painfully rapid." The Evangelical system of the Reformers, on the other hand, "re-created the Sacrament of Christian unity, the fellowship meal in which Christ's followers are joined in a unity of service to their Lord. The belief that at consecration a change took place in the substance of the bread and wine was emphatically rejected. It belongs to a lower stage of religious culture than we get in pure Christianity." We require to keep the distinction between these two conceptions of Christianity before our minds, for to this lower type of Christianity our Church has been steadily tending. "It has been revived in our Church in recent years, and to it the new Prayer Book makes dangerous concessions."

The Position of the Bishops.

As many have supported the new Prayer Book solely on the understanding that the Bishops are determined to act unitedly and to assert the necessity of obedience to its requirements it will be a matter of importance to observe the statements and actions of various members of the Episcopate. Many are already expressing doubts as to the possibility of the united action of the Bishops. Past experience does not afford much ground for expecting it. The diocese of London has always been the outstanding example of what we may describe mildly as independent action. It is said that the Bishop of Chichester has already expressed his determination to govern his diocese in his own way. We may be sure that other bishops will assert their right to interpret the new rubrics according to their own views. The Archbishop of Canterbury has promised that the Bishops will issue a statement as to their policy in the treatment of the new Book. It is a somewhat ironical position that the revision which was to remove all such difficulties of interpretation is already seen to open up possibilities of diversity to which the old Book could only by the exercise of considerable ingenuity be considered liable. If the chief reason for the production of the new Book is the restoration of order and the maintenance of some measure of uniformity its main purpose seems already to a great extent to be stultified. The Bishop of Worcester has indicated some of the difficulties awaiting individual bishops, if they are bound to act in accordance with any decision of the majority which they cannot conscientiously accept.

The Appeal to Parliament.

Many objections have been raised against churchpeople opposed to the revised Prayer Book taking steps to inform Parliament of the grounds of their opposition. It is thought by supporters of the Book that the consent of Parliament is merely a formality. This is not the view taken by the Ecclesiastical Committee. That body has determined to give serious consideration to any statements submitted to them regarding the character of the new forms of

service. The worship of an Established Church is a matter of importance to the whole nation. It cannot be claimed that it is only the concern of the members of that Church, especially in view of the fact that many who regard themselves as potential if not actual members have been alienated from its worship by the introduction of teaching as well as rites and ceremonies definitely prohibited by the present Prayer Book. The legalizing of some of these practices and doctrines in a new Book is a matter of the utmost concern to them, and to the nation as a whole. National character in the past has largely been the outcome of the teaching and worship of the National Church. Those who desire to maintain that character, which has won for the English people in all parts of the world a unique reputation for truth and honesty, are justified in making every effort to secure the national interests in the Houses of Parliament. There are other grounds on which an appeal to Parliament may be justified, but the future character of the nation warrants careful consideration of the future character of the Church.

The Lausanne Conference.

It is impossible yet to estimate the value of the World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lausanne in August. That such a representative gathering of every section of the Christian world with one or two exceptions was in itself a remarkable achievement. The credit for this must be given to American inspiration and perseverance. Many obstacles had to be overcome and long and careful preparations had to be made. The discussions revealed the old lines of divisions with which we are familiar from the Conferences held in this country since the Lambeth Conference of 1920. At Lausanne the same divergences were evident in regard to Creeds, the Church, the Ministry and the Sacraments. The same problem also arose in reference to the use of words with widely differing interpretations of their meaning. The same claim was put forward that actions might be performed, such as ordination or celebration of the Holy Communion, without any definite interpretation being put upon them. Pleas were made for the widest freedom and toleration by some, while others put forward exclusive theories which must result in narrowness and intolerance. We can only say that while we do not despair of some ultimate unity of Christendom, if not in actual organization, yet in spirit and co-operation, we feel that there can be little advance towards a complete solution as long as a theory of the Church is maintained which requires a ministry of one particular type depending upon a particular theory of transmission of grace. Such views are really medieval in character and border more upon magical and superstitious conceptions than upon the spiritual ideals of Christ.

The Province of East Africa.

A practical example of the problems of unity even within our own Communion is presented in the proposals to form an East African Province of our Church. The proposals were considered

at a Conference held at Nairobi last July. The Bishop of Uganda gave an account of them in the *East African Standard*. He described the problem which the Conference was called to face as "not only difficult and complicated, but actually unique in the history of Christian missions." This is due to the development of the Anglican Church in Uganda and Kenya under the Evangelical influence of the Church Missionary Society and in Zanzibar under the Anglo-Catholic influence of the Universities Mission to Central Africa. "The question to be faced was whether, given the acknowledged differences of ecclesiastical tradition and practice, it would yet be possible for the different dioceses to come together, and work happily and harmoniously, under one leader." A further complication arises from the existence of the Kikuyu Alliance to which one of the dioceses is committed. The proposals are to be carried through with safeguards for the independence of each diocese in its own internal arrangements. As long as the unfettered development of the Evangelical dioceses is fully maintained, and the natural affinity of Evangelical Churchmen with their non-Episcopal brethren can be pressed forward to its full expression in the realization of the early hopes of the Kikuyu Movement, there can be no objection to the progress indicated in the formation of the Province. If it should prove to be a means of asserting Anglo-Catholic exclusiveness and the claims of that School to dominate, the freedom of Evangelicals must be strongly asserted and maintained.

The Pastoral of the Wesleyan Conference.

The Pastoral recently issued by the Annual Conference of the Wesleyan Church contains matter that is of interest to all sections of the Church. It refers to the rush of life to-day and to the increase of Christian effort to keep pace with this modern rush. Yet greater organization, improved methods of work in Sunday Schools and elsewhere are not meeting the need. They frequently only produce a sense of strain. There is vision and organization but not power. "The chief cause of the Church's failure to accomplish more is that it is not drawing upon its reserves of spiritual power. Hence its outstanding need at the present time is to wait more upon God. . . . The Church's sense of powerlessness is due, at least in part, to its forgetfulness of the very God whom it serves." This may well be taken as a message to all the Churches. "The sense of God is the secret of power." Little will be accomplished by the development of organization and Church machinery until there is a deeper spiritual experience and a more intense realization of God and of fellowship with Him through Jesus Christ. The Church has great and pressing problems to face. A great work for God is waiting to be accomplished in this generation. We are all eager that the power to accomplish this work should be ours. We welcome the message of this Wesleyan Pastoral which bids Christian people to seek this power from God, to find it in a fresh realization of the Holy Spirit at work in our midst. "The Church must betake itself afresh to God."

Editorial Note.

We present to our readers this quarter a number of articles bearing upon important current problems. When a bishop can describe the Evangelical opponents of the new Prayer Book as an army of illiterates, it is well to show that scholarship has its representatives on this side as able and well equipped as on any other. The article on "Which Communion Service?" by the Rev. A. R. Whately, D.D., shows the grounds of objection to the new Prayer of Consecration from one aspect. The article on "The Greek Sources of the New Consecration Prayer," by the Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., shows the objections from another aspect. The Rev. A. J. Macdonald, B.D., writes on a kindred topic in dealing with recent theological and philosophical views in his article on "Recent Theories of the Incarnation." Canon A. Lukyn Williams, D.D., gives an interesting account of the several phases of the modern Jewish communities in "The More Spiritual Side of Modern Judaism." The concluding portion of Mr. John Knipe's account of "Bernardino Ochino of Siena" shows the closing stages in the career of that great preacher whose sympathies were with the Reformation Movement. The account of the Church in Finland by the Rev. G. W. Kerr, LL.B., enables us to realize the present religious situation in that country as seen by one who has had recently been in touch with it. We have endeavoured as usual to give an account of some of the most important recent books as far as space permits. We venture to ask those who find *THE CHURCHMAN* useful and instructive to assist us in our efforts to secure for it a still larger circulation.



WHICH COMMUNION SERVICE ?

BY ARNOLD R. WHATELY, D.D.

THIS article, as the title indicates, leaves open the question, "Ought the alternative to be granted?" It is quite possible to hold that a new doctrinal position is implied in the new office, and to reject this position, and yet to accept the situation on the ground maintained by the late Bishop of Chelmsford in his general attitude towards the widely differing standpoints, that not mere toleration, but frank and full inclusion, is the true call of present facts. This question is not here before us.

But when the Bishops assure us that no doctrinal change is intended, we are still free to hold our own opinions as to whether the effect of their work does or does not keep within the limits of this intention. This article is written under the pressure of a very strong feeling that we who will not be able to use the new Consecration Prayer must define clearly to ourselves and to others our reasons for this refusal. It is time that some demur were made to the over-emphasis of liturgical considerations. The claim of the ordinary Christian and that of the theological thinker alike need to be firmly asserted. The modern prejudice against "Systematic Theology" is not, I think, merely a commendable suspicion of the rigid and artificial in religious thought, but an unwillingness to *think out* any question of doctrinal logic at all. There has been a disposition among certain churchmen to treat contemptuously the attitude of those who are unable to reconcile the new features of the Consecration Prayer with the Evangelical standpoint, and a strange failure to understand how there can be any field of serious argument at all. One cannot but venture to suggest that, if they themselves would think a little more adequately on the question, they might—though still adhering to their own views—suffer a salutary disillusionment as to its simplicity.

The great danger—and I do not hesitate to call it such—is that the old Communion Service will practically drop out altogether for lack of clear definition and thoroughgoing defence. For we need not be afraid to admit that prejudice may be a strong ally even on the right side. The question is not whether all who, for themselves, decline the change are truly independent thinkers, but whether, behind and beside all prejudice, there may not be intuitions and reasons that ought to be encouraged to come into the open in their own defence.

It is with this feeling that I wish to offer a little contribution to the definition of an attitude that is commonly too loosely and perfunctorily defined. Those who are unfavourable to the legalization of the alternative and those who would allow but could not use it will probably soon be united, the difference irrevocably decided and the bond alone remaining. What we shall need then is to draw a sharp line round the service that we hold to, a line

across which we cannot *drift*, and that neither fashion nor expediency nor the morbid fear of being "labelled" shall be able to bias our judgment. The advocates of the new service are welcome to do their best to convince the prejudiced—and even, for that matter, the unprejudiced. We need not be keen to take advantage of mere *vis inertiae* against the change. But it would be a grievous pity to lose what some of us hold to be the greater and unalloyed treasure just because we are not competent to express and maintain the intuitions that respond to it.

We shall strengthen, not weaken, our position, by frankly recognizing that differences of opinion are rooted in differences of vision. Not only the value but even the truth of our religious ideas depends partly upon the degree and manner in which they stimulate and enrich our sense of spiritual realities, not entirely upon the test of intellectual criticism. For the very meaning of these ideas lies not *entirely* in the region accessible to controversy, but in a transcendent sphere of spiritual knowledge. This is the substance of Otto's doctrine of "ideograms," and I believe it to be of far-reaching importance. In this light is to be viewed the undoubted spiritual value, for some people, of ideas that others cannot accept as "conceptually true," or even as true to their own experience. It is the charter of our right to differ even from doctrines that "make saints," but also the true guide to the spirit in which we should differ.

The scope of this article will be confined to the two crucial new features of the Consecration Prayer, the Memorial before God and the Epiclesis—the latter only in so far as it is an invocation upon the elements.

The former passage runs as follows: "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, according to his holy institution do celebrate and set forth before thy divine Majesty the memorial which he hath willed us to make, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us."

The first comment that suggests itself is this. If it cannot be actually maintained that this passage *necessarily* alludes to the narratives of the institution (a large concession), it is surely very difficult and awkward to take it otherwise. And yet how can it be shown that a memorial to the Father is there directed, without placing upon the two words *ἀναμνησῖς* and *καταγγέλλετε* a meaning which—to say the least—is strongly contested? Is it well that this solemn and central act of devotion should even seem to incorporate disputable exegesis?

But the objection goes deeper still than this. Even though it be granted that the words need only express that Divine intention that must be assumed to lie behind all that the sacrament means, there still remains the vital question whether or no we can accept

this memorializing of the infinite Being as part of that meaning. An attempt has been made to turn the edge of this objection by interpreting the memorial clause to mean simply that the memorial, like all acts of worship, is made in God's presence and as before Him, not that He is the direct object of the memorializing act. This, at least, seems the clearest and most favourable way of stating the distinction. In that case the word "before" will refer not to the act of commemoration as such, but simply to the act of worship as such. I am not quite sure how much is intended to be conveyed by this interpretation as regards the Godward character of the act ; but if the reply is at all relevant to the essential objection, it gives a very thin, and surely not very convincing, meaning to the words. Can we possibly exclude the idea of memorializing God when we speak of celebrating a memorial before God ? And would those who most value this element in the service be content consistently to regard it in this light ? And in fact all that belongs to the essence of the rite as actually instituted is not worship at all, but is incorporated in worship. The Memorial cannot be regarded as Godward on the strength of its character as worship, for in itself it has no such character. The Memorial as such is simply acted speech. The question is not about its utterance in the presence of God, but whether it is addressed to God. That is what a Godward memorial means. The sacrifice of ourselves, which we make on the basis of Christ's Sacrifice, is of course Godward. But this does not make the celebration of the latter Godward.

That view has received expression in a formula due mainly to the late Rev. N. Dimock, and accepted at the Fulham Conference of 1900 :

"That, as one aspect of the ordinance, there may be truly said to be a submitting to the Divine view of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ, in representation, not *re*-presentation, not as making, but as having made once for all the perfect propitiation for the sins of the world."

This, it would appear, was accepted unanimously by the Conference, except that there was some difference of opinion on the clause "representation, not *re*-presentation." (This, we may remark in passing, is rather strange in view of what one, if not two, of the members had said in the previous discussion.) Such statements mean much or little according to the particular setting which they occupy in the mind of the individual. But in any case they mean something, and those who differ from them may say that where they are most innocuous they are least consistent. They call, too, for further scrutiny, for it may well appear that the distinctions made in this pronouncement are not as clear below the surface as they are upon it ; and this objection might be maintained both by those who would disallow the idea of the Godward memorial and by those who would carry it further.

The main challenge—to show the inherent intelligibility of the idea in view of all that we believe about God—ought, I think, to be faced before we urge the apparently parallel case of prayer.

Then we may go on to consider the question: Do we not hold before God the fact of Christ's Death when we pray "in the Name of Jesus Christ"? I do not think that this plea is valid, and that for two reasons.

In the first place, I cannot believe that in prayer—even in pleading the Atonement—we really set any fact before God. Or, if we do, it is as a sort of *argumentum ad hominem* addressed to ourselves. Rather, we set the fact before our own minds, even though in words addressed to God. A comparison with other forms of address to the Almighty will help to make this clear. We often—as in the case of most of the collects—affirm some attribute of God. In certain cases, particularly, it is difficult to think that we are holding them up as facts before God. When we say, "O God, whose nature and property is ever to have mercy and to forgive," and still more obviously when we address Him as "always more ready to hear than we to pray," we are surely not so doing. Our approach is of quite the opposite character. Now of course it does not follow that because God is not memorialized in such passages as these, He is not memorialized when we plead the merits of Christ. But that is not the point. These clauses show that when we plead we do not therefore present. They thus throw the burden of proof upon those who assert that we do so when we plead the Death or merits of Christ. In fact, we cannot argue, baldly and directly, from our use of language as addressed to men to its implications when addressed to God. Speech is an instrument formed on the lower plane and adapted to the higher. And Religious devotion, when it uses it, has to make the best of its resources and avoid its pitfalls.

The distinction may seem a fine one. Let us illustrate it by reference to a well-known hymn that has been made prominent in the recent controversy—"And now, O Father, mindful of the love." The distinction would rule out one couplet, but not any other passage, of the hymn. It would not rule out

"For lo! between our sins and their reward
We set the passion of thy Son our Lord,"

nor

"By this prevailing presence we appeal,"

but only the (very ugly) line that introduces the main clause of the first stanza,

"We here present, we here spread forth to thee
That one true offering perfect in thine eyes." . . .

But fine distinctions sometimes indicate broad differences. And an idea so pronounced and emphasized as the Memorial in the new Consecration Prayer asks for definite acceptance or definite rejection.

To plead, then, is not to present. It is to cast ourselves upon. But secondly, it is worth asking whether the case of prayer is really parallel with that of sacramental communion. In the former we plead; in the latter we receive. And these, again, are two quite opposite directions of the mind, and cannot be combined. It is true that receiving, in or outside the sacrament, is very closely asso-

ciated with prayer, and that prayer, and therefore pleading, is the very setting of our acts of communion. But the actual sacrament itself, being the one, cannot be the other. *A fortiori* it is not presentation.

But, apart from this question of prayer, it is held by some that the High Priestly work of Christ involves His own presenting of His Sacrifice before the Father, and that this is the basis of ours. I cannot see that this is so at all. In the first place it must be noted that the conception of the High Priesthood is not like one drawn from an indefinite field of possible analogies, that strikes the eye because of its special appropriateness. Christ is the High Priest because His work *superseded* the office of the High Priest, the Mediator because He absorbed all finite mediation. Of course this implies at least a minimum of resemblance. But it is the relation rather than the resemblance that gives the key to the understanding of His sacerdotal office. The mental picture of the ascended Lord standing and pleading for us before the Father *may* be a help to understanding of His work for us, but it must not dominate our thoughts. We know, apart from this, what we mean when we say that our prayers go up to God through Him. This is vivid in our experience whatever difficulties we may have in formulating the doctrine. And specially real to us is this when we think of the prayers of the Church as focussed and effective in the Person of its Redeemer and Head. This idea is complete without any further elements drawn from the analogy of the Jewish Priesthood.

Now if, on the other hand, we begin by constructing a picture of Christ before the Father, and *then* apply it to His relation to the Church, we are not only trying to think the unthinkable, but we are positively running counter to what we believe about God. If this were needed to supply a link, we might perhaps plead that the apparently irrational doctrine of Christ presenting the fact of His Death before the Father covered some mysterious truth. But is this so? And we who find it hard to give a rational explanation of *our* presenting it will hardly find the other idea any easier. Rather we should feel that it explains *ignotum per ignotius*.

It may well be that the Epistle to the Hebrews does include the entrance of Christ into Heaven with His Death in one broad conception of His Sacrifice; but to pass *per saltum* from this to a *continual* presentation of it is surely to introduce a new element altogether. We must, however, carefully avoid committing ourselves to wider considerations than the scope of this article absolutely demands. Let it suffice to urge that we who, rightly or wrongly, regard the presentation of Christ's Sacrifice as consummated in His entrance into the heavenly places can certainly not argue from any supposed presentation, or even pleading, of it, on His part, throughout the ages.

These considerations should determine our thought when we come to set the Memorial clause by the side of the earlier clause, contained in both Consecration Prayers, which has always meant so much to Anglican Protestants, the reference to the "full, perfect,

and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." It is equally vain to treat the one as a direct and obvious contradiction of the other and to reconcile them by any facile formula. All depends on just how much we include in the definition of the one perfected Sacrifice. If it is to be so understood as to leave room for any subsequent setting of it before the attention of God—or for anything that that expression might remotely and haltingly convey—then there is no inconsistency. But that it does not leave room even for this is a position that at least challenges serious argument. The Evangelical *claims* at least that the idea of the "finished work" holds a pivotal place in his theology, and is carried through with more logical thoroughness than in other systems: and if, from this standpoint, he holds that the earlier clause preoccupies the ground demanded by the Memorial clause, he is surely no mere child in the faith whose blunders must be simply corrected.

There is no space to consider the quasi-metaphysical attempts to spread the Sacrifice of Christ through subsequent time. I believe that they are philosophically unsound; and at any rate they must follow, not lead, those purely religious conceptions upon which we are so divided. My aim is simply to show, first, that there is a clear issue at the start, and secondly, that when we do proceed to thresh it out, far-reaching considerations present themselves. Those who do not belong to the Evangelical school have sometimes been a little too glib in telling those who do what they (the latter) from *their* standpoint ought to accept. Not that this is fundamentally and always unallowable, but it ought to be done with caution and reserve. *Ceteris paribus* we severally understand our own type of religion best. "The heart has reasons that reason does not know."

But at this point we reach the experiential side of doctrinal differences. It has been necessary to make some allusion to this at the beginning of the article. A word may be said touching its application to the Memorial. On one side of my mind I can feel some real sympathy with those who welcome it as "enrichment," and am distinctly conscious of something left behind when I reject it. But this does not in the least imply that my rejection is in any way hesitating or half-hearted. Something that eludes analysis has been lost, but the deeper and more central intuition is strengthened and vitalized by the rejection. The author of a valuable and very thoughtful work on the Holy Communion from the point of view of experience and devotion frankly admits his inability to give a rational meaning to this appeal to the Almighty, but accepts it because it is so real in his experience. This is an attitude of mind that we can understand and respect, though it is not, I think, often consciously adopted. It is significant and instructive to all who study religious experience. But it can only be adopted where the idea thus accepted appears irrational only *in itself*, not by those in whose reason and intuition it impinges upon something more vital.

We to whom the affirmation of the perfect Sacrifice is the heart and centre of the whole service, and of much more, should guard

our treasure with watchful eye. "Enrichment" is not the only—or chief—thing that we need in our devotion. The vigour and concentration of its central purport may be a still higher ideal. Direct contradiction is not the only danger that we have to fear. If we *cannot* make a memorial to God of His memorial to us : if we cannot turn the stimuli that our own souls need toward Him whose knowledge and grace can never fail : if we even suppress our promptings to do so : we are not defenders of a mere negation. We are asking for free play for a form of faith that has for us a greater power and reality—yes, and a richer content—than any loose eclecticism could ever give in exchange.

The second addition that I wish to discuss is the *Epiclesis*, or Invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon the elements. "Hear us, O merciful Father, we humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that, receiving the same, we may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul."

Of the *Epiclesis* the Bishop of Gloucester says : "When we find an *Epiclesis* in all the Eastern forms, in the earliest Roman form and in the early Gallican forms, the right, and, I think, the necessary, deduction is that it is one of the most primitive features of the Consecration Prayer." The degree of force that such considerations have for us will depend on the various presuppositions in our several minds. Only a one-sided form of Protestantism will be disposed merely to brush them aside. But we are taking the point of view of those for whom even the most venerable forms of worship can but appeal on their own merits to the spiritual sense and emancipated thought of the individual.

It has been specially urged in favour of this addition that it saves us from one undesirable feature of the Roman Canon, the suggestion, at least, of consecration by a magic formula. It is difficult to attach much weight to this plea. The recital of the narrative of the Institution is so natural a feature of even the most Protestant office that without the predisposition to believe in an explicit, definite, and instantaneous transformation of the elements we could hardly regard it in that light. And, on the other hand, if we have this predisposition, the focus would easily present itself. And, further, even we who do not take this view will most of us probably agree so far with the Roman Church as to hold that Christ, not the Holy Spirit, is the true Consecrator. This, as will be seen, is closely connected with the crucial question that we shall raise respecting the *Epiclesis*.

But there is one consideration that it is desirable to notice before we deal with the main point. Sometimes the new *Epiclesis* is attacked on the ground that the Holy Spirit does not act upon dead matter, and defended by maintaining that He does. Now the conceptions of spirit and matter are highly abstruse, and it is surely

better, in these popular controversies, to leave such purely philosophical questions alone. The writer of this article would be the last to underrate the importance of the Philosophy of Religion; but little is gained in Theology by the importation of cheap *ad hoc* metaphysics. Evangelicals are not wise when they obscure the obvious objection that comes to view from their standpoint by a consideration which bears upon it, though really, yet not clearly and directly. The other side, if they think that all Protestant opposition worth noticing vanishes with the dismissal of this metaphysical objection, are strangely mistaken.

The main point is this: does the Invocation imply a change in the elements as physical objects, or does it not carry this as a necessary implication? (The importance of this question lies not in its isolation, but in its connection with two rival contexts of thought.) It is pointed out that the change in the elements is only relative, only "unto us." This may be an alleviation, but it does not touch the primary objection. Christ's institution, I submit, has made them once for all what they are "for us." If the actual effect of their use upon us depends on any virtue imparted to them as physical objects, it does not make much difference if we assert that this change is relative to us, for it must still be a change *in* the elements. Any substantial relief that this qualification gives us would be given, as it seems to me, at the cost of consistency. But a fuller—though concise—statement of the Protestant doctrine,—barring "Zwinglian" negations,—will be desirable.

Such doctrine is essentially positive, and the Presence it postulates is essentially a real and objective Presence. A tendency to waver in some presentations of it must not blind us to this. Here, of course, it will be outside our purpose to defend it, or to dwell upon its full significance, except so far as exposition is itself defence. Its truth or otherwise does not come within the range of our discussion, only its consistency with the new Consecration Prayer.

The Presence of Christ is, we believe, objective, because that of which we partake is necessarily as such outside us till it has been received within us. Real participation involves a real Presence. Also a unique participation—distinguished from other means of grace—implies a corresponding uniqueness of the Presence. But this Presence is in the symbols as such, not in the material objects as such. They are no ordinary symbols, for they are the symbols of no ordinary reality. They could not be the symbols of the nearness and direct self-offering of the Gift without actually focussing and presenting it. To suppose that they could might be shown, I think, to be inconsistent even with the general idea of the presence of Christ. But we hold that, even as the living God acts through the use of material symbols, so it is the living soul of the communicant that acts through the hand and the mouth. As there is God behind the one, so there is the live soul—acting with purpose and faith—behind the other. Otherwise the *res sacramenti* does not pass. There can be no unfruitful reception of *it*, only of the elements. It is focussed to faith, and the mean by which it is received is faith.

This faith is expressed in visible action, even as the *res* is indicated by visible objects, and conveyed by visible action.

Perhaps one disadvantage in a statement even as full as this is that the simplicity of the issue should be obscured. But, after all, it can easily be seen that that does not depend on any special feature of the statement, as distinguished from the form in which the same general belief might be put by others. Now I would venture to ask those who are so confidently asserting the comprehensive appeal and free adaptability of the Epiclesis, first whether they are prepared to maintain that the Divine blessing can be asked upon physical things without implying a possible effect to be wrought upon them as physical things, and secondly whether or no they consider that such a change can mean anything at all except that they shall be made actual bearers of the spiritual reality that they signify, or indeed be identified with it. I think that many Anglo-Catholics would answer these questions in the negative, as I should.

Undoubtedly they have an actual physical function to perform. They are used in the sacred rite : they are displayed and handled as physical things are. But this is irrelevant. Their *physical* function is simple and mechanical only. When it is pleaded that we ask a blessing on our ordinary food, there is no true parallel. This is done because the salutary effect of the food is a matter of at least conceivable doubt, if not as to fact, at least as to degree. A nearer parallel to the elements would be the knife and fork. As symbols, the blessing that the elements contain is absolute, admitting of no uncertainty and of no degree. All finitude and failure are on the side of the reception. If it were not for this, we might of course say that the Holy Spirit could be asked to bless the elements, because, though they are physical, they are also symbols. But such a benediction would be unintelligible. Given their appointment, they are "effective signs" inherently. Thus, from the "Receptionist" standpoint, no endowment of them with virtue, at each celebration, is thinkable, whether we regard them as things or as symbols. And to admit words that imply such endowment is therefore, so far forth, a surrender of that standpoint. Whether *of* or *to* a higher standpoint, is of course a different question. To the writer of this article, and to those for whom primarily it is written, the view we are seeking to guard is not only defensive of other truths, but is a positive and constructive truth about the sacrament itself.

At this point it may be well to take note of the fact that in the Baptismal Service we pray God to "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin." Personally I can use this petition without any feeling of unreality, though its omission would cause me no sense of serious loss. A wide difference may be seen between the two cases. There is little real correspondence between the baptismal water and the bread and wine. The latter stand for spiritual entities, whether by transformation or by symbolization. The water merely qualifies the act. Its character is sanctified by its use : the use of the bread and wine is sanctified by their character. Any

objection to these words in the Baptismal Service would at best be of minor import, and would seem overstrained.

In conclusion, I would repeat my contention that the old Consecration Prayer, whatever its limitations, makes its own special appeal to those who adhere to the Evangelical tradition in the Church. (I use this term in no invidious and in no narrowly party sense.) The appeal is made on the ground of purity and concentration. The old prayer jealously excludes elements which, by rough tests of sentiment and emotion, might be acceptable, but cannot, as we believe, be harmonized with more central convictions and more vital experience. We will do well, in view of the difficult situations in front of us, to state our position in terms of the positive undiluted value of the old prayer and not merely of the shortcomings of the new. But, beneath any mere comparisons, there lies, for us, the simple *non possumus*. This alone, if it does not solve the difficulties, ought at least to exclude all bitterness and strife.

A Call to Prayer.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—

The days we are living in are solemn in the extreme—we might say beyond comparison. The decisions of this coming Autumn, to be made by our Members of Parliament, are so grave, and are to have such far reaching effects, that, as Chairman of the Committee for the Maintenance of Truth and Faith, I have been asked to write and invite all who have the matter at heart, and they can be numbered in their tens of thousands, to join with us at the Throne of Grace in seeking most earnestly and continuously that Divine Wisdom and Guidance may be given to each and all. Daniel and his three friends met together, simply, earnestly, and unitedly, at a time of crisis, and prayer brought about great results. They were definite, whole-hearted, and united; and if prayer could then bring about so much, surely we may now expect great things from our God, if we approach Him in the same spirit.

We have the words ringing in our ears:—"Ask, and ye shall receive"; "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven."

It has been suggested that it might be helpful if all would make a rule to pray about this matter for say five minutes between 9.30 and 10 o'clock each evening. This may be found a convenient time for most. But anyhow, let us pray.

Yours very truly,

H. W. HINDE.

THE VICARAGE,
ISLINGTON, N.I.

THE GREEK SOURCES OF THE NEW CONSECRATION PRAYER.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D.

IS the Consecration prayer in the New Prayer Book sound in scholarship? Considering that Cranmer (1549) was the authority followed in the passage in question:—

“Wherefore . . . we . . . having in remembrance the precious death and passion of Thy dear Son . . . according to His holy institution do celebrate and set forth before Thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts *the memorial which He hath willed us to make*—”

it would seem presumptuous to answer in the negative had not Cranmer himself seen fit to erase this passage (1552). Now our Lord when instituting the Holy Communion said, as it is reported by St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 24 f.) and St. Luke (xxii. 19), “Do this in remembrance of Me,” *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (touto poieite eis teen emeen anamnesin)*.

In the first place, what is the meaning of *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*? It always means “do this (action).” That is its meaning in classical Greek, in the Septuagint, in the Greek Testament. It cannot mean “offer this.” And the words quoted, “the memorial which He hath willed us to make,” taken in conjunction with the preceding words, “set forth before Thy Divine Majesty the memorial which He hath willed us to make,” distinctly imply “offer.” In fact it would serve as a good definition of the verb to offer. We shall return to this point later on.

Again, from a grammatical point of view, these words of our Lord cannot be rendered “make this memorial of Me,” as this would be on a par with saying that “keep this out of gratitude” means “keep this gratitude.” Or, as the learned Dr. T. K. Abbott in his brochure *Do this in remembrance of Me*¹ (p. 28) said: “As well might we consider that because a scholarship in college is said to be ‘in memoriam’ therefore ‘memoria’ means scholarship.” To render these words as “make this memorial of Me” in the sense of “offer” is to employ the verb (*ποιεῖτε, ποιεῖτε*) and the substantive (*ἀνάμνησις, anamnesis*), which is not the direct object, but the purpose of the object, which is *τοῦτο (touto)*, in a manner unjustified by the context and the use of these words in the classics and in the Old and New Testaments, and is contrary to grammar.

I. First of all take the word *anamnesis (ἀνάμνησις)*. What is its meaning? Plato used it in the sense of remembering. *Philebus* (34) describes it as the *act* of recovering a past experience. *Phaedo* (72) says “learning is remembering,” both active substantives, *mathesis anamnesis*. Aristotle wrote an essay on the difference

¹ Longmans, 1898, p. 28.

between "memory" (*mneme*) and recollection (*anamnesis*). Polybius the Greek historian (167 B.C.) used the word *anamnesis* frequently of "recording" facts, e.g., 4, 66, 10, "for the sake of recording it"; but he never used with it the active verb *poiein* (*ποιεῖν*) which is used here, but according to the Greek idiom, the middle voice *poieisthai* (*ποιεῖσθαι*), in his phrase "to make a record of" an event, e.g., 2, 37, 6; 1, 5, 4. According to the Greek idiom one could not say *poiein anamnesin* (*ποιεῖν ἀνάμνησιν*). It would be a solecism. In Lysias (404 B.C.) the word *anamnesis* is indeed used in connection with sacrifices, but it is the *recollection of vows to pay sacrifices*, *ἀνάμνησεις θυσιῶν* (194, 22).

In Wisdom xvi. 6 the word is used with commandment: "They were troubled for a short time, to put them in remembrance of the commandment of Thy law" (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς, eis anamnesin entolees*). Here the active meaning of the verb is correctly given. Hebrews x. 3, "In them (the sacrifices) there is a calling to mind of sins (*anamnesis hamartion*) or a remembrance of sins every year." Here we have a close parallel to the Holy Communion. It is not a sacrifice like the Jewish sacrifices, but it is a service in which there is a *calling to mind*, a remembrance of the Atonement for sins—being done in remembrance of Christ, *εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*. Substitute "memorial" for "remembrance" in the above passages in the classics and the Scriptures and the sense will be made nonsense because *anamnesis* means action, whereas *memorial* is a thing. The word *anamnesis* occurs in the LXX of the Old Testament four times, twice in Psalm titles 38 and 70. But these titles are so erratic that no argument can be based upon them. The Hebrew verb which those in question represent is the *hifil* (*hazkir*) of *Zakar*, to remember, and means to *record*, and even if one connects it, which one has absolutely no right to do seeing that the Greek of 38 adds "concerning the Sabbath" and that of 70 "to the Lord to save me" (bad Greek), with the *azkarah* of Leviticus ii. 2, one gains nothing, for there it is the incense portion of the *minchah* and it was burnt. And if the meaning was applied to the New Testament expression *eis teen emeen anamnesin*, it would only mean "for the incense portion of me." To pass on to Numbers x. 10, there the word refers to the blowing of the trumpets, as v. 9 shows: "You shall blow with the trumpets and you shall be remembered before the Lord your God." The Greek also, being in the singular, cannot refer to the sacrifices.

Now we come to the last passage where the word appears in the Old Testament, Leviticus xxiv. 7. The R.V., following the Hebrew, renders it, "Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row (of the shewbread) that it may be to the bread for a *memorial* (*azkarah*), even an offering made by fire (*ishsheh*) unto the Lord." The offering in connection with the shewbread was that of the frankincense. Like the handful of the meal offering in Leviticus ii. 2 it was a memorial, an *azkarah*, and was burnt. It was that portion of the meal-offering that was never eaten. And so in connection with the shewbread which was not to be offered or burned but simply "set

forth" and eaten at the end of the week by the priests, there was an offering of frankincense which was to be burned. And this was the *azkarah* or memorial. The shewbread is not the *azkarah* but the frankincense is. But the LXX has possibly caused the confusion by its rendering, "They (the loaves) shall be for loaves for a remembrance, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν, set forth, προκειμένα, before the Lord." Here the loaves are said to be for a remembrance, *anamnesis*, the Hebrew word being *azkarah*, used of a memorial or fire portion. And so the loaves which were kept for a week, and then eaten by the priests, were identified with a portion consumed by fire (Hebrew *ishsheh*)! This was due to confusing the shewbread with the *azkarah*, memorial or incense-portion, that was placed upon the shewbread and burnt. And owing to this confusion in the course of time the loaves of the shewbread came to be regarded by the Greek Churches, which used the LXX version, as a memorial, *azkarah*, set forth before the Lord (προκειμένα). This was really a contradiction in terms, for the shewbread in Hebrew, "bread of the presence" (*panim*), 1 Samuel xxi. 6; "holy bread" (*ibid.*), "the pile-bread" Nehemiah x. 33; in Greek "the loaves set forth" (προκειμενοι, Exod. xxxix. 18), or "the loaves of the setting forth" (πρόθεσις), as they were generally called, were kept from Sabbath to Sabbath and were only for the priests.

From the Greek liturgies, ancient and modern, it is evident that the shewbread influenced their conception of the Lord's Supper; and especially its description in Leviticus xxiv. 7, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκειμένα τῷ κυρίῳ.

In the Liturgy of St. James we read: "Send Thy all-holy Spirit upon us and upon these holy gifts set forth (προκειμένα) that He may make this loaf the sacred body of Thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of Thy Christ." In the Liturgy of St. Clement we have: "Look upon these gifts, set forth (προκειμένα) in Thy presence ἐνώπιόν σου (another remembrance of the shewbread, ἄρτοι ἐνώπιον, Exod. xxv. 30), and send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this sacrifice (θυσία) that He may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ, etc." In the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, "send Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set forth (προκειμένα) and make this bread the precious body of Thy Christ, etc." St. Basil's liturgy is even more reminiscent of the shewbread: "Presenting (προσθέτης) the antitypes of the holy body and blood of Thy Christ, we implore Thee that Thy Holy Spirit may come upon us and upon these gifts set forth" (πρόκειμένα).

The verb for "presenting" is the same as that used in Exodus xl. 23 of the shewbread (προσέθηκαν). St. Mark's liturgy has: "Send Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these loaves (ἄρτοι) and upon these cups that He may sanctify and consecrate them and make the loaf the body and the cup the blood of the New Testament." Here the plural is evidently suggested by the loaves, ἄρτοι, of the "setting forth" (πρόθεσις). By the way, it should be pointed out here that the Greek verb to lie (κείσθαι) is used as the passive of the verb to "place" or "set" (τιθέναι); e.g., "the law lies"

(*κείται*), in 1 Timothy i. 9, is the passive of to make (*τιθέναι*) a law. And so here *προκειμένα*, used of the gifts set forth, is the idiomatic passive of *προτιθέναι*, the word used of setting forth the loaves. This makes the connection of the shewbread, the loaves of the *prothesis*, or setting forth, with the gifts set forth, *προκειμένα*, in the liturgies quite clear. It is also to be observed that in the Greek liturgies followed by the compilers of the new Prayer Book these gifts set forth are regarded as an oblation or sacrifice, *θυσία*, and that the Holy Spirit is invoked to come upon them and transubstantiate them into the body and blood of Christ.

Now what did Cranmer do in 1552? Let Dr. Burkitt answer: "He did not turn the Eucharist into a real but pagan sacrifice of bread and wine. He was too sound a Western Divine to fall into the error of the Greeks. In this he differed from the Non-jurors and their modern imitators."¹ But Cranmer in 1549 had fallen into the very error of the Greeks. It was from them and their obviously erroneous connection of the Holy Communion with the shewbread, the loaves set forth, *προκειμένα*, for a remembrance, *εις ανάμνησιν*, where the Hebrew word *azkarah* means a memorial, that he composed his great, although erroneous, sentence, "We . . . do celebrate and make here before Thy divine majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed passion, mighty resurrection and glorious ascension." (Cf. the Greek liturgies, "remembering His saving sufferings, His resurrection, His ascension.")

It was consequently from the Greek liturgies and their erroneous connecting of the Holy Communion with the shewbread, and through Cranmer, that the Revising Committee of 1927 took the equally grand and equally erroneous sentence of their canon with the change of order and the alteration "set forth" for "make," an alteration suggested by the comment of St. Paul, "you do show" (A.V.), more correctly "proclaim" (R.V.) (for *καταγγέλλετε* is used in every other place in the New Testament of preaching) "the Lord's death till He come" (1 Corinthians xi. 26), and by the name of the shewbread, "the loaves of the setting-forth" (*πρόθεσις*). The passage reads, "We . . . do celebrate and set forth before Thy Divine Majesty with these Thy holy gifts the memorial which He hath willed us to make."

II. We have shown that it is through an erroneous rendering of the Hebrew that the word "memorial" in Leviticus xxiv. 7 was brought into Cranmer's first Prayer Book. We have now to consider the meaning of the expression *τοῦτο ποιῆτε* (*touto poieite*). Can it mean "make this memorial"? Such a phrase in connection with the bread and wine, and with the expression "celebrate and set forth before Thy Divine Majesty," distinctly implies an offering. So we have to ask, Does *τοῦτο ποιῆτε* mean "offer this" or "do this action"? Some argue that because *facio*² is used a few times in a sacrificial sense, once or twice with an ablative, e.g. "facere

¹ *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, p. 28.

² Also *operari*, Tac. A., 2, 14; and *δέξω*, Homer.

vitulâm," to sacrifice a calf (Virg. *Ec.* 3, 77) and also "Junoni . . . facere" (Cic. *pro Mur.*, 41, 90), that *poiein* (*ποιεῖν*) must be taken here in the sacrificial sense of "offer this."

In the LXX there are some 2,500 instances of *poiein*: in some 50 of these the rendering "offer" is possible owing to the presence of some sacrificial term in the context, in the shape of a verb, adverb or noun. But it is a remarkable fact that the Latin translators of the LXX avoided rendering *poiein* in such sacrificial passages by their word "facere," except in such cases as "to make an holocaust." And it is also to be noted that the regular Hebrew word for offering a sacrifice, *hiqrib*, is not rendered by *poiein* but by *propherein* (*προσφέρειν*).

The fact is that *poiein*, like the English "do," is used in a hundred different idioms and phrases. It is an indefinite verb, meaning many things, and its definition must be supplied by something else in the context. Now in the institution of the Holy Communion there is no sacrificial term. "Body," "Cup,"—these are not sacrificial words. And so we argue that even admitting that *poiein*, when the context demands, can bear a sacrificial meaning, this context does not demand it, and therefore it is not to be rendered here as "make" this memorial (in the context of the canon meaning "offer").

But there may be no reason even for such an admission, as a further examination of the use of *poiein* in the LXX shows. In the first place, if *poiein* is a sacrificial word—which, by the way, is far different from a word that is used in connection with a sacrifice—why is *poiein thusian* (*ποιεῖν θυσίαν*) not found in either LXX or New Testament? On a few occasions, in rendering the Hebrew parallel passage, it is used like Hebrew 'ásâh to save repetition (Ps. lxxv. 13). But the sacrificial word "offer" was employed in the first of the double clauses. When used with an animal suitable for sacrifice it can always mean "prepare," e.g., 2 Samuel xii. 4, "prepare (*ποιῆσαι*) the lamb for the stranger." Genesis xviii. 7, "he hastened to prepare (*ποιῆσαι*) the calf" (for eating). This is the verb used of the preparing of the bullocks in 1 Kings xviii. 23 ff. It is used several times in Exodus xxix. 35, 36, 38, 39. And if we are to render it "sacrifice" in one place we must render it so in all, that is, if we are to be logical and consistent. And so we shall have to read in v. 35, "You shall sacrifice (*ποιήσεις*) to Aaron and his sons." Whereas, the simple words "do for" and "do" are adequate and consistent renderings all through this passage.

And again Exodus xxii. 30, "So shalt thou do with (*ποιήσεις*) thine oxen"; Exodus xxiii. 11, "So shalt thou do with thy vineyard"; Deuteronomy xxii. 3, "So shalt thou do with his ass," are passages which militate against the sacrificial meaning. The same verb is used of the prince and his offerings in Ezekiel xlv. 22 ff.; but it was not the prince but the high priest who offered them. The prince had them prepared. Leviticus ii. 11, "No meal offering (*θυσία*) which you shall offer (*προσφέρειν*) to the Lord shall be made or prepared of leaven (*ποιηθήσεται*)," and many other passages

prove that the verb *poiein* can be used in a sacrificial connexion and yet not mean "offer."

And the Greek translator of 2 Kings xvii. 32 was unaware of this meaning of *poiein*, for he renders the Hebrew: "they made for themselves (*ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς*) priests of the high places; and made (them) for themselves in the house of the high places." If "made" in the second clause is to be rendered "sacrifice" we shall have, "they sacrificed to themselves"!

In the New Testament, the verb *poiein* is used with the passover, but never in the sense of sacrificing the paschal lamb but of keeping the passover. In the former case *thuein*, *θύειν*, was used, Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7, 1 Corinthians v. 7. Contrast "I will keep *poio* (*ποιῶ*) the passover at thy house," Matthew xxvi. 18.

In Luke ii. 27, "to do (*ποιῆσαι*) for him according to the law" cannot mean "offer," for it refers to the Presentation of Christ. The offering was not for Him but for the purification of the mother. St. Luke ii. 25 used "give" (*δοῦναι*) an offering, not "make." In Hebrews xi. 28, "he made (*πεποίηκεν*) the passover and the sprinkling (*πρόσχυσις*) of blood." It is of the Mosaic institutions that the writer is speaking, and the word cannot be rendered "offer" in either case. In 1 Timothy ii. 1, "I order you to make prayers and thanksgivings," *ποιεῖσθαι προσευχάς*, not "that prayers be made." The middle, not the active, is used with such verbs, e.g. to "make a journey" requires the middle (Luke xiii. 22); and in Luke v. 33 they make (*ποιῶνται*) supplications. The active (*poiein*) could mean *compose*, not "offer," and so the rendering "that eucharists be offered" is ruled out by the Greek idiom.

A study of the use of *anamnesis* and *poiein* has thus proved that they cannot mean, when conjoined, offer or make a memorial; and still less so when the former is not the direct object of the latter.

We have now to see what commentators say. Justin Martyr (Trypho) 345 has an instructive passage. Arguing with a Jew who said that only the prayers of the Diaspora were acceptable to God, and that "he called their prayers sacrifices," *θυσίαι*, Justin says: "Prayers and thanksgivings made by worthy people are the only sacrifices (*θυσίαι*) perfect and pleasing to God. I myself assert. These are the only things Christians have been taught to do even at the COMMEMORATION (*ἀνάμνησις*) of their food both dry and liquid, in which they also remember the passion suffered by the Son of God for them."¹ The whole service is thus an *anamnesis* or act of commemoration of God's natural gifts and of the passion of the Son of God: and the sacrifices offered (*θυσίαι*) are the prayers and thanksgivings of the faithful. This passage is therefore very strong against the rendering "offer or make this memorial of Me." Furthermore the Vulgate "hoc facite in meam commemorationem" cannot be rendered either as "make or offer this memorial."

It is distinctly an action that is the object of both *ποιεῖτε* and *facite*, an action that cannot be described as a memorial, for that

¹ καὶ ἐπ' ἀνάμνησει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηραῖς τε καὶ ὑγρῶς ἐν ᾗ . . . μέμνηται. Cf. Apol. i. 66.

is a thing, but as a commemorative act. Bellarmine the Roman theologian ridiculed the idea that "facite hoc" could mean "make this sacrifice." He called that idea "impostura adversariorum," says it was a fiction of Calvin and that Catholics do not argue so stupidly. He analyses our Lord's words thus: "that which (id quod) we are now doing, I consecrating and delivering and you receiving and eating, continue to do until the end of the world." Estius, another Roman commentator, took the words as "do this," saying that to render "do" (facite) as make a sacrifice (sacrificate), as some here interpreted it, is contrary to the mind of Scripture. He said that the words of the Canon "haec quotiescumque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis" cannot, except in a forced sense, mean "make a sacrifice," and the word "facite" gives the power of doing those things which Christ did. With regard to "hoc facite" of the cup, he says "it is restricted to the one action (actionem) of drinking." Of *anamnesis* (ἀνάμνησις) he says: "in meam commemorationem" is *recordationem*, which means "recollection" not a memorial. What (quod) I now do and (quod) what you do at My command, that is to be done by you and your successors and in commemoration of Me, recollecting My passion and death for you. Maldonatus, the erudite Jesuit, explained the words as "Do this which I have done, that is, consecrate for that end for which I consecrated, that is, for remembrance of Me." This excludes the rendering, "make this memorial of Me."

Accordingly, we are logically entitled to say that our studies of the Greek, Latin and Hebrew, and of the greatest commentators, have led us to the same conclusion—that the Consecration prayer in the new Prayer Book is unsound from the standpoint of scholarship; and that the rendering of our Lord's words, which are correctly translated, "Do this in remembrance of Me," as "Make or offer this memorial of Me," is bad scholarship, as such a rendering would require the middle voice (*ποιεῖσθαι*) with a verbal noun, converts a noun of action into a thing and a purpose into a direct object!

¹ *Opera*, iii, p. 362 b. E.

RECENT THEORIES OF THE INCARNATION.

BY A. J. MACDONALD, M.A., B.D., F.R.Hist.S.

Outspoken Essays (Second series), W. R. Inge. Longman's (1922).

Belief in Christ, C. Gore. Murray (1922).

Christus Veritas, W. Temple. Macmillan (1924).

"The Incarnation." Kirsopp Lake. *Hibbert Journal* (October, 1924).

WHEN Professor Kirsopp Lake claims that the synoptic writers do not teach the doctrine of the Incarnation he is, perhaps, only carrying to a just conclusion the interpretation peculiar to himself and the school of writers to which he belongs. But we cannot so lightly pass by the fact that he claims the support of writers who have not hitherto been associated with that school. It is probable that he seeks more support from certain isolated passages than they would be willing to concede, but the fact remains that a new mode of defending, which will involve a new mode of defining, the doctrine of the Incarnation, is being adopted by more orthodox writers. Dean Inge speaks not uncertainly of the Incarnation. "I have made the weight of my theological position rest on a certain conviction about the historical Jesus—namely, that He was the Incarnate Word or Logos of God, a perfect revelation of the mind, and character of God the Father" (*Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, p. 51). Yet he can also say "the existing Gospel (our Synoptics and others) taught an apotheosis-Christology, whereas the Pauline Churches had learnt an incarnation-Christology" (*ibid.*, p. 81). Dr. Gore is more cautious, he allows value for such passages as Matthew xi. 27, xiii. 32, and Mark xii. 6 (*Belief in Christ*, p. 56). Yet he also contends that "We can conceive nothing further from the method of Jesus than that He should have startled and shocked their consciences by proclaiming Himself as God" (*ibid.*, p. 68). If He did not claim to be God, He certainly claimed to be Son of God, and the difference would amount to very little in Jewish ears. But the most striking example of the modern tendency to seek authority for the Incarnation in some quarter other than the synoptic writers is to be found in Dr. Temple's book. "After a period of specially close intercourse with Him they were ready to follow St. Peter in acknowledging Him as the promised Messiah. But this is still far short of a confession of His deity. In our day many people identify the terms superhuman and divine. They think that if in our Lord besides humanity there was something more than humanity, that something must be divinity. But this is quite a baseless assumption, and the Jews did not make it. What from the scene of Cæsarea Philippi onwards the Apostles certainly believed is that their Master was more than human in the sense that we are human. The Messiah was at that date conceived as a superhuman and celestial Being, who might properly be spoken of as in a peculiar sense the Son of God; but He was not conceived as

divine in such a fashion as would lead to His being spoken of as God the Son" (*Christus Veritas*, p. 107).

This is to suggest that the Apostles held an Arian conception of this celestial Being, a conception which was surely as remote, if not more remote from Jewish thought than the possibility of a revelation of God in the flesh. It is true that the Jewish conception of Messiah did not associate deity with Him. But neither did it associate the attributes of a demi-god with Him. An anthropomorphic appearance of Jehovah was really less contrary to Jewish ideas, at least to some inherited traditions, than the conception assigned to the Apostles by Dr. Temple.

It may also be true that the Jews, as distinct from the Apostles, did not make the assumption that if there was something more in Jesus that something must be divinity. But this does not prove that the claim was never admitted by Jesus. Here lies the main difficulty in the contention both of Dr. Gore and Dr. Temple. If Jesus did not convey this idea to the Jews why did they condemn Him? At the examination before Caiaphas the question was put, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" (Mark xvi. 61). Matthew and Luke amended "Son of the Blessed" by "Son of God," and Matthew and Luke in conjunction form a good authority. In all these writers Jesus admitted the charge, and was thereupon condemned for blasphemy. Yet this striking passage receives no attention from recent writers on the Incarnation. The claim that He was Son of God was not merely likely to shock the Jews, as Dr. Gore says, but it actually did so, and they condemned Him.

Dr. Temple's treatment of the New Testament evidence is controlled by his theory that "The Synoptic Evangelists are obviously concerned with history and not with theology" (p. 118). As a general statement this is undoubtedly correct, but in their historical accounts they could not avoid recording some words of our Lord, and of the disciples and the Jews, which have a definitely dogmatic import. The question of Caiaphas and the reply of Jesus are illustrations. Dr. Temple applies his theory to the Atonement. He says (p. 118) that the Synoptics, while minutely telling the facts of the Passion, do not attempt to indicate a doctrine of the Atonement. But he omits all reference to the "ransom" passages (Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke xxii. 19-20). Dr. Rashdall attempted to overcome the difficulty presented by these passages to the radical critic of the doctrine of Atonement by deleting them from the text. But they also belong to the ancient Matthew-Luke tradition which is a good authority.

This older tradition supplies us with another passage bearing on the doctrine of the Incarnation which is also rejected by Dr. Temple. (Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22.) "All things are delivered unto me of my Father and no man knoweth the Son save the Father neither doth any man know the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him." The unmistakable Johannine ring in this passage proves that the teaching which has been labelled Johannine was being given in some form by the earliest disciples.

Whatever additions may have been made by the writer of the Fourth Gospel, his doctrine is a development of what dated back to the earliest traditions of Christian teaching.

Dr. Temple contends that a change in the conception of the disciples dates from the death of Stephen and that it was developed by St. Paul. But he offers no explanation of so extraordinary a change beyond the theory that dogma followed experience. Nor does he explain how the experience of Stephen became at once the experience of the Church. Even if a vision of the ascended Christ might have won from Stephen the cry, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," how did that experience suddenly become the experience of the rest? Moreover, even Stephen's experience would be contrary to all our notions of psychology, unless an idea of the divinity of Jesus had existed previously in his mind. He could not have interpreted the vision in these terms, unless at least, the possibility of the divinity of Jesus had been previously fixed in his mind. Experience follows doctrine.

In a similar manner St. Paul's experiences, and even that which took place on the Damascus road, were originally based upon a growing conviction, derived from instruction in some form, whether from reports of the disciples' life and teaching, or from his own meditation on them. The revelation of God to the soul never begins with a vision. It is always commenced by instruction, by doctrine, no matter how rudimentary. Experience may develop the doctrine and even enlarge it. Our view of the nature of religious experience, and of its course in the history of Israel and apostolic days, as well as in later times, will have to be completely revised if Dr. Temple's argument from Stephen is to be accepted. It is the theory that experience precedes doctrine which causes him to reject the passage in Matthew xi. 27, already noticed.

The evidence of the Fourth Gospel need not be considered at length. As Dr. Kirsopp Lake says, the doctrine of the Incarnation and deity are clearly stated there. But, being written at the end of the first century at the earliest (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, pp. 456-61), its evidence cannot be adduced with the same confidence as that of the Synoptics, save by those who believe in the Zebedean authorship. Now, Dr. Temple accepts the Zebedean authorship of the Fourth Gospel (p. 107), and yet declines to admit that the sayings of Jesus in that book conveyed the impression to the minds of the disciples that He was divine. The confession of St. Thomas is dismissed with the remark that "This remains an isolated utterance, and the theology implied by it was not yet intellectually grasped," and he continues, "If the Apostles reflected at the time on the saying, 'I and the Father are one,' they would remember that He justifies that saying by a reference to the psalm where those to whom the word of the Lord came are dignified with the divine title. He claimed to be the revelation of God, but the disciples who heard Him say 'He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father' only reached, before the Passion at any rate, the confession that He was one sent by God." We may agree with the next statement, "Our Lord's language does

not necessarily imply that He claimed to be Himself Jehovah," and also with what follows, "And if it had, we can see that it would have baffled and perplexed their minds." But that is exactly what took place in the minds both of the disciples and the Jewish hierarchy, though with different results. The hierarchy were so perplexed that they condemned Him to death for blasphemy. The disciples, by degrees, recognized the import of the teaching, so that we have not only the confession of Thomas (if as Dr. Temple maintains this is a Zebedean report), but an apostolic faith which was imparted, not indiscriminately, as when Peter preached publicly to the Jews, but privately—a faith held and imparted so sincerely that it created a background for the visions both of Stephen and Paul.

But Dr. Temple is not sure. His reservation "before the Passion at any rate" really surrenders his contention. It was indeed the Passion and the events which followed it that finally opened their eyes. Some, perhaps considerable, hesitancy before the Passion must be conceded, even at Cæsarea Philippi. But if they realized the conception of the deity of Jesus after the Passion, even though that realization appears to be closely related to definite incidents or phases of their religious experience, His own teaching must have prepared the way for it.

Most people would find their difficulties reduced if they could accept the Zebedean authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But having succeeded where others failed, he strains at the gnat. Yet his own doctrine of development and especially of survivals can be applied to the problem of the relation between Matthew xxi. 27 (Luke x. 22) and the Fourth Gospel. The teaching of the Fourth Gospel, more especially if it be Zebedean, implies the existence of some previous teaching such as that of Matthew xi. 27, and "uses (that) for its expression." So also, the teaching of Matthew xi. 27 finds its fulfilment only "when possessed by the higher grade of teaching" supplied by the Fourth Gospel.

Before passing on to consider the philosophic basis of the doctrine of the deity of Christ, one other possible source of evidence for the existence of this doctrine at an early date must receive attention. By the end of the first century Cerinthus was at the head of a flourishing school of critics of the doctrine. Gwatkin dated the Ebionites as early as A.D. 70, which does not seem to be too early if the school was flourishing twenty or thirty years later. Now, critics do not attack what does not exist. If all the records of the Tory party were to perish, it would still be possible to substantiate, five hundred years hence, the doctrine of Mr. Chamberlain, from the records of the Liberal party. If the doctrine of the deity of Christ was not being taught by the disciples at least as early as the fall of Jerusalem, it is difficult to account for the teaching of the Ebionite School.

Let us now turn to the brilliant definition of the nature of Reality, and the relation of its different aspects to each other, contained in *Christus Veritas*. Reality, says Dr. Temple, is stratified in the form of matter, life, mind and spirit.

“ We have seen that every grade in Reality finds its own fulfilment only when it is possessed by a higher grade, and that each higher grade uses those which are lower than itself for its expression. From this it follows that humanity only reveals its true nature when it is indwelt by what is higher than itself—and supremely when it is indwelt by the Highest ; and that the Highest uses what is lower to express Himself and does this more adequately as this lower approximates to likeness with Himself, so that of all things known to us human nature will express Him most perfectly. But if this is so, and if in Jesus Christ God lived on earth a human life, then it must be true that in Jesus Christ we shall find two things. In Jesus Christ we shall find the one adequate presentation of God—not adequate, of course, to the infinite glory of God in all His attributes, but adequate to every human need, for it shows us God in the terms of our own experience. But in Jesus Christ we shall find also the one adequate presentation of Man—not man as he is apart from the indwelling of God, but man as he is in his truest nature, which is only made actual when man becomes the means to the self-expression of God ” (pp. 124-5).

If this description had been confined to an attempt to define the relations of matter, life, mind and spirit as they are revealed in “ existence ” or by the phenomenal, as distinct from “ being ” or Reality as the ultimate content of the universe, it would meet our requirements more completely than any other attempt which has hitherto been made. Moreover, its description of the relation of God to man, and of man to God, as revealed by Jesus Christ in the time-process of the evolutionary development of the spirit of man, leaves no ground for criticism, especially in view of the elaboration of the second part of the thesis given on p. 138.

“ When life supervenes upon matter, it does not indeed lead to any contradiction of the ‘ laws ’ of physical chemistry, but it takes direction of the physico-chemical system ; it asserts priority in the sense that the explanation of the action of the living thing is sought in the requirements of its life. The physical system supplies the requirements *sine quibus non* ; the life supplies the efficient causation. So when mind supervenes upon the living organism, it takes direction and becomes the cause of the agent’s conduct. We shall expect, therefore, to find that when God supervenes upon humanity, we do not find a human being taken into fellowship with God, but God acting through the conditions supplied by humanity. And this is the Christian experience of Jesus Christ ; He is spoken of as a Mediator, but that expression is used, not to signify one who is raised above humanity by an infusion of deity, but one in whom deity and humanity are perfectly united.”

But the theory breaks down when considered as an explanation of the place and function of the Incarnation in the scheme of Reality. Dr. Temple introduces the Incarnation as the crown of that stratification of Reality upon which his explanation is based.

... “ What we find in Christian experience is witnessed not to a man uniquely inspired, but to God living a human life.

. . . " Now this is exactly the culmination of that stratification which is the structure of Reality." . . . " Even had there been no evil in the world to be overcome, no sin to be abolished and forgiven, still the Incarnation would be the natural inauguration of the final stage of evolution " (p. 139).

But surely the Incarnation, when expressed in these terms, although admirably related to the time-process of the development of matter, life, mind and (human) spirit, yet represents a doubling-back upon the scheme of Reality, if that term means the ultimate constitution of Being, and it can scarcely mean anything else. In the stratification of Reality God is surely the topmost stratum in the structure, which He has erected within, or out of Himself. He, indeed, implies the lower—spirit, mind, life, matter ; and the lower finds its fulfilment in Him. But an Incarnation of God on the plane of the human is unnecessary even under the terms of the theory. Mind, for example, does not descend on to the plane of matter in order to complete its evolution, there is no " inmaterialization " of mind, although undoubtedly mind implies matter, and matter finds fulfilment in mind. The evolution of Reality proceeds by regular stages, of which God is the final result. But it is necessary to observe that when described in this way the starting-point, or the foundation stratum, is a point or phase in the time-process, the whole of which is already in God. We shall return to this qualification shortly. To proceed, the stratification can allow for an Incarnation for the purpose of Atonement or illumination, but not for an Incarnation which is a culmination of that stratification which is the structure of Reality. The Incarnation cannot be a final cause, it is solely an efficient cause ; it was an auxiliary phase, not the conclusion of a teleology.

Only if God is the outcrop of the stratification can the Incarnation be described as the culmination of the process. This is not what Dr. Temple means, but it is a second difficulty suggested by his theory, for the theory suggests that God was not until the Incarnation took place. He who is timeless "was not" until an event, the Incarnation, took place in time. It is of course possible, if not probable, that the Incarnation is a function of the timeless condition of Being, but if so, it cannot be fitted into a structure, even metaphorically, of which the starting-point is matter. The evolutionary or creative process may comprise the evolution of God. In this case the evolution of humanity is a phase in the process, though whether the final phase or not we cannot say. By taking man into Himself a contribution is made to divine evolution. The Incarnation will then be the means by which that phase of the process is completed. But the stratification metaphor does not describe the whole process. It carries with it the implication that there was a time when God was matter, when He was the lowest stratum in the evolutionary process, unless we are to postulate God as being at both ends of the stratification and at the same time passing through it with the purpose of the creation and the assumption of humanity. The antinomy in the centre of the theory arises from a confusion of the timeless with the

time-process, with the result that the metaphor breaks in two and becomes divided against itself.

The theory is put forward ostensibly as a reaction from the out-worn terminology of Greek Christology and theology. But it is doubtful whether an illustration taken from theology, although *ipso facto* modern, represents an advance upon Greek thought, which at least had a metaphysic. A new metaphysic has still to be supplied, and it is our obvious need. In the meantime a more subtle metaphor might have been devised by developing another of his definitions—"centre of consciousness," a term which besides being related to modern psychology, is free from the rigidity of the stratification metaphor. On pp. 116-17 Dr. Temple says:

"It seems to me that we are distinguished from one another by two principles. One of these is essential; it is the mere numerical difference in the centres of consciousness themselves. I, being myself, am not you; you, in being yourself, are not I. We are distinct selves. We may hold the same opinions, share the same experience, aim at the same goal; but we do it together and remain distinct. The other principle is accidental. I am the child of my parents, a native of my country, a member of my school and university: these things are not mere external appendages to my personality, but actually make it what it is. And any two finite persons living under the conditions of space and time will be distinguished for ever by the variety in the circumstances of their history. . . .

"Clearly these differences which I have called accidental are due to the conditions of our finitude. If we conceive centres of consciousness capable of envisaging the totality of things and themselves immune from the conditions of time and space, differences of this kind would vanish. But the other differences would remain. What we should then have would be three centres of one consciousness. Any further treatment of this theme must be postponed." . . .

But can we not at once apply it towards the solution of our problem? As Dr. Temple points out (p. 139), the problem is not to explain the relation of deity to humanity in Christ. That can never be done. The nature of the union must remain for us a mystery, and the Greeks broke in the attempt to solve it. The practical problem is to attempt an explanation of the relation of Jesus to God on the one hand, and to man on the other.

What is the normal relation of God to man and of man to God? Relatively to men as a race God transcends them. He is set up over against them, at a distance, the object of worship and the standard of spiritual aspiration. Or, as Dr. Temple says (*Mens Creatrix*, p. 23): "the Infinite will not be something divided from the Finite, but just the system of the finites." But relatively to men as individuals God can be imminent, inspiring individuals who open their hearts to Him. Thus men and women consist of separate centres of consciousness cohering in God. The being (essence) of the universe, of existence, is ultimately God, supplied by Him and from Him for the creative or evolutionary process. If the

consciousness of man coheres in anything but God we are face to face with a hopeless dualism. In Him we live, move and have being.

In *Christus Veritas* (p. 151) Dr. Temple describes "each man" as "a focussing point for Reality as seen from the place within it which he occupies." He uses this argument to define the unique humanity of Jesus. "He, more than others, is Humanity focussed in one centre" (p. 152), but may we not apply the argument to His divinity? Jesus becomes a focussing point for divinity as well as humanity, for that ultimate spiritual condition of humanity which is already implied in humanity as we know it. In the Incarnation God becomes immanent in a man, not merely imminent to him. God as a centre of consciousness coheres in a man, but not in the race, a centre of focus of divine consciousness. He coheres, becomes incarnate in the man Jesus. The centre of human consciousness in Jesus is expanded and becomes conterminous with a centre of divine consciousness or Being, with the eternal Son. The process is not a taking of the manhood into God, but a taking of the Godhead into man, as the Greeks long ago taught. It is not denied that the taking of the manhood into God is involved. But that is not incarnation, it is involved in the later process descriptively defined by the Church as Ascension, a process which necessitated the laying aside of the externals of humanity as we know it. Because, then, the divine gained coherence in a centre of human consciousness, God appeared as a man. Transcendence and immanence are equated in the Incarnation.¹

But how is this possible without destroying for a time, at any rate, the existence of the One, who has now become immanent in an item of the many? "To say that God the eternal Son at a moment of time divested Himself of Omniscience and Omnipotence in order to live a human life, reassuming these attributes at the Ascension, seems to me to be just the kind of thing that no event occurring on this planet could ever justify" (*Christus Veritas*, p. 141). Yet we cannot go to the other extreme and say, "Inasmuch as God is one it is not part of God, but God in His fulness who is incarnate thus" (*ibid.*, p. 115), for the difficulty still remains, as Dr. Temple sees—"it is God in one of the three Persons or centres of His spiritual Being who is incarnate, and that one which though co-equal in glory is derivative not primary" (p. 117). This surely contradicts the preceding statement, but its reference to the doctrine of the Trinity does offer the solution. In God are three centres of one divine consciousness or Being. In men the centre and the consciousness are identical. There are many human consciousnesses. Dr. Temple says that humanity, which is focussed in the individuals who comprise the race, is a unit. But as Gregory of Nyssa taught, no such unit as humanity exists. When we speak of Peter, James and John, we speak of three men, not of "man" in which Peter, James and John share. But in the Incarnation one centre of the single divine

¹ "Divine immanence" is a term which should be confined to the personality of Jesus. To men God becomes imminent (not immanent) if they allow Him, by consciously turning to Him.

consciousness became immanent in one centre of human consciousness, which is at the same time one of many human consciousnesses.

So, in relation to God, the historic Jesus is a centre of human consciousness, in whom a centre of divine consciousness is immanent. In relation to man He is a centre of divine consciousness which has occupied a centre of human consciousness, though without displacing it. In relation to man He is God, God immanent in a man.

The objection may be raised that the restriction of divine immanence to the person of Jesus unduly limits the range of divine operation among men, and an influential body of Anglican thinkers have for long sought to extend the range of the Incarnation by teaching that the sphere of the Incarnation is extended in the consecrated bread and wine of the Eucharist. As God became incarnate in Jesus, so the now glorified Jesus becomes incarnate in the faithful who receive His body and blood in the Sacrament. But the teaching of the Western Church has seriously over-emphasized the significance of the spiritual presence of Christ in the Sacrament. There is little Scriptural evidence for regarding the Sacrament as an exterior of the process of Incarnation, and a widening of the area of divine immanence. If we were to look for divine immanence, apart from its manifestation in the person of Jesus, we shall find it rather in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit than in that of the Holy Communion. There is much New Testament teaching to support the contention that if God is immanent in the hearts of men, and not merely "imminent to" them, as we have already argued, it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit, who, hovering over the hearts of all men, enters those who consciously appeal to Him. Thus the Incarnation is extended by the Holy Spirit. God comes into the human heart by His agency. This was the teaching of Jesus, namely, that after His Ascension the Holy Spirit should have charge of the spiritual destiny of all who believed in Himself.

OUR RED-LETTER DAYS. By P.D. London: *Robert Scott, Paternoster Row, E.C.* 2s.

A series of chapters or addresses on the Saints' Days in our Book of Common Prayer. They are of an exceptionally high order of merit. Each one ends with helpful suggestions for thanksgiving and prayer. For example, that on St. Paul closes thus:

Let us thank the God of Hope—

For those who "press towards the mark," and specially for His servant Paul and his message to us.

Let us pray—

For those who have lost heart through dwelling on the past, that they may find it again.

For ourselves, that we may press on in hope, with our faces towards the goal.

Most suitable, as the writer suggests, for home reading—"a Sunday message for busy people to take with them through the week." Excellent for reading at the Saints' Day Communion.

S. R. C.

THE MORE SPIRITUAL SIDE OF MODERN JUDAISM.

BY CANON A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, D.D.

THE title of this article will, no doubt, displease all Jews and not a few Christians.

The former will be offended that a Christian should dare to imply that Judaism is other than perfect. Dr. Gaster, the head of the Sephardic Jews in our country, says: "Jews have still a great mission to perform, and those of them who have studied the various phases of Christianity and measured them by our own standard would know that we stood far above them, and that it was for us to carry the light into the future, and salvation into the world."¹ Christians, on the other hand, will say that the Jewish religion to-day is of so formal a character that its spiritual side is negligible. For, alas, there are still missionaries and workers among the Jews who believe this. But it is improbable, to say the least, that a religion which has enabled its votaries to endure throughout these many centuries does not contain much, very much, of true spirituality.

On the contrary, great harm has been done, and is still being done, to the spread of Christianity amongst the Jews by the failure to recognize the better side of Judaism.

By "Modern Judaism" is here intended the religion of Judaism as it exists to-day in all the chief divisions of the Jews, viz. the Chassidim, the Liberal Jews, the Reformed Jews, the Zionists, and the Orthodox.

I. Who are the Chassidim? They are the followers of one Israel ben Eliezer of Poland (c. 1700-60) who attained such distinction as a worker of miracles by the use of the sacred Name (Shem) that he was called Baal-Shem-Tob (בעשט Besht), "The Master of the Good Name."² He was grieved by the formalism and petty superstitions of the ordinary Polish Jews, and was attracted by the mystical teaching of the Cabbalists. He thus insisted on a pantheistic omnipresence of God, and on our communion with Him.

"Man," he says, "must always bear in mind that God is omnipresent, and is always with him; that He is, so to speak, the most subtle matter everywhere diffused. . . . Let man realize that when he is looking at material things he is in reality gazing at the image of the Deity which is present in all things. With this in mind man will always serve God even in small matters."³

Naturally there are differences among the Chassidim; they are not all alike. Some of them, following Besht's grandson, R. Nachman of Bratzlaw, despise those who would be rich, hold that the

¹ *Jewish Chronicle*, Jan. 14, 1927.

² L. Ginzberg in *Jew. Enc.*, ii, 383.

³ Dubnow in *Jew. Enc.*, vi, 252 sq.

poor are God's favourites, and have a high respect for manual labour. "Happy is he," they say, "who lives by the work of his hand: he knows the majesty of God better than the angels." Truthfulness and simplicity of life rank high among them. Prayer and joyfulness are all important, and assist each other. "Joy increases holiness, and Joy enlightens thought." Dancing may assist prayer—as even Zinzendorf proposed religious dancing in Divine service.¹

The fullest investigation into Chassidism is that by Mr. Paul Levertoff, a Hebrew-Christian, now Vicar in East London. He tells us the Chassidim say that Repentance brings the Messianic redemption nearer. Not only do gross sinners need repentance, but also they who are pious. For they too are burdened by sinfulness and their distance from God. There are three kinds of repentance, first, the negative, when a man gives up sinning; second, the positive, when he also does what is right; third, when he unites himself wholly with God the source of all, for "one can keep all God's commands and transgress none, and yet be far from God Himself."²

Mr. Levertoff has also embodied some of the Chassidic teaching in his little English book *Love and the Messianic Age*.³ In it he says in a passage which also hints at a more superstitious side of Jewish thought: "To the Hasid, Scripture is full of spiritual truth, and even the Hebrew letters of the Book are considered to be 'vehicles which bring to the upper and lower worlds life from the Divine centre.' He who comprehends the spiritual meaning of the Word of God and receives it into the innermost chambers of his heart is called 'the friend and brother of God, and the holy temple of the Divine Spirit.' The deepest longing, therefore, of the genuine Hasid is to become a 'living Torah.' The keeping of the Law is to him only a means to an end—union with God, and for this reason he tries to keep it scrupulously, for 'God's thoughts are embodied in it.'" ⁴

Again, "Fear and love are wings by which the soul is carried to heaven. . . . Just as all the riches of the world are as nothing in comparison with the love that we have for our own life, so the accumulation of good works, through the keeping of the Law, is nothing in comparison with the natural love of the soul for God. The fellowship with God which comes from such a love is so all-pervading, and leads to a self-surrender so complete, that the result is joy ineffable. Such love cannot, at times, endure the limitations of the body, the heart cannot contain it."⁵

This is very delightful, but would that the Chassidim had always lived up to it! For their insistence upon the emotions in religion has led them into many excesses, and in spite of much of the spirituality of their teaching they are often strangely superstitious. They depend far too much on their "righteous men" (*Zaddikim*), whom

¹ A. Jeremias, *Jüdische Frömmigkeit*, 1927, p. 51.

² P. Levertoff, *Die religiöse Denkweise der Chassidim nach den Quellen dargestellt*, 1918, pp. 30 sq.

³ 33, Bedford Square, London. [1924.]

⁴ P. 17.

⁵ P. 27.

indeed they often regard as almost divine, and on whose intercessions they conceive their own salvation to depend.

But they form a large proportion of the Jews in Eastern Europe, and we Christians ought to know more of them, and at least try to help them. We have made little attempt to do so.

II. From the Chassidim to the Liberal Judaism of a few English Jews is a startling change. The former insist on the inspiration of every word and letter of the Books of Moses. The latter have serious qualms whether Moses ever existed, and pay to the writings that pass under his name a very qualified respect. Certainly they still are Jews, for they observe circumcision and keep the sabbath more or less, but they hold the Dietary Laws as of little account, and esteem the Prophets as in reality of much more importance than the Law. Needless to say that they do not expect the coming of a personal Messiah, and if they do look forward to a return to Palestine (and they hardly do) they certainly do not pray with most Jews for the rebuilding of the Temple.

The Liberal Jews are, it will be observed, to be distinguished from the Reform Jews in general, who are the direct heirs of a movement in Germany dating from the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. For the English Liberal Jews are the outcome of the thoughts and efforts of one man who is still among us, and is perhaps more respected in England to-day than any other Jew, Mr. Claude G. Montefiore. He is a learned man himself, and had for his intimate friend and colleague the very remarkable scholar Dr. Israel Abrahams, whose death last year all Cambridge lamented.

The object of the Liberal Jews was stated very plainly by Mr. Montefiore last February at the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the movement—for it is as recent as that. He says, "The movement from the first has been a Jewish movement, a religious movement; its object was, and still is, to quicken religious life and faith in our community, to make Judaism more vital for many Jews, and to make Judaism itself more vital. (These two aspects, Mr. Montefiore adds, of the movement are obviously one and the same, for if there are no Jews whose faith is living, there can be, and there is, no living Judaism.) It was, and it is, a missionary movement to Jews from Jews—from those who realized the need to those who realized it also, or who realized it a little, or who did not realize it at all. It was, and it is, a movement from seekers to other seekers, from those who had found it at least a *little* to those who had perchance not found even *that*. It was, and it is, a movement from those who themselves felt the necessity for something new to those who also felt the necessity, or who were subjected to the *results* of that necessity, but had not consciously experienced it themselves. It was a movement of reclamation, of regeneration, of religious uplift and vitalization. It was a movement *to combat drift and indifference* and apostacy, it was a movement to bring back many to Judaism, and to bring Judaism back to many. . . . Orthodoxy is losing its hold, though the shell, the framework, may

remain. . . . More and more, the younger generation in these countries . . . is becoming alienated from Judaism as a religion, and very often alienated from religion altogether."

At the same meeting, Mr. Mattuck, the Rabbi of the Liberal Synagogue, said: "Liberal Judaism stood for the idea and the spread of a knowledge of Judaism which should combine the influence of the past with the realities and needs of the present." . . . It "wished to combine the teachings of Judaism with modern thought, and to adapt the great institutions of the Jews to the present conditions of the life of the Jew. Its principles were that Judaism was a living and universal religion."¹

Brave words! But at least Mr. Montefiore and his friends have done their best to bring about their ideal. His Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels in two volumes (1909) was inspired by a sincere desire to understand the life of our Lord, and to show Him to other Jews. It has called forth, not unnaturally, the strongest possible opposition from many Jews, who detest his expressed opinion that every Jew ought not only to know the Gospels, but also to adopt whatever good teaching they can find in them. After being out of print for many years the Commentary has recently been issued in a second and enlarged edition.

Dr. Israel Abrahams, to whom reference has already been made, collaborated somewhat in that Commentary, and a third volume was to have contained notes by him on many points. That was found to be too troublesome a task, and the volume was never issued. But Dr. Abrahams did publish two independent but quite invaluable books, entitled *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*,² in which he illuminates by his Rabbinic learning many details of the Gospel story. He was a man of singularly deep personal religion, who, while still remaining a Jew, gave expression to his opinions about our Lord and His teaching with the utmost reverence.

In an essay on Philo, he writes as follows: "The divine Law is not something mechanically imposed on us from without; it corresponds to an inner law of our being."³ "'The business of man,' says Philo, 'is to follow and to imitate God . . . to abide in God is man's highest blessedness.'"⁴

The last book that Dr. Abrahams published before his death is full of sayings—both quoted and original—which show the more spiritual side of his Judaism. "Judaism," he says, "has always laid great stress on the communal aspect of morals and religious practice. But it is possible that in no other matter does it more earnestly attempt to harmonize its Communism with individualism than in its treatment of the personal contact with God. Every one is an individuality, unlike all others. [Yet] on all and on each is thrown the corporate responsibility. . . . [If] you lose the Glory yourself . . . you steal it from others."⁵

¹ *Jewish Chronicle*, Feb. 25, 1927.

² 1917 and 1924.

³ *Some Permanent Values in Judaism*, 1924, p. 58.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 61.

⁵ *The Glory of God*, 1925, pp. 78 sq.

Again, " 'The invisible, spiritual Shekinah is with every born Israelite, and with every possessor of the true religion, pure in conduct, clean of heart, and with soul untainted in its relation to the God of Israel.' " ¹

Again, " God created the world for His glory. This is the essence of the idea—it runs through every phase of it, through God's glory in Nature, in the Law, in every Revelation of the spirit, in the whole universe of men and of things animate and inanimate. . . . Creation was thus necessary to make the Glory of God manifest. And God has faith in His world—finding it very good, and gaining new satisfaction whenever men justify his faith. . . . It is left to us to vindicate God's love for His world and His hope in us. We must be ever ready. There is no other time but here and now. . . . Man must not waste his opportunities. He must ever be ready to receive the vision, in a sense to deserve it by surrendering himself—when the vision is offered—' for Thy sake, O Lord, not for ours.' Honour God with thy very substance. There must be no reluctance of expenditure, no limitation of preparedness to give." ²

III. It was said above that Liberal Judaism is held by English Jews, and by very few of these. But it is in close touch with movements of a similar kind in America, which, however, must be passed over here for lack of space.

There are, however, many more Jews in England who have not actually joined the Liberal Union, and yet sympathize with much of its teaching. They call themselves Reform Jews, i.e., Jews who, before Liberal Judaism as we know it was thought of, urged many details of Reform, particularly in the conduct of the Synagogue services.

Dr. Morris Joseph has been one of the most remarkable of these, and his volume entitled *Judaism in Creed and Life* (1903) is very helpful to all religious minds. But to-day it is well to quote something more recent, viz., a paper by Dr. Joel Blau, minister of the Reformed Berkeley Street Synagogue, entitled *Two Types of Reform*. In it he is trying carefully to distinguish himself not only from Orthodox but also from Liberal Jews. " A man may intelligently ask himself: how can I, as an individual Jew, secure the survival of this [Jewish] people, help preserve the continuity of its flowing, growing life, contribute towards its enhancement and ultimate perfection? . . . The living Jewish people is, humanly speaking, the most clearly manifest embodiment of the spirit of the Living God. . . . Now, personally, if I were convinced that Orthodoxy is the one and only form of Jewish life best calculated to secure the preservation of my people, I would instantly turn orthodox. If I do advocate the mild type of Reform as represented by the Berkeley Street Synagogue, it is because I believe it can best assure, at least for us in this country, the continuity, in its integral essence, of the Jewish tradition as a distinctive form of life to be lived by the Jewish people

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 83, quoted from Jehuda Halevi, *Cusari*, III (beginning).

² *Ibid.*, pp. 87 sq.

as a distinctive individual entity. I advocate this type of Reform, not because I love Orthodoxy less, but because I love Judaism more."

Again, "When I was a student, I had to swallow the Teutonically pedantic characterization of Judaism as an Ethical Monotheism. But I knew then, as I know now, that Jewish martyrs did not die for Ethical Monotheism. A people like ours, moving by the breath of God, does not die for a philosophy, but for a faith. Who would die for an abstraction? Our people went to the stake for a Living God, for hearth and altar, not for the pale creation of German theologians. God was *real* to the Jew, insomuch as he realized Him in his own life and identified himself with His vaster being."

Again, "My type of Reform—the Berkeley Street type—aims at preserving the Jewish character of the service by a generous retention of Hebrew in the service, and also by following faithfully the traditional structure of the liturgy."

Again, "I want the Jew to possess and preserve his *background sense*. It is this sense that makes for the greatness of peoples; the knowledge that they have sprung from somewhere and make for somewhither; that they have an origin and a destiny. . . . We are of the ages, ageless. When we say that we worship the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, we mean just that our origins stretch away back to the dimness of time, yet are real to us. . . . Ours is an ancient but not an antiquated, outdated life; ours is a flowing growing life, a tradition not rigidly fixed, yet continuous and coherent." ¹

It may be worth while noticing the nature of the demands made even in Orthodox circles, for they recall a quaint phase in the history of the Presbyterian Church. An anonymous writer in the *Jewish Chronicle* for February 25, 1927, signing himself "Outsider," asks that the Chief Rabbi may sanction the following reforms: an organ, the Triennial Cycle of the Law, a shorter liturgy, a certain amount of English [for there is none now except in the prayer for the King and Royal Family], and the elimination of such prayers as now are meaningless.

These requests seem to members of the Church of England extraordinarily slight and conservative, but they do show that even the bulk of the Jews are moving towards more personal and practical religion.

Yet with all our inclination towards Jews of a Reformed or even of a Liberal type we must remember that, unless the voice of history deceives us, the future of Judaism does not really rest with them. It is, surely, no accident that of all the descendants of the famous Moses Mendelssohn (1729–86), who did so much to awaken Judaism out of its slumbers, not one has remained a Jew. His grandson, the musician, is a typical example.

One cannot wonder, therefore, at the fierceness with which the Chief Rabbi deals with the American Scholar, Dr. Emil Hirsch, who

¹ *Jewish Chron. Supplement*, Jan. 28, 1927.

banished the Roll of the Law from his synagogue, and the glee with which he quotes the dictum of the scientist, Professor W. M. Haffkine, "Is there a Jewish community anywhere, however safely domiciled, which has relinquished the *Torah* for even one generation and survived that separation? Those who forsake the *Torah*, bringing it into disrepute and weakening the hold it has on us, are working at the destruction of the brotherhood that cradled and sheltered our fathers and forefathers through all the vicissitudes of the bygone ages, to whom they owe their own life and presence on earth."¹

IV. What then of Zionism, that most extraordinary movement of our time, in which the promises of God through the Prophets are in process of fulfilment before our very eyes? The chief founder of Zionism, as we know it, was Theodore Herzl (1860-1904), a Viennese playwright and journalist, who was chiefly a materialist with but little faith in God, as we reckon faith. And many of the prominent leaders of Zionism, it is said, have been like him. But, in any case, they have not had it all their own way. For there has always been among the Zionists, among both its financial supporters and those who have gone to Palestine, a strong contingent of sincere and pious souls.

Most of these indeed are mute. They have not the gift of literary power. But there was one famous writer who, though not indeed belonging to the more pious side, has at least seen the importance of the higher as contrasted with the merely political and social aspect of Zionism—Asher Ginsberg (1856-1927) who wrote under the name of Achad Ha'am ("One of the People"). He is noteworthy, partly for his Hebrew style (a great contrast to the "Hebrew as she is wrote" of some modern authors), but above all, for his insight into the Jewish character and the necessity for developing this in the best direction.

Before Herzl's pamphlet (1896) Achad Ha'am was already interested in the movement of "the Lovers of Zion" (*Chôbebê Zion*), and has always insisted that on their basis alone—the Love of Zion connected with the service of God—can political Zionism really succeed.

No doubt one must be careful not to read into Achad Ha'am's utterances more "spirituality" than he himself intended. For the word "spiritual" in translations from German or Hebrew is apt to mean much less than it does in ordinary English. But, allowing for that, Achad Ha'am does take the higher side of life, and insist on the necessity of it if work is to succeed.

Notice, in the first place, his clear statement of the meaning of the Balfour Declaration about Palestine. "When, then, the British Government promised to facilitate the establishment *in Palestine of a national home* for the Jewish people—and not, as was suggested to it, the reconstitution of Palestine as the national home of the Jewish people—that promise meant two things. It meant in the first place recognition of the historic right of the Jewish people to

¹ *Jewish Chron.*, Dec. 25, 1925.

build its national home in Palestine, with a promise of assistance from the British Government, and it meant in the second place a negation of the power of that right to over-ride the right of the present inhabitants and to make the Jewish people sole ruler in the country." ¹

Notice also Achad Ha'am's feeling about the injury done to Judaism by life in exile.

"Have we a right to regard the rebuilding of Palestine as an ideal for the whole nation, and its success as vital to the hopes of the whole nation?"

"We have! For *galuth* [exile] is twofold—it is material and spiritual. On the one hand it cramps the individual Jew in his material life, by taking from him the possibility of carrying on his struggle for existence, with all his strength and in complete freedom, like any other man; and on the other hand it cramps no less our people as a whole in its spiritual life, by taking from it the possibility of safeguarding and developing its national individuality according to its own spirit, in complete freedom, like any other people." ²

Again in 1897 he wrote:

"Why deceive ourselves? Of all the great objects of *Chibbath Zion* [the love of Zion] (or, as they call it now, 'Zionism') there is only one towards the accomplishment of which we have at present the strength to approach in any appreciable degree, and that is the *moral* object—the emancipation of ourselves from the inner slavery and the spiritual degradation which assimilation has produced in us, and the strengthening of our national unity by joint action in every part of our national life, until we become capable and worthy of a life of dignity and freedom at some time in the future." ³

Lastly, so long ago as 1889, he wrote in substance:

What then must we do? . . . We must sanctify the first fruits of our work to giving new life to our hearts; to increase our love for the welfare of the community, to glorify the desire for its prosperity, until our better inclination be aroused and the workmen work faithfully ⁴ . . . But indeed this task is hard and long; it is not for one year nor for ten, and it is done not by talk alone but by all those ways by which hearts are won. ⁵

It is at this point that mention must be made of Dr. Joseph Klausner, for like Achad Ha'am he represents Jewish workers in Palestine. He made his name as far back as 1904 by his very able and suggestive study of the opinions about the Messiah held by the teachers of the Mishna, ⁶ but recently has become much more famous by his life of our Lord entitled *Jesus of Nazareth, his times, his life*,

¹ Achad Ha'am. 1920 Preface. Leon Simon's Trans. 1922, p. xviii.

² Achad Ha'am, 1906, *The Time Has Come* (Leon Simon's Translation), 1922, p. 96); Hebrew iv. 62.

³ Translation, pp. 95 sq.

⁴ [cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12.]

⁵ Hebrew i. 6.

⁶ *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten*, 1904.

*and his teaching.*¹ It is a painstaking and learned book, but owes the sensation that it caused among the Jews to the fact that it was written by a Jew. So much does it say of the excellence of our Lord, and the duty of all Jews to try to understand Him and His teaching that many Jews even asserted that it was written at the prompting of the missionaries! It would be strange indeed if it had been, for it is often very painful reading for a Christian man, being, as it is, largely a réchauffé of rationalistic books, French and German. But in any account of the forces that make for the spiritual uplift of modern Judaism it must not be omitted.

It is indeed often short-sighted, and one-sided. For example, he says that Jesus' "negative attitude" towards property "led the Jacobins, during the French Revolution, to hail Jesus as 'le bon sansculotte,' and the Bolsheviks to style him 'the great communist'; though it is very doubtful [!!] whether Jesus, who opposed fighting against evil, would have consented to the terrible murders during the great French, and the still greater Russian, Revolution. But it is unquestionable that throughout his entire teaching there is nothing that can serve to the upkeep of the state or serve towards the maintenance of order in the existing world."²

A remarkable comment, betraying, surely, extraordinary ignorance of the methods of Jesus, and of the social and political success they have attained.

More pleasing quotations, though far from satisfactory to us, are the following:

"The influence of Jesus upon his disciples and followers was exceptional. In Galilee masses of people followed him to the danger zone, to Jerusalem; they remained faithful to him both during his life and after his terrible death. Every word he spoke—even parables which they did not understand, and the more enigmatic figures of speech—they treasured like a precious pearl. As time went on his spiritual image grew ever more and more exalted, till, at length, it reached the measure of the divine. Never has such a thing happened to any other human creature in enlightened, historic times and among a people claiming a two thousand years old civilization."³

Again: "Though exaggerated self-confidence can at times be repellent, yet Jesus was so often tender, gentle and humble as to mask his self-confidence."⁴

Again: "The contradictory traits in his character, its positive and negative aspects, his harshness and his gentleness, his clear vision combined with his cloudy visionariness—all these united to make him a force and an influence, for which history has never yet afforded a parallel."⁵

¹ Published at Jerusalem in Hebrew, 1922, and translated into English by Canon Danby, 1925.

² Hebrew, pp. 409 *sq.*; English, p. 376.

³ Hebrew, p. 442; English, p. 408.

⁴ Hebrew, p. 443; English, p. 409.

⁵ Hebrew, p. 445; English, pp. 44, 411.

The last page of Klausner's book contains the following sayings : " Jesus is, for the Jewish nation, a *great teacher of morality and an artist in parable*. He is *the moralist* for whom, in the religious life, morality counts as everything. . . . In his ethical code there is a sublimity, distinctiveness and originality in form unparalleled in any other Hebrew code. . . . If ever the day should come and this ethical code be stripped of its wrappings of miracle and mysticism, the Book of the Ethics of Jesus will be one of the choicest treasures in the literature of Israel for all time." ¹

And so Dr. Klausner's work ends, upon a note that sounds excruciatingly discordant to the ear that has been trained in the Divine harmony. Yet it is serving its purpose in making the Person of Jesus less abhorrent to many Jewish minds, and in leading them to try to understand something of the reason for the Christian's adoration of Him.

V. Frankly, it is a relief to turn from the rather patronizing literature of whole classes of modern Jews to the definite opposition of the Orthodox. For, after all, as was said above, it is with these that the future of Judaism really lies. True that many even of them are studying Jesus as never before, but they do not attempt to combine with their Judaism any obedience to Him.

Yet a great deal of their teaching is bound up with a high standard of spiritual religion—so far as that is possible for those who reject the Lord Jesus.

It might almost be sufficient to quote many passages from the Jewish Prayer Book, used regularly in the synagogues of the Orthodox,² but it seems preferable to illustrate our subject from utterances of our own day.

Dr. A. Jeremias, the well-known Christian professor at Leipzig, tells us in a recent book that when he was in Warsaw a few years ago he wanted a *droszky*. He went to the stand—there the *droszkies* were, and the horses, but no men! " I knew," he says, " where the men would be if I were at home," i.e., in Germany! But a young Jew guided him, and took him to an upper room in a back street, and there he found all the drivers reading large folios and discussing the contents. It was the Talmud, and these cab-drivers were debating the meaning of God's statutes. So it was with all the trades there; the bakers, the butchers, the tailors, all had their own room or club for the study of the Talmud.³

Nor is this peculiar to poor Jews. For Jeremias tells us on another page that Amschel Rothschild, the founder of the famous Frankfurt house, who died in 1855, during all his long life spent two whole nights a week studying the Talmud.⁴

Only the Talmud! Yes, but think what the regular study of the Talmud implies! A sincere desire to know what is right, and

¹ Hebrew, p. 448; English, p. 414.

² See my paper on this subject in the *International Review of Missions*, April, 1926, pp. 205-17.

³ *Jüdische Frömmigkeit*, 1927, p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

to learn how to regulate one's life in the smallest detail in accordance with the will of God.

For, as the very learned but very Orthodox Dr. S. Daiches says, " ' To be religious ' means to the genuine Jew to fear God and obey His law. The study of the Torah and its proper interpretation, including the adaptation of its enactments to varying and changing conditions, form part of the duty and prescribed activity of . . . the guides and leaders of Israel of all ages. Prayer and public worship are prescribed as means to an end—the end being right conduct—and are intended to prepare the Jew for submission to the Divine will and for the faithful practice of the precepts and ordinances of the Divine law. In the same way, the ceremonial and ritual observances are intended to strengthen the Jew in his endeavour to suppress his lower self, to place his whole being in the service of God and man, to remember his association with Israel as an ethnic entity, and to pursue the aim which the Lawgiver has set before him as an individual and a son of his people." ¹

Again, after saying stiffly, " We cannot revise our Prayer Book," Dr. Daiches adds, " But we can visualize its greatness, beauty and holiness, and can catch something of its splendour. If we will understand our Prayer Book, if we will understand all that Judaism means, then we will feel the full thrill of the words, ' And who is like Thy people, like Israel, a nation one on the earth ? ' " ²

Let us now listen to Dr. Hertz, the Chief Rabbi of the British Empire, who has been giving two series of Lectures, one in direct opposition to Liberal Judaism, and the other in exposition of the Affirmations of Judaism. He adds to each lecture copious illustrations from writings which he is attacking, or which he draws upon for support, and is himself very outspoken in his defence of Orthodoxy. We are only concerned with the way in which he insists on the higher teaching of Judaism.

" Judaism," he says in the Lecture on the Revelation at Mount Sinai, " embraces the whole of life. And because it has at all times and in all lands embraced and regulated the whole life of its loyal children, Judaism is far more than a creed or a theology, greater than a denomination or a Church. *Judaism is a religious civilization*, a spiritual culture aglow with a passion for righteousness; a national complex of language, literature, history, customs and social institutions, organized round the beliefs in the unity of God and the reality of Divine Revelation." ³

Again, the Chief Rabbi quotes with approval the words of Dr. Loewe of Cambridge and Oxford, " Possibly the most misunderstood of all our ordinances are those which regulate carrying and travelling on Sabbath. Sabbath is the home festival, it is the strength and glorification of home life, home worship, and home rest. Theatre-going, golfing, cycling, harmless and even desirable though they be, are alien to the Sabbath spirit. The moment that riding

¹ *Jewish Chron. Supplement*, March 25, 1927.

² *Ibid.*, Feb. 18, 1927.

³ *Ibid.*, Apr. 9, 1926.

[i.e., in tram or train, etc.] is tolerated, the whole Sabbath spirit is changed; it becomes something absolutely different. It is quite impossible to draw a line and say 'I will permit this violation, but observe that; thus far, but no further.' Practical experience has shown the futility of such distinctions. Jewish life rests on refraining from riding. Whosoever begins by riding will end by losing the Sabbath altogether."¹

Dr. Hertz ends his Lectures thus: "Let my last word be: Whenever we overcome callousness to human misery, whenever Jewish brotherhood, human brotherhood, moves us to deeds of pity and beneficence, we *imitate God*, we experience eternity in this life, and enrol our names among the children of Him who revealed Himself unto Moses in the Thirteen Attributes of Mercy. Amen."²

Now these utterances of Orthodox Jews of recognized authority may seem to be rather disappointing, and not representing a very high degree of spiritual teaching compared with the words of many Christian preachers. But at least they represent a side of Judaism infinitely superior to the idea of it which is so common among non-Jews, that Judaism is a formal and sterile system, the votaries of which are singularly deficient in the aspirations of true religion. These quotations will have shown how very wide of the mark such a belief is. That fact is that, though often not according to knowledge, the religion of modern Jews is permeated through and through with a sincere desire to learn of God, and to follow His will.

It is up to us Christians to consider how best we may help them to do so.

"The Canon of Tears," said Raymond Lull in his *Blanquerna* [c. 1300 A.D. N.B., Bp. Blanquerna had given certain duties to each of his Canons], "passed by the Synagogue of the Jews, and saw many Jews entering therein that they might pray to God; so he sat at the door of the synagogue. The Canon remembered how that the Jews had been the cause of the Passion of Jesus Christ, and how they dishonoured Him in the world, and believed not in Him but maligned Him daily. While the Canon thought upon these things, and on the damnation whither the Jews through ignorance go, he wept right bitterly, saying these words: 'Ah, Charity and Devotion! How is it that ye go not to honour our Lord among these people who think that they honour Him, yet do Him dishonour? Ah, Pity! How is it that thou hast not mercy upon these people who daily through ignorance journey towards the fire that is everlasting?' Many other words spake the Canon, and long did he weep in that place, and many times came he to weep in that place, to the end that Divine grace might enlighten those that had strayed, and give devotion to Christians, that by the virtue of God they might have greater diligence than now they have, in enlightening the unbelievers."³

¹ *Jewish Chron. Supplement*, July 23, 1926.

² *Ibid.*, Feb. 4, 1927.

³ Cap. lxxi. Translated from the Catalan by E. A. Peers, 1926.

THE CHURCH IN FINLAND

By THE REV. G. W. KERR, B.A., LL.B.

THE visit of Dr. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, last May, to Finland, on the invitation of Dr. Gummerus, Bishop of Tammerfors, will strengthen the traditional friendship between Finland and Great Britain. We in this country owe a debt of gratitude to the Finns, for in 1918 they put down a revolution organized by Soviet Russia, and thus checked Bolshevism from spreading to western Europe. Finland is now an Independent State, and looks to Great Britain for the secret of her moral ascendancy. This country has always been closely associated with the destinies of Finland, for, while Englishmen have played a leading part in the ecclesiastical life of the country, Scotsmen—Dr. Finlayson and others—have helped to develop its industrial resources.

In the twelfth century, Pope Adrian IV (formerly known as Nicholas Breakspear, Cardinal of St. Albans) founded the Metropolitan See of Upsala, in Sweden, and appointed another Englishman, Henry, as the first Bishop. Bishop Henry authorized King Eric of Sweden to start a Crusade to convert the pagan Finns. Henry baptized the first converts at Abo. He is the Patron Saint of Finland, and Festivals in his honour were the first National Feasts common to the whole people.

In the next century another Englishman, Bishop Thomas, conceived a plan of severing Finland from Sweden, and making it an Independent Catholic State under the Suzerainty of the Pope. This plan did not succeed, but its inception is a testimony to the strength, even in those early days, of the Finnish National Spirit, which centuries of oppression failed to crush. Bishop Thomas was the organizer of the Finnish Church, and commenced the building of the only cathedral Finland has ever possessed, at Abo. During the Middle Ages successive Bishops of Abo were native-born Finns, who not only took a prominent position in affairs of State, but represented Finland in diplomatic relations with other countries, and Abo Cathedral was the National Sanctuary of Finland.

As a result of three Crusades by the Swedes, which combined the zeal of the missionary with the passions of the military adventurer, Finland became part of the Kingdom of Sweden. For over 600 years she was the buffer State on which intermittent warfare was waged between Sweden and Russia. Hers was a tragic history, but from Sweden she acquired culture and the traditions of European civilization.

In 1808 Russia found a pretext for annexing Finland, and though Alexander I made Finland a Grand Duchy, and solemnly undertook, on behalf of himself and his successors, to safeguard the rights and liberties of the Finns, the Covenant was not observed by his successors, and Finland felt the full force of Russian tyranny. A turning point in her fortunes came in the Great War: when the

Russian Empire collapsed, Finland claimed her independence, and her claim was recognized by the Great Powers. She became a member of the League of Nations, and accepted the ruling of the League with regard to the Aland Islands, and so composed an outstanding quarrel with Sweden.

The Reformation was carried through in Finland, as in Sweden, without any violent revolution, but chiefly in the form of an internal reorganization of the National Church in an Evangelical spirit, while adhering to primitive forms. Michael Agricola, a pupil of Martin Luther, was the leader of the Reformation. He became the first Lutheran Bishop, and gave to the people for the first time the New Testament in their native tongue. It is recorded that when some timid members of his flock expressed a fear that God might not understand their prayers unless said in Latin, the Bishop assured them that He, who could read the inarticulate desires of the heart, would understand His children when they prayed in their own language. Agricola drew up a reformed Catechism, and commenced the work of National education, which until recently has been entirely promoted by the clergy, and with such remarkable success that there is scarcely any illiteracy in the country. The Finnish Church is founded on education, the clergy have always refused to marry persons unless they have been confirmed, or to confirm those who could not read and write. It is due to the Church that to-day education is almost a passion among the people, and that in town and village Institutes working-men assemble to study English, Science, and Philosophy, not for material advancement, but for the joy of intellectual activity. (Did not J. S. Mill observe that Democracy would justify itself when working-men could enjoy reading the sonnets of Wordsworth?)

Episcopacy was not abolished at the Reformation in Finland, as in Germany, though Bishops ceased to be temporal rulers, controlling armies, and confined themselves to their spiritual functions. Apostolic succession was retained up to the year 1884: in that year, however, all the Finnish Bishops died, and as it was not considered desirable to seek Consecration from abroad, the new Bishops were consecrated by a duly ordained clergyman. The Church of Finland acknowledges no essential difference between Ordination by a bishop and Ordination by a clergyman.

From the seventeenth to the nineteenth century the Lutheran Church was in the strictest sense a State Church, and every citizen was compelled to belong to it. The local Church Community was responsible for municipal administration, poor relief and other social services. The Clergy had the right of representation in the Diet, as one of the four estates, with the Nobility, Burghers, and Peasantry. During the nineteenth century, as a result of a religious revival, and the spread of secularism, a tendency arose to separate the functions of Church and State, and to regard religion as the concern of the individual conscience. Then, gradually, the State assumed these social functions in which the Church had been the pioneer. To-day, the Church in Finland is under the control of

the State, but enjoys a large measure of freedom, and is the National Church in virtue of the fact that the majority of the population are adherents.

Finland is divided into five Dioceses, and these into Deaneries and Parishes. In the Church Assembly, as in the Diet, women vote as well as men, and the system of Proportional Representation has been adopted. The Church Assembly is composed of 38 Clergy and 54 Laymen. The standard of Scholarship for candidates for the Ministry is high—four years at the University and two years in a Theological College. When a living is vacant, the Bishop invites applications to be sent to him within 60 days. He then selects three candidates and submits their names to the congregation to choose the one whom they prefer. For the election of a Bishop the Clergy of the Diocese select three men and submit their names to the President of the Republic, who makes the appointment. In the administration of the Church persons of either sex are entitled to one vote at the age of 24, to two votes when they reach 40—a tribute to the riper wisdom of middle life: ten years of married life confer a third vote—the maximum. Who but the bachelor or spinster would grudge this graceful recognition of the valuable experience of wedlock? Great stress is laid on the rite of Confirmation, which is administered, not by the Bishops, but by the Parochial Clergy. The age for Confirmation is 16, and the instruction given in school is supplemented by 100 hours of special teaching in Confirmation classes. An organist attends, and the hymnal as a Manual of Instruction takes its place with the Prayer Book and Bible.

The Church has successfully withstood the propaganda and missionary activities of the Roman Church, which has recently appointed a Bishop, who lives in the capital. The last official census numbers the Roman Catholics in the country as 420. The people are frankly Protestant, and are repelled by Sacerdotalism and the materialistic doctrine of the Mass. The Church has shown a greater power of resistance than the Lutheran Churches in Sweden and Norway to the forces of German Rationalism. The State levies for the maintenance of the Clergy a tax on all citizens—a minimum contribution of one-half of one per cent. Citizens have a right to contract out by declaring that they are not members of the Lutheran Church. Only twenty thousand out of a population of four and a half million avail themselves of this opportunity—a sign that the Church has found a place in the respect and love of the people. Dissent is almost a negligible quantity, although complete freedom is secured by law to any citizen to join or leave any sect he pleases—a privilege not allowed when Russia was in control. The Greek Orthodox Church is almost confined to the monastery of Valamo, an island in Lake Ladoga, on the borders of Russia. This monastery is a quaint survival and a popular resort for tourists, who are entertained in a vast Hostel, and watch with interest a colony of priests who are self-supporting, and who are trained as doctors, farmers, fruit-growers, etc. Although the Church in Finland is free from unhappy divisions caused by divergent views of doctrine

and ritual, she is faced by formidable barriers of race and language, for the Nation is bi-lingual and consists of Finns proper and Swedish Finns. The difficulty is surmounted by a brilliant device. One parish is superimposed upon another. The Bishop will appoint two ministers, each with his own church, or if the population is small, one church is used at different hours by the two congregations, just as Garrison churches are employed in this country. In this way unity is secured without uniformity.

The order of Divine Service is modelled on that of the Middle Ages. The Evangelical impress is given in the hymns and sermon; the latter is usually of a revivalistic character, to awaken the conscience of the hearers. It is still the custom for the minister to wear a chasuble, but the Holy Communion is regarded as the Lord's Supper, and vestments have merely an aesthetic significance.

The Finnish Church is feeling the urge of those great movements which are stirring the minds of Christian people throughout the world. Last summer 1,050 representatives of the Y.M.C.A., from almost every country in the world, met in Helsingfors to consider "the Claim of Christ upon the Young," in reponse to the World Call. There is a growing interest in studying the social aspect of Christianity, in the permeation of every department of life—civil, commercial, political—by the Christian ethic, as opposed to the theory of a Church divorced from the life of a Nation. The Society for the Evangelisation of Industrial Centres functions in settlements, meetings and welfare work, and has promoted social legislation for an eight hours' day in factories, a week's holiday in the year with full pay, and the abolition of child labour. While all Scandinavian countries have been experimenting with Temperance Reform, the Finnish Government has boldly adopted Prohibition as the best policy for a Young State striving to build up her fortunes after centuries of oppression. Most of the Clergy support this movement, though its success is as problematical as in America.

The Church in Finland is confronted with the mighty, yet congenial task of shaping the destiny of a virile Nation which exults in her newly won freedom, and strives to express that freedom in Art and Literature, Industrial Expansion, and Social Betterment. Visitors to Helsingfors cannot fail to observe signs that Religion is a living force in the development of the new Finland. Among the churches which have recently been built, the church of Kallio, by Sonck, holds the spectator spell-bound with admiration. It represents an original style of Church Architecture. It is a statue-like monument of granite, composed of straight lines with little ornamentation, and yet it is an edifice of delicate and dream-like beauty. In the Athenæum are exhibited pictures of modern painters which show that Finland can claim a distinctive school of Art, and the great Masters—Edelfelt, Eckman, Jarnefelt—find their inspiration in religious subjects—"The Open-Air Service in the Archipelago," "Christ and the Magdalene" (a Finnish peasant girl at the feet of the Good Shepherd), or in illustrating the Kalevala—

that National storehouse of folk-lore, which is one of the world's great Epics. The Kalevala shows the early struggles between Paganism and Christianity, and the indomitable courage of hardy pioneers contending with the forces of Nature—flood, storm and fire.

It is in the home life of the people that Religion is most potent. Every woman regards her home as her chief interest, and desires to make it the expression of her personality. Marriages are solemnized in the home, not in the Church, and in country parishes, some of which are as vast in extent as an English Diocese, the minister holds services in the outlying farms, which the neighbours attend.

The Finns are likely to increase their prestige among the Nations of Europe. They have been compared to the Scotch, the Irish, the Japanese, the Americans, and the inhabitants of one of the ancient Greek States, and the comparison suggests a wonderful versatility. As emigrants they are eagerly welcomed by our Dominions overseas: Canada admits seven thousand Finns every year, and while the original emigrants may long for the old homeland, their children become true Britons in sentiment, outlook and loyalty to the Throne.

LETTERS ON RELIGION AND FOLKLORE. By the late F. W. Hasluck, M.A. Annotated by Margaret M. Hasluck, B.A. (Cantab), M.A. (Abdn.). *Luzac & Co.* 12s. 6d. net.

This volume contains many extracts from letters written to Professor R. M. Dawkins, which have been copied and annotated by the writer's wife. These letters discussed not only the interplay of Islam and Christianity in the East, but also the transition in the West from paganism to Christianity and the evolution of Christianity from the "Pelagian" to the "Olympian" stage. Besides discussing Christianity the book gives a considerable amount of information on varied subjects gleaned by the author in various by-paths of the Near East, and include notes on Architecture (there are 29 excellent illustrations) and there is an interesting excursion into Balkan Folklore and the part played by Syria in disseminating both Christian and Mohammedan legends. The book being in the form of letters not meant for publication but written for the diversion of a friend and covering a period from April, 1914, to February, 1920, gives much out-of-the-way information of an interesting character.

BERNARDINO OCHINO OF SIENA : CAPUCHIN AND REFORMER (1487—1564).

BY JOHN KNIPE.

PART II

1541 CONFERENCE AT RATISBON (REGENSBURG). CONTARINI, THE LEGATE, MAKES CONCESSIONS TO THE PROTESTANTS.

Cardinal Contarini made a noble attempt to heal the breach in the Church. It was Rome's hour, and the Legate, by his kindness, courtesy and wise tolerance, had nearly won back the Protestants of Germany. He thought that Justification by Faith might be accepted as a pious belief but not as a Dogma.

The General Chapter was held at Whitsuntide in Naples and Ochino was unanimously re-elected. "He had not yet shown the slightest token of heresy either by word of mouth or writing" (Boverio). Then the rumour arrived, Contarini was in disgrace and his concessions rejected at Rome. Ochino hesitated to accept office; he went out of the Chapter House alone, but Bernard of Asti followed him and urged him so earnestly that he consented to the entreaties of one whom he greatly honoured.

DEATH OF VALDEZ. THE CIRCLE DISPERSED.

Taken from the evil to come Valdez died that summer.

The Capuchin chronicler, Boverio, in deploring what followed, blamed Ochino for remaining after the Chapter in Naples, and "forming an intimate friendship with Valdez, a heretic," who lent him Lutheran books which "Ochino, fond of novelties, eagerly read." Boverio ignored the earlier years of their friendship. And Ochino did not then remain long in Naples. Probably he was at Florence when he heard of Valdez' death. The Spanish mystic had a great soul in a frail body, and he seems to have died suddenly.

Ochino was himself ill for several months. He declined an invitation to Siena in a letter which shows how he felt his loss. "I have been suffering for some time from such severe lumbago and other ailments that even if I could rise and travel it would be quite impossible for me to preach. . . . I must remain and accomplish my writing work while I am being treated." . . .

He may have tried to reorganize the Circle, for he wrote later of his own spiritual convictions: "The eyes of Italy were so weak that I should have hurt them grievously if I had let them look on the great Light Christ as it had been revealed to me. But *in the narrow Circle* I revealed the secret to many." He added mournfully: "Many of these came to me to tempt me; others from covetousness to inform the Pope and the Cardinals. . . . And again others joined who, partly from envy, partly for religion's sake,

sought to bring the matter to an issue. They contended that I preached heresies . . . and such poisonous heresy that none could ensnare or . . . catch me in my own words." It had become plain both to Ochino's friends and his enemies that he believed in Justification, and it was the *practical* nature of that grand doctrine which cut away the ground of the sacerdotal system. As it does in every age when it is plainly and fearlessly declared.

OCHINO SUSPECTED AT ROME. LENT IN VENICE, 1542.

At Christmas they were selling copies of the "Nine Sermons" in Venice, which were eagerly bought in anticipation of his coming.

When the beloved figure of the venerable Capuchin slowly mounted the pulpit of the SS. Apostoli the Nuncio Fabio Mignanelli had his spies in the church, having received the Pope's directions to watch Ochino closely. The friar knew that he was suspected. He chose his words prudently, while he wrote to his friend Del Vasto, "Christ's soldiers serve the bravest general of all." The disappointed spies wrenched his words from their context and reported them to the Nuncio as "heretical expressions." Mignanelli heard Ochino in private and dismissed the charge. But in March the Nuncio condemned for alleged heresy one of the Valdez' Circle, the preacher Terenziano of Milan. The "Savii" or "Committee of the Great Council for Church Affairs" threw Terenziano without trial into the dungeons near the Bridge of Sighs. All men wondered what Ochino would say. A great congregation held their breath while he knelt in silent prayer before them. Then rising and surveying the upturned faces, "Oh, Queen of the Sea!" he thundered in that mighty voice which he could subdue to a low, clear whisper: "If thou castest the heralds of truth into dungeons and chains and condemnest them to the galleys, what resting-place shall remain for the Truth?" The spies rushed off exultantly to tell the Nuncio. In anger Magnanelli forbade Ochino to preach. But the furious Venetians threatened to expel the Nuncio, who yielded on condition that Ochino abstained from any reference to such disputed matters.

Three days after Ochino was back in the pulpit and the Nuncio was writing to Rome. The Savii did not condemn Terenziano, but they left him in his dungeon from which some years after he escaped. He became a pastor in the Valtelline.

His Course finished Ochino retired to Verona. The Capuchin Convent stood "where the Adige leaves the town walls." He expounded St. Paul's Epistles to his friars from all over Italy and saw daily his friend Bishop Giberti, sometime member of the "Oratory of Divine Love."

Siena begged him to return. The city "had amended after his preaching," and the Pope had promised them his Missioner for the next Lent. Ochino's reply in the Town Archives was warmly affectionate. He was sorry, but "a Papal Brief had ordered him to go to Venice and stay there until further orders."

CITATION TO ROME.

The wavering Pope had shelved the Report on Church Reform, alleging the impossibility to reform his Curia! Now he summoned Caraffa and asked him, "How shall we overcome the heretics and retain Catholics in the Faith?"

Caraffa advised him to restore the Inquisition. Heresy should be crushed by the highest Tribunal sitting in Rome. The Cardinals much preferred a General Council, but backed by Ignatius Loyola, who signed the Memorial of Request, and other influential names, Caraffa obtained the infamous Bull "LICET AB INITIO." June 21, 1542.

It was not—as has been pretended by some historians—"to suppress bad books." Of thirteen paragraphs all were concerned with "Proceedings against Heretics and those Suspect of Heresy." The Holy Office was given unlimited and rapid powers, secret denunciations were accepted, the accused might neither call nor question witnesses, and even the Confessional Seal was not held sacred in reserved cases. Of course Ochino's name was foremost on Caraffa's List.

But Rome dared not arrest him openly. It must be "without uproar." The Cardinal De Carpi, Protector of the Order, "agreed with the Pope that Ochino should be cited privately." The Secretary, Cardinal Farnese, sent him a civil letter, requiring his presence after the great heat, on "matters of importance."

Ochino showed Giberti the letter. He distrusted it. He had been warned that he was suspected as a Lutheran and how certain of his own friars had arrived in Rome to give evidence against him. He thought the smooth words were "not honest nor straightforward" (Giberti letter to Del Vasto, Sept.). However, Ochino decided to obey and he wrote that he would come in the cooler weather. Giberti got a dispensation for him to ride, but he could not obtain a delay. Instead a second Brief came from Venice, citing Ochino to appear at once. It was mid-August. The friar consulted Giberti, who urged him to obey, and trust the Pope's kindness. The bishop lent him a horse and servant, and gave him a letter to Beccadelli, Contarini's secretary. On the way Ochino read it and found his fears were justified. "The affairs of our Pater Fra Bernardino," wrote Giberti, "will, I trust, have that ending which his sincere piety deserves; which we may expect from the Pope's wisdom before whom he is invited to appear . . . if the Lord Cardinal will assist him in his kindness all will be so much easier." This letter opened Ochino's eyes.

ARRIVAL IN BOLOGNA. MYSTERIOUS SICKNESS OF CONTARINI.

When Ochino reached the Legate's Palace Contarini had fallen suddenly ill. "The Cardinal received Ochino and told him to retire to rest till the morning" (Muzio). This brief statement shows that Contarini did both see and speak to Ochino privately

on the night of his arrival—Ochino has himself described his reception by the great Cardinal :

“ Although I knew that a hard struggle was awaiting me at Rome I set out thither. . . . At Bologna I spoke with the Cardinal Contarini and convinced myself that there was not the smallest hope that . . . Justification would be accepted in Rome. Contarini added that he himself had been in great danger because it was said he had not exposed the Protestants enough at the Diet. He barely escaped death. He even added in a whisper, ‘ If I have only escaped it.’ I answered, ‘ If they have dealt thus with the green tree, how shall it be with the dry ? ’ ”

Later on Beccadelli denied the private interview. He said that he kept Ochino till noon hoping Contarini would improve, but that the Cardinal only grew worse in the night and being in high fever he could hardly murmur his regrets and ask for Ochino’s prayers.

There is no more dramatic incident in the history of the Reformers than Ochino’s meeting thus with the dying Contarini. The friar reached Florence and sent back Giberti’s loan. Alarming rumours were in the air. Peter Martyr came from Lucca, resolved himself to disobey a similar summons to Genoa. He had written to Monsignor Pole. He warned Ochino of his imminent peril and pressed money upon him out of his own slender purse. Flaminio and Carnesecchi begged their friend to flee. The heat was intense and Ochino paused to reflect. He had been secretly informed that the Pope would exchange the cowl for a cardinal’s hat if he submitted. “ Their religion has need of silence,” Ochino said bitterly. He wrote a long pathetic letter to Vittoria Colonna. “ I am still lingering near Florence, tormented by doubts. . . . I was especially persuaded by Don Pietro Martire and others not to go. . . . I should be forced to deny Christ or be crucified. . . . I feel no call to go to death. . . . Christ has several times taught us to flee. Shall I preach Him under a mask ? . . . I hear Cardinal Farnese says that I am cited because I taught heresies and other abominable things. . . . I am the same person your Excellency has known. You will consider how the flesh shrinks from the thought of leaving everything behind. Christ has permitted my persecution. . . . He wills it for some good purpose. . . . I should have much liked to speak with you . . . or Monsignor Pole, or to receive a letter from you, but I have not had one for more than a month. Pray God for me. I am more willing than ever to serve Him. Salute all. Florence, Aug. 22, 1542.”

The Valdez Circle was scattered and Vittoria proved herself to be a fair-weather friend. Her brother, Prince Ascanio Colonna, gave Ochino a horse and servant. On the hills near Siena that St. Bartholomew’s Eve the Inquisition Guards watched all day for the Capuchin Vicar-General. At sunset they closed their cordon round the Convent outside Porta Camollia. Ochino had not arrived. He had turned to the north-east, avoiding Bologna where the noble Contarini died the next day, beloved and lamented by his flock. The Capuchin, his friars told to friends, reached Ferrara and was

hospitably received by the brave Duchess Rénee, Calvin's hostess, who was ever ready to help the Reformers. In her Palace Ochino laid aside his habit and put on secular dress. Thence he rode on by Brescia to Milan where the Imperial Governor Del Vasto was a faithful friend. Bishop Giberti wrote thanking him "for all he had done to help the good father." Probably the Marchese gave Ochino an armed escort. He reached Chiavenna and climbed the Splügen Pass over the Swiss frontier alone. He stood awhile looking back sorrowfully over Lake Como and the rich Lombardy Plain where the vines twined in festoons between the high maize-poles. Ahead to the north stretched the rugged territory of the Free Cantons where was security and religious freedom; but Ochino was a Latin, by birth, by training and by temperament; alien in spirit and in feeling, he was, as he wrote: "an exile for Christ Who never forsakes His own."

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE.

The chief authority for the above sketch is Dr. Karl Benrath's *Life*. Ranke also has a brief notice. The Siena Archives contain his letters to the Council, and Monsignor Bembo's Letters are published. There are only two writings of Ochino's Italian Period: "The Nine Sermons" and "The Seven Dialogues." The remainder were burned by the Inquisition.

Of his exile, including his visit to England and Cranmer's hospitality at Lambeth, there are many accounts.

It may interest Evangelicals to know that Ochino was Cranmer's guest during the Compilation of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552).

RETREATS. Their Value, Method and Organization. Edited by the Rev. R. Schofield. *S.P.C.K.* 3s. 6d. net.

Retreats have reached the stage when they have to be scientifically considered and psychologically valued, and this book is intended to be a guide for every class of Retreat. It represents the views of all sections of Christians including the Free Churches and the Roman Church. It describes the methods that have been adopted with success by each. There are many different temperaments and the style of retreat which suits one may make no appeal to others, and this is recognized in the wide variety of methods indicated. Bishop Chavasse writes a preface in which he points out some of these facts and gives an interesting account of the first Evangelical Retreat held at Christ Church, Hampstead, in October, 1874. Its leading principles were fellowship, freedom, and variety. Retreats conducted with these ideals may well receive the support of Evangelical Churchpeople, and useful suggestions as to conducting them will be gathered from the experiences of the contributors to this volume.

BOOKS AND THEIR WRITERS.

DR. L. P. JACKS is the editor of a series of books of special interest to students of contemporary religious life. Under the general title of "The Faiths" and the sub-title "Varieties of Christian Expression," the series contains an account of various sections of the Christian Church, each written by a prominent representative of the body of which he writes. Dr. Jacks has allowed the writers the fullest liberty of expression, and adds, "the hope is entertained that from the presentation of differences in this series there may emerge some unities hitherto unsuspected or dimly seen." The publishers are Messrs. Methuen & Co., and the price of each volume is 5s. net. It is probably some half-conscious sympathy that leads me first to *The Faith and Practice of the Quakers* by Dr. Rufus M. Jones. I have always been shy of referring to the Society of Friends as "Quakers," lest it might seem to indicate a want of respect for a body of Christian people whose work and devotion to high ideals must command the admiration of us all. I am glad to learn that "it has now come to be a name in general use both outside and inside the Society of Friends and no longer carries any stigma." Dr. Jones gives an interesting account of the rise of the Friends and their spiritual background. Experience is their starting-point. They cultivate direct correspondence with God. Their organization is very simple and the total number of members at present in all parts of the world is somewhat less than 150,000. The influence of such a small body is a matter for astonishment. It is a testimony to the purity of their principles as well as to their fidelity in maintaining them. His explanation of their attitude towards war deserves special study.

Dr. W. B. Selbie, Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, contributes a volume on Congregationalism to the series. Evangelical Churchmen naturally have considerable sympathy with the underlying idea of Christianity, which is presented; for "it is integral to the Protestant faith as over against that of Catholicism." The relation of the individual to Jesus Christ comes first. The form of Church organization follows. The historical narrative begins with an account of Robert Browne and the Brownists. It follows the course of the more or less familiar story of the place of the Puritans in the history of our land, and explains the modern developments which have led to the abandonment of pure independency and to the setting up of the Congregational Union to meet the needs of today. Under this scheme the country has been divided into nine districts or provinces, and Moderators or superintendents have been appointed to supervise the work of the churches in their areas. This we may hope will help towards the ultimate union of the Evangelical Churches of the country, but Dr. Selbie makes it quite clear that the episcopal organization of a reunited church must not

mean belief in "Apostolic succession, the transmission of grace and the whole thaumaturgic machinery."

To the Jesuit, Father C. C. Martindale has been allotted the task of explaining "The Faith of the Roman Church." He follows lines familiar to all who have any acquaintance with the works of Roman theologians, especially of those designed to win the allegiance of "non-Catholics." The faith is not some set of doctrines to be acquired by individual effort, it is the whole system imposed by authority and this authority rests with Peter and his successors.

Two volumes deal with the Church of England. Dr. Percy Gardner writes on "Modernism in the English Church," and Canon T. A. Lacey gives an account of "The Anglo-Catholic Faith." A third volume representing the Evangelical School has been promised but has not yet appeared. The characteristics of Canon Lacey's mind are probably well known. He combines ingenuity and subtlety with extensive learning and he applies his powers to an elaborate defence of the position of those who have introduced into our Church the theories associated with the title Anglo-Catholic. These theories are by no means the same as those that were held by the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century to whom that title was given even by the Tractarians who started the Anglo-Catholic Library. Canon Lacey cannot help being interesting even to those who disagree with him. His contrast of the Free Churchmen in Scotland, whom he condemns for leaving the Church of Scotland, with the Anglo-Catholics "who have clung to endowments and prestige at the cost of consistency" is interesting. That "the sloth or cowardice of prelates was the cause of failure" of the Clergy Discipline Act of 1841 is a statement that lacks nothing of force of expression. His endeavour to make out a case for those who say that the Church of England must conform to the faith and practice of the whole Catholic Church and that their appeal is "not to something vague and elusive and indeterminate" is more subtle than convincing. His candid acknowledgment of the failures of the Anglo-Catholic "sect" on many points is refreshingly frank, and we doubt if its members will be obliged to him for such an exposure of their weakness even though he is buoyed up with the optimistic hope of the permeation of our Church with the Catholic temperament. Reactions are inevitable and come in unexpected ways.

In Professor Percy Gardner's treatment of Modernism in the English Church there is an altogether different atmosphere. Modernism is a much abused term and is not in favour even with those "who use it to describe their position for want of a better word." Dr. Gardner would gladly use some substitute if a suitable one could be found. He accepts Mrs. Humphrey Ward's definition as the best. "Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches, to secure, not a reduced, but a

reformed Christianity." That might be used as a description of the endeavour of the great Reformers of the sixteenth century in their day. Like the Quakers the Modern Churchman starts from the inward experience, and he regards that as essential. The antagonism which is felt against them is mainly based on objection to the advanced results which many of them believe they have reached. Dr. Gardner quotes the resolution passed in the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation against the grave and obvious danger of "the publication of debatable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths." To this the reply of a prominent modernist was that "the publication of debatable suggestions as if they were ascertained truths is one of the greatest foes with which they have to contend." The distrust of Modernism on the part of more conservative churchpeople is the fear that the movement will go too far in a rationalistic direction and will result in a reduced Christianity. While there is this danger in individual cases, we can surely trust its sane and sober theologians to keep the movement true to the great facts of the faith.

A book that will provide preachers with a useful supply of illustrations when dealing with the subject of the future life is *My Faith in Immortality*, by William E. Barton (Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd., 3s. 6d. net). This popular treatment of a theme of never failing interest meets the objections raised to the belief in immortality by showing the lines of evidence which converge in support of it. They rest upon such facts as the existence of a Power which is parental and personal behind the phenomena of nature. "Unless there is a God who loves, and has taught us to love; unless there is a God who possesses life and has given us life, then I think faith in immortality is probably a delusion." A chapter on the teaching of science, and another on the lessons of philosophy contain much illustrative matter. The hope of immortality involves the survival of personality and the continued existence of personal identity. His examination of the answers given to the question, "Can we communicate with the dead," exposes the fraudulent nature of the majority of mediums and the triviality of "such communications as have come from tipped tables and the dark cabinet and the alleged trance utterances of mediums." We need a life beyond the grave worthy of Jesus Christ who brought life and immortality to light. He answers the question "May we pray for the dead?" with a qualified affirmative. The chief value of the book is its wide range of illustration and the cumulative effect of the various lines of evidence.

Canon Hanauer's *Walks in and around Jerusalem* (Church Missions to Jews, 6s. 6d. net.) has been a most helpful companion to many a visitor to the Holy City. A new and revised edition has just been issued. Dr. Macalister, one of the greatest authorities on the archæology of Palestine, pays a well deserved tribute to Canon Hanauer's learning in an introductory note. He says: "Few

men can know Jerusalem better than Canon Hanauer ; in comparison with his knowledge, my own is scanty and superficial, as I have had occasion to realize times without number during the years in which I have been privileged to hold personal intercourse with him. He has accumulated a vast store of information regarding the buildings of the city and their multifarious traditions. He has lived on terms of familiarity with members of all classes of its complex community, and he has stored in the treasures of his memory a wealth of lore, garnered from every available source. To walk round Jerusalem in the company of Canon Hanauer is an inspiration, though at the same time the disciple cannot but feel discouraged at the unattainable standard set by the master." Canon Hanauer assisted Sir Charles Warren in his earliest excavations. He has seen the many changes that have taken place in the sixty years since then, and has kept in close touch with every advance in research up to the present day. His book is therefore a treasury of exact and extensive information, much of which it will be difficult to find elsewhere. There is no book on Jerusalem that tells so clearly and so accurately just what we want to know. It was written primarily for those unable to visit Palestine and is therefore supplied with a wealth of illustration. Six pages are filled with the full index of these, and they are excellent reproductions of photographs taken by the author and other residents. Jerusalem has a special fascination for us all, and the reading of Canon Hanauer's Walks will deepen it and give it the added value of accurate knowledge.

The Creed of a Young Churchman (Longmans, Green & Co., 2s. net.) is one of a number of books by Canon H. A. Wilson in which he caters for the young with an exceptional insight into the methods of the juvenile mind and a special gift of expressing great truths in the way best calculated to impress boys and girls. The fact that it has now reached a third edition is sufficient evidence that it fully serves its purpose as "A Manual for Confirmation Candidates and other Young Churchpeople." In the preface to this edition Canon Wilson says: "In these days of so much loose and erroneous thinking, it is a duty of paramount importance to see that our boys and girls have their faith solidly built on Holy Scripture and that handmaid to Holy Scripture, the Book of Common Prayer." His explanation of Christianity begins with the Church of the Apostolic days. He then explains to the young people the special features of the Church of England in which they find themselves. Its distinctive teaching is unfolded as it is contained in the Creeds and presented in the Sacraments. Special emphasis is laid upon the privileges and responsibilities of Church members: and helpful practical counsel is given on such matters as prayer, Bible reading, and Church attendance. Many parents will be glad to know of just such a book as this as a help in the instruction of their children.

The Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* is one of the principal sources of our knowledge of the beginnings of Christianity in this country. The Rev. H. Curtois has collected a number of the most interesting of Bede's stories, and places "in the hands of the general reader the substance" of Bede's *History*, in his *The Conversion of the English* (S.P.C.K., 6s. net.). He wishes to make English people familiar with the work of those to whom we owe the introduction and development of the Church in this land. Bede's record is supplemented by accounts from other authorities when his narrative is wanting in some particulars necessary to complete the story. Nothing is told us here of St. Columba and his companions from Ireland. The account of the work of the Iona missionaries begins with the arrival of St. Aidan in Northumbria. A brief note supplies a scanty reference to this important omission in the early records, but the story is incomplete without some adequate mention of the work of the Irish Church. The book is well furnished with illustrations drawn from many sources, and a well-designed series of maps illustrates the development of the Church.

Three volumes of the Great English Churchmen Series (Macmillan & Co., 6s. net) were reviewed in the last number of THE CHURCHMAN. Attention was then drawn to the lack of sympathy between the biographer and his subject in at least one instance, in spite of the Editor's note to the effect that "it is the general Editorial policy to select a biographer sympathetic with the character with whom he deals, since, in the view of the Editor, sympathy is necessary to understanding." The choice of Dr. Hutton, Dean of Winchester, as the writer of the life of John Wesley will scarcely seem to the average reader as in keeping with this policy. Throughout Dr. Hutton is more critical than sympathetic in his attitude towards Wesley's character and work. It is scarcely to be expected that a High Anglican of the rigid school of to-day would have any large measure of sympathy with the leader of the great Evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. No one will lay down this account of the greatest figure in the religious life of that century with any consciousness of an approach to hero-worship. The idol's feet of clay are protruded to our notice with unflinching reiteration, and the critical attitude predominates throughout. A few passages of enthusiastic admiration for the work accomplished, and for the debt which England and the world owes to the Wesleys for the revival of religion would have made a refreshing variety. At the same time the Dean has brought together a number of interesting matters. Although the comparison of Wesley with Gladstone is somewhat far-fetched, it brings out the influence of "untarnished goodness." [He gives us Bishop Warburton's well-known saying regarding Wesley's efforts to reform the Church. "The Church, like the Ark of Noah, is worth saving, not for the sake of the unclean beasts and vermin that almost filled it, and probably made most noise and clamour in it, but for the little corner of rationality that was as much distressed by the stink within, as by the tempest

without." The Wesleyan "sect" might not have continued if only the English bishops had recognized more fully the mission of "unlearned, or half-learned men," and had admitted to Holy Orders many of the Methodist preachers. Wesley, at any rate, would not have been put to the necessity of ordaining men for the work. Some idea of Wesley's activity is gained from the estimate that he travelled two hundred and fifty thousand miles and preached forty thousand sermons. The Dean admits that even when read to-day Wesley's appeals have often a most impressive force. They are full of the love of God and the love of man. In spite of the emphasis laid on Wesley's autocratic spirit, obstinacy, vanity, self-confidence, hardihood, the fact cannot be concealed that "the influence of Wesley indeed, even within the Church of England, radiates far and wide." When America, our own Dominions and the Mission field are included, the full extent of that influence is realized.

In the same series the Rev. A. S. Duncan-Jones writes the life of Archbishop Laud. There is no lack here of sympathy between the author and his subject. Laud's career is made an opportunity for emphasizing those particular points of Churchmanship which the Archbishop endeavoured to fasten on the Church. The Reformation is not unduly praised, in fact it is described as "from certain points of view an outbreak of the philistinism and vulgarity and selfishness that lie at all times not far below the surface of humanity." We are told that Laud was shocked to find the Communion Table standing in the midst of the Choir at Gloucester Cathedral. This was a sign of terrible neglect, for the position of the "altar" was the emblem of the continuity of the Church of the ages. We are told that Laud held the same view of the Real Presence as Cranmer and Ridley, but we are also told that they passed on the teaching of the Middle Ages, "which is the official teaching of the Anglican Church." This is somewhat ambiguous. Mr. Duncan-Jones is an ardent Royalist. Parliament was an arrogant and foolish body, obviously incapable of business. It had Roman Catholicism on the brain. The City of London represented Puritanism and Capitalism and spread prejudice against Church and King. The Puritans were the enemies of reason. Laud, it may be observed, had a sympathetic fellow-worker in Wentworth of "Thorough" fame, but their efforts in Ireland had unfortunate results. In Scotland Laud's Communion Service praised "as an inspiration to the rest of the Anglican Communion" was not a success. All that can be said in defence of Laud's unfortunate narrowness, obstinacy and intolerance is said in this volume—by a devoted admirer of his teaching and work.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

DR. N. P. WILLIAMS ON THE FALL AND ORIGINAL SIN.
 THE IDEAS OF THE FALL AND OF ORIGINAL SIN. By N. P. Williams,
 D.D. *Longmans.* 21s.

Dr. Williams has strong convictions. He tells us that the traditional view of the Redemption of the world is wrong. The Fall and the Cross are not the two great twin pillars that bear the Faith. As far as the Fall is concerned it may be considered as a decorative pillar comparable to the pillars that seem to onlookers to be real, but are in reality no support of buildings that depend for their stability on the internal ironwork. And this leads us to say that the whole argument of this book is addressed to the modern mind. It ranges from astronomical metaphors, that are not always accurate, to the latest psychological theories from Vienna—it is scholarly in its knowledge and use of sacred and classical literature, and it is marked from beginning to end by Anglo-Catholic sympathies. The stress on the institutional side of Christianity is strong. We seem to see the idea creating the Institution, and now that the Institution is so strongly compact and well built—by the irons that are invisible added throughout the ages—the time has come for mere decoration to be laid on one side and the Church with its Sacraments and Ministry to be declared independent of the formative forces that led to its growth into its present form. So modern indeed is Dr. Williams that he uses words in a sense that is not usual, e.g., psychological for psychic and biological for vital. He is truly a son of the Twentieth Century, with his convictions steadied by his belief in Institutional Christianity.

This is seen in his treatment of Holy Scripture. Putting on one side the threefold conception of human nature in its sinful character—the Genesis story, the Watcher theory, and the *yecer* of diffused iniquity view—we find that the traditional view was held to a very great extent by St. Paul. It is hardly too much to say that it was the foundation on which Augustine built. St. Paul was exercised in his mind as a “twice born” soul, and his own experiences coloured his view, which was freely discarded until his Epistles were admitted into the canon. From that time a change took place which was accelerated by the growth of Infant Baptism—a practice that required explanation which could only be found in the doctrine of Original Sin transmitted from Adam to the race. His excursus on baptism is extremely interesting. He is by no means sure that pædo-baptism is apostolic. At any rate it tended to give a lowered conception of what adult baptism involved, and reflection upon it made the way plain for the adoption of views of human nature that cannot be supported in the light of modern knowledge.

There is a conflict between the Hellenic view of the “once born” and the Western view of the “twice born.” He traces this contrast in a series of extracts drawn from many sources, but

it is seen that Western views were held in the East and Eastern views in the West, and the interesting fact appears that Origen, at a time when we naturally would expect to find him holding the "twice born" view, is an advocate of the "once born" teaching and later changed his position. Dr. Williams uses the Vincentian Canon scientifically to discover what the Catholic view is, and determines this by a mathematical Highest Common Factor, which practically means that the Hellenic conception is the Catholic doctrine and that the Augustinian, and therefore to a very large extent the Pauline, teaching is to be abandoned. As we consider the growth of other Catholic doctrines and apply to them the method adopted by Dr. Williams, we consider that the whole of Catholic Institutionalism which he so rigorously holds is in danger of toppling to the ground. We wonder where Apostolic Succession and the Mass would be if he used his historical canons. But then he would probably retort that pragmatically they have proved their usefulness, while at the same time indignantly denying that his rule is in any sense a Protagorean one. To others this argument will be by no means convincing.

Very few will be prepared to accept the full Augustinian teaching on the Fall and Original Sin. It is terrible in its relentlessness, and most readers will sympathize with the condemnation meted out to it by Dr. Williams, who follows its revival and, as he thinks, extension under Luther and Calvin. We are prepared to admit that the reformers were too one-sided in many of their statements, but we do not see in their doctrine the awful harshness of Augustine, and certainly do not find in their lives the callousness Augustine showed to the mother of his child and Adeodatus. And we also think that if Augustine erred in one direction Pelagius erred even more, and that the support Pelagius received and the freedom from condemnation as described by Dr. Williams are not so great as he imagines. When a doctrine has been overcome and disappears very little is said of it, and whatever may be said of the *tractoria*, it is certain that the teaching of Augustine triumphed, and those who took the other view were far from numerous as compared with those who followed Pelagius. Dr. Gore has pregnantly said, "The Nestorian Christ is the fitting Saviour of the Pelagian man," and in many passages we have noted, our author goes very near the exposition of Nestorian conceptions of the Saviour and Pelagian views of man. But he runs much closer to the borderline that divides truth from error, in his sympathy with Pelagianism. He adopts to a great extent certain aspects of teaching associated with Ignatius de Loyola and his followers.

Dr. Williams arrives at the solution of the problem of the Fall by the hypothesis of a transcendental or pre-cosmic fall for which we have no evidence. Our author knows that his whole book is opposed in its teaching to the Articles and therefore he argues in favour of a Revision of the Articles. He says, "Revision of the Liturgy, as Porteus saw a century and a half ago, must involve as its logical corollary revision of the Articles, and in some ways the

latter is the more important task of the two." The manner of Revision is outlined when he speaks of Tract 90 as a "*benignior interpretatio*, which may be employed as a kind of intellectual shoe-horn for accommodating the stiff formularies of the past to the religious experiences of the present." Needless to say "the religious experiences" are wider than the modified Augustinianism contained in the Articles. The warning is given. Revision carries us back to Medievalism in eucharistic doctrine and makes original sin depend on a bracket. Revision of the Articles will carry to a logical conclusion what is begun in the Deposited Book and we see whither we are being led. This book, learned and able as it is, demands the careful study of all theologians, for while it has much that commands approval, it is so one sided that it is apt to be misleading. By avoiding the Scylla of extreme Augustinianism it has not escaped the Charybdis of Pelagianism. Both are out of touch with the message of Holy Scripture, and we still prefer St. Paul as a guide to right conceptions of the mystery of iniquity, which we know to exist. Its origin is hid from our eyes. But its existence is co-extensive with humanity and as long as this cannot be denied, we believe that there is a *depravatio* as well as a *deprivatio* in man.

ST. PAUL.

CHRISTIANITY ACCORDING TO ST. PAUL. By Charles Anderson Scott. *Cambridge University Press*. 12s. 6d.

Thirteen years ago Dean Inge wrote, "Protestants have always felt their affinity with this institutionalist, mystics with this disciplinarianist. The reason, put shortly, is that St. Paul understood what most Christians never realize, namely that the Gospel of Christ is not a religion, but religion itself, in its most universal and deepest significance." To-day we have a great revival of interest in St. Paul, and this is the most satisfactory feature in the theological outlook, for the more the teaching and outlook of the Apostle of the Gentiles be studied the nearer we come to the heart of the Gospel. Every revival in the Church—it may be broadly stated—owed its source to the study of the "ugly little Jew," who was raised up by God to spread the knowledge of His Son. He saw truth in perspective and transformed without transmuting the Gospel from a message of salvation to the Jew to the world religion our Lord intended it to be. He burst the bonds of Judaism and proclaimed the salvation of all men through faith in Jesus Christ.

Dr. Anderson Scott, in this admirable and well-balanced exposition of the doctrine of St. Paul, sees as strange the setting forth of St. Paul as the author of "sacramentarian" Christianity and the only begetter of Catholicism. When we read works written from this angle we cannot understand how the conclusions can be derived from the text, although we see how they are read into the words of the Apostle, who never gave them the meaning now assigned to them. We are in entire agreement with Dr. Scott when he lays such strong emphasis on the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures on

the mind of St. Paul. It is only necessary to work through the references in "The Revised New Testament with Fuller References" to grasp this fact. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews and his contact with Hellenic thought and religion was slight. It is comparable to that of the average Englishman's knowledge of Hinduism, even though he may live in India. St. Paul was not a comparative theologian. He knew Christianity to be religion itself and did not trouble much about other creeds. And this also applies to his sacramental teaching. Mithraism and the Mystery Religions may have used similar language and the current coin of words was used by the Apostle in its natural sense without any occult meaning. Ingenuity is capable of making words mean anything, but they must be judged by their setting, and St. Paul's sacramental teaching is as far as possible removed from that of the Mystery Religions.

There is much in this book we should wish to discuss, as we are not in complete agreement with some of its contentions, although on the whole we have no hesitation in saying that it is the best book on St. Paul that has appeared in recent years. It is frank and honest, never burkes a difficulty, and strives to be strictly loyal to the text of the documents. We are not convinced that his exposition of the sacrifice of Christ covers all the facts. But no one who reads what Dr. Scott has written can fail to see that the attempt to make a sacramentarian theory the basis of the thought of the man whose whole thought moved in the atmosphere of personal union with the Person of Christ, is making bricks without straw. The whole idea is foreign to the outlook of the Apostle.

It is well to see how Dr. Scott deals with the teaching of St. Paul on the Eucharist. He considers that the clause, "Ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come," has a deeper meaning than the announcement of the fact of the death of Christ. The more we reflect on the context in which St. Paul places it, the judgment quality which he finds in the rite, which he stresses and elaborates, and the ethical demand for which he finds here a sanction, the more clear does it become that something more is intended here than the mere proclamation or attestation of the historical fact that Christ died. "The clue is discovered in the words 'in Remembrance of Me.'" The A.V. rendering of the Greek is inadequate. Anamnesis signifies the act of recollection. "The force of the phrase is therefore not 'with a view of preserving my memory' or even 'celebrating my memory,' but 'with a view of recalling me.' That really was the primary purpose and function of the rite. It recalled Christ so vividly to memory that He was felt to be present. And it was this which gave numinous significance to the Loaf and the Wine by means of which His followers reconstituted the scene which had been so familiar in the days of His flesh." Dr. Scott comments on the word translated "worthily" in connexion with the Lord's Supper. This implied that the celebration should be worthy of its origin and meaning. "They showed that one result of that death had been to establish a Society of which they were

loyal members, manifesting consideration for others, unselfishness and a brotherly spirit." All through his references to the Supper St. Paul has before his mind the moral characteristics of those who worthily partook of the Bread and wine. There is no magic in it. We are brought into the Upper Room, into the Presence of the Master and His loved followers. His was the Sacrifice about to be made. The Church in the future and all its members would offer themselves to God as His Body and members of the Body of Christ. This exegesis is in full harmony with all the New Testament references to the Holy Communion and deserves to be studied as set forth by Dr. Scott.

Our space is exhausted, but we hope that we have said sufficient to send readers to the book, which they will find full of accurate information and sound reasoning. It represents the thought of a lifetime given to the consideration of the work and doctrine of the greatest of the Apostles. And the writer of the book is uniquely equipped for the work he undertook.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE OF FORGIVENESS. By H. R. Mackintosh. *Nisbet*. 10s. 6d. net.

Christianity is above everything else a Religion of Redemption. Its whole outlook centres on the forgiveness of sins, which it believes to be essential. Our Lord came to save His people from their sins, and His teaching, as well as that of the Apostolic Church, centres in the redemption of mankind from the guilt and power of sins. Remove this doctrine from the Bible and its message is meaningless. It is true we have the Revelation of God as one and holy, the Incarnation and all it means in the Person of Jesus Christ our Lord, and the insistence on the Holy Spirit as the Sanctifier of the Lord's people; but underlying all revelation is the great fact that man is a sinner, and that Christ is his Saviour. It is therefore fitting that the first volume of "The Library of Constructive Theology," under the competent General Editorship of Sir James Marchant and the Theological Editorship of Professors W. R. Matthews and H. Wheeler Robinson, should be devoted to *The Christian Experience of Forgiveness*, and no better choice of writer could have been made, for Dr. Mackintosh is a careful thinker who has had great experience as a teacher and has devoted much time and thought to the consideration of the subject. The Library as a whole will attempt to restate the great doctrines of the Christian Faith from a new standpoint. Christian experience is a reality, but Christian experience is not everything in a Religion of Revelation. It is explanatory and determinative of the effects of Revelation, but cannot be considered in any way a substitute for Revelation. All experience must be tested by the content of Revelation, for Christian experience covers a great deal that cannot be considered Christian—if we mean by this the individual experiences

of all Christians, for much that individual Christians experience and attribute to Christianity is idiosyncratic and cannot properly be called Christian. Of this the Editors are well aware, and Dr. Mackintosh in this book proves that he has not become the victim of any delusions on the subject.

Dr. Mackintosh starts his inquiry with individual Christian forgiveness and shows what the experience involves and the character of the need of man for pardon. He proves that the personality of Jesus is the supreme guarantee of pardon for the sinful, and describes how this works in the lives of the outstanding men of the Church. Forgiveness as the act of God is shown to reveal the highest conception of God and that the atonement involves cost to God. It will at once be seen that the book covers an immense tract of religion and theology. He is alive to the many perplexing questions raised by the New Psychology, which he discusses with frankness and a lucidity which makes his meaning clear.

Like all men who have faced the problem—or for that matter any fundamental problem in Theology—he finds that the deepest questions are raised and that all things shade off into mystery. We can very readily ask questions that cannot be fully answered, and if there be any weakness in the book it is his discussion of the Atonement, for he holds very strongly a view of the passibility of God which raises many questions that cannot now be discussed. But who can resist the implications of the following sentences: “We are constantly under a temptation to suppose that the reason why we fail to understand completely the atonement made by God in Christ is that our minds are not sufficiently profound. And, doubtless there is truth in the reflection that for final insight into the meaning of the cross we are not able or perspicacious enough. But there is a deeper reason still. It is that we are not good enough; we have never forgiven a deadly injury at a price like this, at such cost to ourselves as came upon God in Jesus’ death. We fail to comprehend such sacrificial love because it far outstrips our shrunken conceptions of what love is and can endure. Let the man be found who has undergone the shattering experience of pardoning, nobly and tenderly, some awful wrong to himself, still more to one beloved by him, and he will understand the meaning of calvary better than all the theologians in the world.”

We cannot deal with his illuminating treatment of the subject of Assurance, on which he writes with sympathy and understanding. “The earthly love that shows likest God’s is never apt to put its penitent loved ones on probation, but accepts them just as they are. And our thoughts of God’s mercy must not be less wide.” Dr. Mackintosh is a firm believer in the doctrine of the Church. Forgiveness and the Church are two great realities bound vitally together. The Church is a forgiven community rejoicing in fellowship with the Father of men and suffused with the spirit of forbearing love. It is this fact that gives the Church the healing mission that can be discharged by no other organization. The book as a whole is a noble exposition of the saving work of Christ and will bring

help, comfort and confidence to all who read it in the spirit of the New Testament and test it by the Gospel therein revealed.

THE FOUR GOSPELS. By the Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D. S.P.C.K.
4s. 6d.

There is no study so rich in results as the study of the Gospels, and strange to say, amid the wealth of literature on the subject, there are very few popular introductions that can be recommended. We are frequently asked where a fair presentation of the Synoptic Problem may be found, and since the first edition of this book appeared we have always recommended inquirers to use it, for no clearer statement of the literary history and characteristics as well as the interrelation of the gospels can be found in English. It has the lucidity we associate with French writing and an accuracy that cannot be challenged. The New Edition has a Preface that gives a short sketch of the main contributions to the subject since the first was issued. Dr. Jones reviews the masterly work of Canon Streeter, the writing of Dr. Vincent Taylor, the conjectures of a German school that strives to show that the form of the Synoptic Gospels sacrifices truth to formulæ, and the writings of various scholars on the Fourth Gospel. We may be wrong, but we think that Dr. Jones has to some extent modified his belief in the Johannine Authorship, for he shows considerable sympathy with the view that there were two Johns in Ephesus and that Irenæus confused the two. As we read much of New Testament criticism we ask ourselves, Had there been no dogmatic interest at stake, would the movement in favour of attributing this Gospel to an unknown author have taken so pronounced a form? We do not think so, and see no good reason for abandoning the traditional belief. Given the fact that its author was a genius and a man of very rare insight, there is no ground why he should not have been a fisherman who by meditation and study fitted himself for writing the Gospel. We have in our own literature men like Hugh Miller—not to mention Shakespeare—and why should we exclude from the authorship of the Fourth Gospel a man of the Apostolic band? Genius associated with our Lord during His ministry can rise to heights not attained under normal circumstances, and the Holy Spirit can lead such a man into all Truth. But this is by the way. We desire in the strongest way to commend this little book to those who wish to understand what modern writers think of the way in which the Gospels came into existence and the relations between them.

THE PRAYER BOOK REVISED. By the Bishop of Winchester.
Longmans. 4s. 6d. net.

As was to be expected, the Prayer Book Revised has received an episcopal welcome from the Bishop of Winchester, who gives us the impression that we now have an incomparable liturgy that is superior in every way to the present Book. He holds that the

Bishops' Book is entirely in accord with the best traditions of the Church of England and of undivided Christendom and will be a means of reconciliation between Catholic and Evangelical. It is for him the synthesis that expresses the doctrine of Christ and His Church. No one reading his panegyric on the Book would believe that it has been the subject of extremely divided opinion on its literary merits, its doctrinal teaching and its adherence to Anglican or Catholic tradition of the best kind. He believes that the Book is so excellent that it will win its way by its merits. He has discovered that Evangelicalism and Anglo-Catholicism—in their true interpretation—are not incompatible but complementary. Everything depends on the meaning given to the words "true interpretation," and as we shall show there are incompatibilities that cannot be overlooked, in spite of the opportunity of an era for a great reconciliation. How can two walk together unless they be agreed? And the New Prayer Book stereotypes differences.

Dr. Woods tells us that the Bread and Wine become by Consecration "the Body and Blood of Christ" and thereby there "ensues in a way peculiar to the Sacrament a Real Presence, independent of the worshipper's spiritual state, and calling for the penitent and humble adoration which, if our Lord were here in the flesh, we should give Him." Again we read of a moment for ritual accompaniments of obeisance and adoration. No wonder the Black Rubric is not attached to the General Rubrics or to the Alternative Service! Again he defends Reservation for the sick only, sympathizes with those who find help and inspiration from the Presence of the Reserved Elements when the Sacrament is "resting on its way to the house of sickness." We cannot see how a Book that teaches what we have mentioned can be a reconciling help in the convictions of those who believe such teaching to be untrue, unwarranted by Scripture and opposed to the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer. But then we are not able to make the synthesis of the true equivalent to the syncretism of the true with the false.

LECTURES IN HYDE PARK. By the Rev. C. F. Rogers. *S.P.C.K.*
2s. 6d.

We welcome this Second Series of Hyde Park Lectures by that well-trained and well-informed champion of the Faith, Professor Rogers, who has the gift of making his points clearly, facing difficulties squarely, and never attempting to mislead those who are opposed to him by arguing from the unknown to the known. In these Five Lectures he has much to say that will help preachers and a great deal that will rivet conviction on the heart and mind of his readers. His great experience shows him where "the shoe pinches" and his transparent honesty wins him the confidence of all who ponder over his argument. These Lectures deal with "Free Will and Determinism," "The Problem of Pain," "One God—One Law," "Theism and Ethics," and "One God—One Self"—all questions as old as Christianity—some of them a great

deal older. It may be thought that Mr. Rogers has nothing new to say. That may be so—but he says it in a new manner with a wealth of illustration and reference that will enable his readers to carry further his remarks and to pursue the study of the subjects. We cordially commend the book, which is very cheap for half a crown—judging by present-day prices—and its value cannot be measured by its price.

CASUISTRY.

CONSCIENCE AND ITS PROBLEMS. An Introduction to Casuistry. By Kenneth E. Kirk. *Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd.* 16s. net.

The Publishers' notice on the jacket tells us that "this book is an attempt to rescue the systematic study of cases of conscience in the Anglican Communion from the neglect into which it fell at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and thereby to continue the adaptation of the historic principles of moral theology to the practical needs of the modern Church begun in *Some Principles of Moral Theology*" (a previous work by Dr. Kirk on the same subject).

Moral theology is the system practised in the Church of Rome in the Confessional. From long experience that Church has discovered how exceedingly difficult it is to deal with individual cases. A whole library has grown up based upon the writings of Aquinas and other Roman casuists. It has been developed by the Jesuits with such effect that casuistry has become a name for subtle methods of evasion which can ingeniously be contrived for the avoidance of unpleasant duties, or the mitigation of the consequences of actions, that may be inconvenient. Recent cases of the dealing of the Roman Church with marriage problems show the practical working of the scheme in that Communion.

Dr. Kirk thinks that there is a great necessity for the setting up of machinery in the Church of England to deal with cases of conscience, but he recognizes that the Roman scheme, however excellent and worthy of imitation he may regard it, is not quite suited to the character of the English Church or people. His efforts are therefore directed to the presentation of plausible grounds on which the scheme may be advocated as an essential element in the life of the Church of England. The Roman scheme rests for its authority on an infallible Church with an infallible head from whom the whole body of confessors derive their power to pronounce their authoritative decisions. Our Church cannot fall back on such an authority and he therefore endeavours to base his scheme on an appeal to "Scripture and reason."

It is important for us to remember that our Lord was in close contact during the period of His teaching on earth with one of the most elaborate systems of casuistry that the world has ever seen. The teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees was an attempt to apply the Jewish law to particular cases. It proved a gigantic failure, resulting in a wholesale hypocrisy which received the strongest condemnation that our Lord ever uttered. The righteousness of the

Scribes and Pharisees was of such a character that it could find no place in the Kingdom of Heaven. The inner principles of that kingdom demanded an altogether different conception of the relation of man to God and His laws. Our Lord's teaching was directed towards the establishment of this relationship on its true motive and inspiration—the love of God and the love of man. He brought the individual conscience face to face with God, without any intermediary and without enunciating claims of loyalty to any organization, and He knew that the clearer the knowledge of God the more alert would the conscience be to live and act according to His claims. When the Church of England at the Reformation returned to the teaching of the New Testament, the Confessional with the sacrament of penance and the whole Roman system fell off as useless and unnecessary. To follow the inner light has not always been possible as the history of Quakerism has shown. Compromise with existing conditions has been necessary in every age. Yet the progress towards a higher standard of morality has been progressive in proportion as men have lived in the light of Christ's teachings, and have allowed themselves to be guided by the inspiration of His words. The Reformed Churches of the eighteenth century were on right lines when they substituted the study of Christian ethics for the detailed treatment of individual cases of conscience required by moral theology. The line of true progress to-day is not the setting up of the Confessional in the Church of England, to endeavour to mould character by the direction of an external authority, whatever its character may be, through the imposition of penances or the interpretations of canon law, but by the setting up of the standard of Christian morality at its highest, and by emphasizing the motives which will lead men to conform not merely their outward actions to its requirements, but will have the compelling power to regulate the whole inner being in a closer harmony with the Pauline ideal of being in Christ.

Two conceptions of Christianity are in conflict. Dr. Kirk advocates one. It has been shown in the past to fail in many essential particulars. It is in reality sub-Christian. The Evangelical conception is higher, purer, more spiritual and as we believe in harmony with the mind of Christ and the revelation of God. We are compelled to regard the work expended on this effort to justify the Confessional in the Church of England as misspent labour and ultimately mischievous in purpose.

SADHU SUNDAR SINGH.

THE GOSPEL OF SADHU SUNDAR SINGH. By Friedrich Heiler, Ph.D., D.D. Translated by Olive Wyon. *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 12s. 6d. net.

This is a remarkable book both in regard to its author and its subject. Dr. Heiler, Professor of Comparative Religion at the University of Marburg, has become known in this country as the

author of a noteworthy book on prayer, *Das Gebet*. The character of Sadhu Sundar Singh's life is familiar to the Christian people of this country, and many had the opportunity of hearing him during his visit a few years ago. It was probably impossible that a life with experiences so remarkable as his should pass without question, and it is therefore not surprising that doubts have been raised as to the reality and sincerity of the Sadhu. Heated controversy has been aroused over him. A Jesuit Father at Darjeeling has tried to prove that he is an impostor who has invented the greater part of his life story in order to win the reputation of sanctity. A Protestant pastor has joined the Jesuit and they have published a book *The Legend of Sundar Singh*. In this he is treated as a neurotic person whose sense of reality has been impaired, and by methods of psycho-analysis they have endeavoured to show him as the victim of various repressed complexes. Dr. Heiler has examined these accusations. He has caused inquiries to be made in India by reliable witnesses, and the result, he declares, has been most astonishing. "I have been forced to modify my own critical attitude towards the miraculous element in the Sadhu's life and to revise my theory of the legendary element." He has already published answers to the attacks of the Jesuit and the Pastor, and has also written the volume, *Sadhu Sundar Singh, Ein Apostel des Ostens und Westens*, which has already run through four editions in German since its publication in 1924, and of this the present volume is an abridged English translation.

The result of Dr. Heiler's inquiries is not merely a refutation of the particular charges brought against the Sadhu, but a glowing appreciation of his character. "As a catholic-minded Christian, I have considered it my duty to test and examine the Sadhu's message in the light of the faith of the Church Universal, by the sense of the corporate tradition of the whole of Christendom," and he finds it "wonderfully uplifting, consoling and strengthening."

Of the five parts into which the book is divided, the first is devoted to an interesting account of the ancestral faith of the Sikhs. It shows the endeavour to blend Hindu and Islamic piety. The second part contains the record of Sundar Singh's life and tells of his mother's religious devotion, the wealth and comfort of the home which he forsook on his conversion, his adoption of the saffron robe of the Sadhu, his witness to Christ throughout India, his efforts to penetrate into Tibet, and his visits to Europe and America. These visits were a sad revelation to him of the condition of Western Christendom. He compares the inhabitants of heathen lands with those of Christendom, and says, "The former are heathen because they worship idols made with hands; in the so-called Christian lands, however, I found a worse kind of heathenism; people worship themselves. . . . I began to realize that no European country can be called really Christian, but that there are individual Christians." Part III tells of Sundar Singh's religious life. Prayer has the first place, and his experiences of ecstasy spring from it. Part IV is an examination of his thought-world, and Dr. Heiler finds many

striking resemblances to the teaching of Luther. One of the chief elements of interest in this section is the revelation of the attitude of an Eastern mind to the problems and divisions of Western Christendom. The final section gives an estimate of the significance of Sundar Singh. There is much to be learned yet as to the interpretation of Christianity to the Eastern mind, and the Sadhu is the means of teaching important lessons in missionary method.

The volume is one of fascinating interest, and a word of tribute to the translator for the excellence of her work must be added.

WILLIAM BLAKE.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF BLAKE. By Max Plowman.
J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd. 4s. 6d. net.

William Blake has always been an enigma to the student of the literature of the period embracing the closing years of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the nineteenth. Some have pronounced him insane and have not sought to find any clue to the weird and "weedy" symbolism in which he clothed his thought. Some have seen in him a prophet with a new method to enlighten the world in a new era. Blake was for a time a follower of Swedenborg whose belief in the New Jerusalem had a permanent influence on the poet's thought. Mr. Max Plowman has devoted considerable care to Blake's writings and offers in these studies an interpretation of his thought. He claims that we must not attempt to judge the poet by any ordinary standards, and that we must not be hopeful of completely understanding him. Blake's symbolism is bewildering. "Whether any one person will ever comprehend all the images of Blake's imagination seems doubtful, but that he offers to every intelligent reader a little universe of images which seem to be the immediate personal gift of the poet is not doubtful," and Mr. Plowman believes that even to possess one-tenth of this treasure is worth the effort to penetrate Blake's forest of undergrowth. In these busy days we fear this must be the luxury of the specialist. For it is doubtful if Blake has any gift to offer for which we should be "compelled to go on hands and knees before his work." Mr. Plowman makes large claims for his influence, but it is doubtful if they can be substantiated. "Blake's theme was the soul of man," and his aim was to reveal the nature of the soul. His treatment of the subject provides no helpful guidance for those who cannot penetrate his symbolism or interpret his visions, and with ordinary Christian teaching Blake apparently had no contact. He was busy with "things above reason," and few of us can live in that atmosphere.

Yet there are wide stretches of Blake's work that make an appeal to the ordinary average human being. His "Songs of Innocence," as Mr. Plowman says, "express for the first time in English literature the spontaneous happiness of childhood." The verses again which close with the familiar stanza,

I will not cease from mental fight,
 Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
 Till we have built Jerusalem
 In England's green and pleasant land,

have become popular and have been sung in many churches as an expression of desire for a new condition of things which would be very different from that contemplated by Blake. His poem "The Divine Image" appears in at least one collection of hymns used in our churches, and we have heard it sung at a Marriage Service, though its doctrine may be regarded as far from that authorized in any Church formulary. Blake will remain a solitary figure moving in a world of his own, but students of literature will be glad to read Mr. Plowman's essay as the stimulating and enthusiastic effort of a devoted admirer to make the writings of his author a little more intelligible to those who seek for whatever secret Blake has to offer.

SELECTIONS FROM ROBERT LANDOR. Edited by Eric Partridge.
The Fanfrolics Press, 5, Bloomsbury Square, W.C.1. (7s. 6d. net.)

As an introduction to the poetry and prose of an author whose style and matter entitle him to a high rank in the annals of our literature, this book serves a useful purpose. The eight selections from the writings of Robert Eyres Landor (1781-1869), a younger brother of that erratic genius Walter Savage Landor, are well chosen, fairly lengthy and, with explanatory notes, make a book that repays perusal.

The selections are of uniform excellence, alike in poetry and prose, and it is difficult to understand why an author of such remarkable qualities has been allowed to sink into obscurity. It may be that the younger was overshadowed by the brilliance of the elder brother: that some resemblances in style led the casual reader to place him as a subservient imitator and plagiarist; but that is a superficial and unjust view. Robert Landor can stand alone on his merits, and no admirer of his famous brother, who occupies a unique position in English literature, need regard his claims with disfavour.

A position of equality with, and possibly in some respects of superiority to, W. S. Landor may be conceded to the younger brother on the publication of his complete works.

"Guy's Porridge Pot," a dedication "Addressed to the learned characters of my Poem," with which the book opens, is a delightfully ironic and witty production. The selections from each of the nine books of *The Impious Feast, A Tragedy of the Fall of Babylon*, should arouse interest in the full version of this fine poem. The love of Nature shown in the graceful lines on "Night" (Book I), "Dawn in Babylon" (Book III), "A herd of deer surprised" (Book IX), "The maiden Ailona in a hanging-garden" (Book VI) and "Winter" (Book IX), points

to a contemplative element in Robert Landor which is lacking in the elder brother, whose stormy life was passed in loneliness and exile, and in the restless activities of a rebel against the accepted canons and conventions of his generation. Robert Landor, on the other hand, was a scholarly clergyman of exemplary character, who, despite a forceful personality, was usually able to maintain friendly relations with his fellows.

"The Fawn of Sartorius" is the story of a white fawn, the constant companion of the great general Sartorius who defended Spain against the attack of the Romans under Pompey. The fawn was supposed to be the medium of the Goddess Diana, whose advice was helpful alike against the treachery of his colleagues and the tactics of his opponents. It shows that Robert Landor possessed the faculty of transporting himself into the times and sentiments of the Romans, and of the oppressed Spaniards during the campaign, and is a fine example of classical prose.

A short poem written in a copy of *The Fawn of Sartorius*, presented to another brother (Henry) on August 24, 1846, reads:

"Lover of all things fair—of flowers, birds, and beasts—
Of all things fair and gentle—Brother Harry!
Pleased while the martins claim their last year's nests
To teach which kinds come first, which longest tarry;
But often grieved to mark how short life's span
When fate bows down the lapwing's high plumed head,
Or smites King Charles's spaniel black and tan,
Old, blind, yet prescient of his master's tread:
Read what is written of a Fawn, for she
Was fairest, gentlest, faithfullest! The pride
Of warriors stooped before her sanctity:
Read how she loved till death, and where she died."

"The Letters to the *Courier*" are of historical interest and importance, and that entitled "Irony in the Grand Manner," written shortly after the Government had indicted the *Courier* because of the outspokenness of his contributions, is convincing proof of his ability as a publicist in troublous times.

"The Ferryman: or the Translated Escutcheon," an interesting dramatic poem; the three songs in the Third Act, "The sun is mirthful up on high"; "Her girdle was golden, her garments were green"; and "A servant's Song," are delightful, and one is tempted to quote, but space is lacking.

H.

THE ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW. (H. Milford, 4s. 6d.)

The July issue of this well-known American journal maintains the high standard it has set, and it should be read by Anglican Churchmen who desire to follow the trend of theology across the Atlantic.

The first article, "The Outlook for Theology," by Professor Grant, is an interesting survey of the problems now confronting the Christian religion, which, though not deeper, yet are in their sweep and range, greater than those of earlier ages; and the writer holds

that the greatest need of the present day is a thought-out, defensible, modern theology. "We want no closed doors, no fire-walls, no water-proof compartments: a living theology must be master of the whole and possess the freedom of the city of Mansoul." The real need in religion is more or less the need in every part of life—something quite beyond criticism, viz., appreciation, appraisal, the recognition of true values, creative living, fresh and independent thought, immediate contact with reality; and Professor Grant believes that beyond the bounds of this age of universal criticism there lies a land of promise into which our world is soon to enter: and that rather than be alarmed over the prospect we may well congratulate ourselves—and especially the younger minds among us—upon the outlook for theology. "For it may well be that men will someday look back to this age and say,—

‘Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven.’

This may be and probably is the case, but it must be admitted that the signs are not yet very manifest.

The most important article in this issue is entitled "Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim," an exhaustive review by Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson of the first two volumes of an extended work on Judaism by an American Christian, Dr. George Foot Moore, of Harvard, who is a recognized authority on Talmudic and Rabbinical literature, and has devoted ten years of intensive labour to its production.

Professor Foakes-Jackson hails this monumental work as being not simply an historical account of a great religion, but as one of the greatest presentations of its doctrines. He considers that in order to understand Judaism we must clear our minds of some pre-suppositions which tend to make certain propositions unintelligible: "all modern men, whether they be Jews or Christians, are so accustomed to think of religion in terms of development, that they find it hard to imagine that either Judaism, or Christianity in a less degree, would refuse to admit anything of the kind. In the Law the whole of religion was revealed—'nothing was kept back in Heaven.' Being perfect from the beginning the Law was unalterable."

The most interesting, if not also the most valuable part of the first volume, in Professor Foakes-Jackson's opinion, is found in the two sections on "The Idea of God," and "Man, Sin, and Atonement," and it would seem that we may have to revise some of our ideas about the tenets of Rabbinic Judaism on these topics.

"The re-emergence of the Arian Controversy" is an interesting article by Professor Buckler, of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, who acknowledges his indebtedness to the late Professor H. M. Gwatkin. He gives reasons for asserting that the Arian controversy is again upon us, "the ordinary man . . . demands once more an explanation of his relationship with God," and he holds that "it is only by accepting the assurance of the

Divine Sonship and perfect (complete) humanity of Jesus, that we can accept or know that this sacrifice (the Atonement of the Cross) *was* complete." Broadly stated, the conclusion arrived at is that God as a God of love does not regard man's struggles with the compassionate eye of a sympathetic observer, but He shares them, for *φιλια* and the Oriental conception it is intended to convey involves an organic relation, an organic unity of the lover and the beloved.

Whilst unable to share the satisfaction of Professor Richardson of Burlington, Vermont, that the recitation of the Decalogue will no longer be compulsory, if the Bishops' Prayer Book is authorized, we gladly endorse his defence of the Old Testament description of God as "a jealous God." The article on "The Jealousy of God" is an excellent exposition of a phrase which has troubled many Christian minds, and shows that "behind that supreme mystery of self-sacrificing love which we call the Atonement is the divine necessity which Old Testament prophets dimly discerned and described in the phrase "a jealous God."

Professor G. F. Springer ably supports the contention of his article, "No mistranslation in Luke i. 39," holding that the form of words is readily explained as a simple Semitism familiar to the author, and it is therefore unnecessary to assume that written Aramaic is behind the use of the doubtful words to give any other sense than "province, country or district."

H.

The Church Quarterly Review, for July, contains two articles on the Bishops' Prayer Book: (1) "A Defence of the New Prayer Book," by the Bishop of Gloucester, and (2) "The New Prayer Book Examined," by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, D.D., and a closely related article, "The Scottish Liturgy," by the Rev. J. E. MacRae, M.A.

A defence of the New Prayer Book which makes no attempt to account for the very serious opposition to an alternative version of the Book of Common Prayer, purporting as it does, to be enriched, modernised and perfected as a "corporate expression of the desires of the Church at the present time," is not convincing.

Dr. Headlam is very appreciative of those accommodating Evangelicals and High Church-Anglo-Catholics who support the New Prayer Book, but his depreciation of the Book's opponents is overdone. The opposition is by no means confined to, or mainly represented by, "a small knot of extremists, led by Dr. Darwell Stone," nor does "prejudice and objection to a reasonable freedom in the Church of England" rightly define the position of Bishop Knox and Sir William Joynson Hicks, who "are attacking it with much violence, with persistency, and I think without much intelligence." And an enumeration of the opponents which excludes the four Diocesan Bishops is misleading. But although the Bishop of Gloucester professes to think lightly of the opposition, he devotes

eighteen pages to dealing with their case in some detail. And the best answer to his attack upon the Evangelical leaders is that contained in the Primate's eulogy, in the Church Assembly, of their high tone and fine temper.

The Diocesan Bishops who oppose the New Prayer Book made no secret of their convictions and, although this was not known when Dr. Headlam's article was written, they have carried their opposition to the length of voting against it in the Church Assembly.

Surely these Diocesans, rather than Bishop Knox and Dr. Darwell Stone, are the leading opponents of the New Prayer Book, or rather of those sections of it which are seriously challenged. Their opposition is reasonably stated, is based on principle and cannot wisely be regarded as negligible by the Church or by the State.

Dr. Headlam's statement "that the Church claims quite definitely in all its teaching to be Catholic but not Roman," needs some qualification. No reputedly Catholic teaching has an accredited place in the post-Reformation Church, unless it is, first and foremost, Scriptural—the Articles are quite clear on that point. In dealing with three of the most important points at issue Dr. Headlam is content to rely upon other than Scriptural considerations.

(1) The restoration of *Prayers for the Dead*, in public worship, after their ejection 375 years ago for lack of Scriptural authority, is not justified by any Episcopal repudiation of the "doctrine of purgatory and everything associated with it (which) has not the authority of the primitive Church." Repudiation, moreover, is by no means as definite as Dr. Headlam assumes, unless a tacit ignoring of the whole subject is equivalent to repudiation.

(2) With respect to *Reservation*, Dr. Headlam is content to rely upon the plea that the custom of the deferred Communion of the Sick has prevailed widely in the Christian Church since the second century. But the *cultus* of the Reserved Sacrament, which he strongly reprobates, is not the only valid reason against its restoration into the Anglican Church, after four centuries' disuse. The administration of previously consecrated Bread and Wine in effect deprives the sick person of an essential element in communion, as was pointed out by Dr. Temple in the Lambeth Hearing in May, 1900.

(3) The *New Communion Office*. Here again no Scriptural authority is cited, Dr. Headlam being concerned with its defence as "Catholic, rather than Roman," and as being in accordance with "the traditions of the Catholic Church and of the Church of England." Naturally those who value the Reformation and desire to retain the Scriptural standard of the Thirty-nine Articles cannot be expected to regard that as justifying a reversion to the pre-Reformation position.

Dr. Brightman's article, "The New Prayer Book Examined," is an important contribution to the discussion on the Bishops' Prayer Book. Dr. Brightman holds that "nothing more than a supplement of prayers relating to new situations (such as have

always been provided on special occasions and would only fill a few pages) and perhaps some modernising of language," is wanted in order to bring a Service Book compiled in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into line with the needs of the twentieth. But the Bishops having decided otherwise, and produced a new Prayer Book, Dr. Brightman proceeds to subject it to a critical examination from a literary, liturgical and doctrinal standpoint which is deadly in its effectiveness. He notices "three things, and perhaps only three, among the contents of the new Book, which are of real distinction." One of them is the familiar Collect, "O God, who hast made of one blood," written by Geo. Cotton, Bishop of Calcutta (1858-66); the second is the Prayer, "Remember, O Lord, what Thou has wrought in us," and the third, the "Exhortation whereby the people are put in mind of the law of Christ"—and of these he remarks "they are worthy of a place, and even of a better place than is given them here, in the Service Book of the Church of England."

The article on the Scottish Liturgy, by the Rev. J. E. MacRae, Rector of Invergowrie, is of special interest in explaining why a distinctive form of the Scotch Liturgy has gained the approval of Dr. Frere, Bishop of Truro, as "the best Liturgy in use in the Anglican Communion," and indicates the reasons which are probably responsible for the Archbishop of York's contention that (1) the Alternative Order enunciates no difference in doctrine when contrasted with the Office of 1662, and that (2) the Scottish and American Churches, using their own Liturgies, which are comparable with the Alternative Order now proposed, have remained in inviolable and harmonious communion for over a hundred and thirty years with the Church of England.

The desirability of introducing new elements into our Prayer of Consecration cannot be conceded because similar features are found in the Scottish and American Episcopal Churches, and inasmuch as the present Office is generally acceptable to all schools of thought in the Church of England, the need for an alternative is not apparent. That the Scottish Liturgy may yet stand forth as the Liturgy of the Reconciliation is the earnest hope of Mr. MacRae, but that is not in the immediate future; and meanwhile the repudiation of the Reformation Settlement proceeds apace.

H.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE TEACHING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE CONCERNING THE HOLY SPIRIT.

By the Rev. W. C. Procter. *Robert Scott*, 2s. net.

The author's aim is "to present a complete and comprehensive, yet compact and concise view of the Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Spirit." The words of Scripture are largely used and the teaching is clearly expressed. Among the subjects considered are the personality and deity of the Holy Spirit. His titles, and

emblems. The Old and New Testament teaching. His work in its various aspects, and His gifts. Many poetical illustrations are given, and a full index of Scriptural references is added. It is in brief form an admirable introduction to the study of the Scriptural teaching on the person and work of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity.

PLAIN RULES FOR CHURCHPEOPLE. By Rev. W. H. Heaton-Renshaw, M.A., Hon. C. F. London: *S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.

The Bishop of Chelmsford contributes a Foreword to this little manual prepared by the Vicar of West Norwood. It consists mainly of simple rules, together with short, sensible Instructions and a Prayer List. Admirable for Confirmation candidates, entirely free from all extravagances of either doctrine or ritual-direction.

S. R. C.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON. By S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D. London: *S.P.C.K.* 6d. net.

It is thought by competent scholars that these first or second century Odes were sung at the Baptism of Catechumens in the Early Church, in Syria or Palestine, and these translations have been made that they may be sung as hymns at Confirmations and Adult Baptisms. Here is a selection of twenty-one of them and suitable tunes are suggested. Here are two verses from the hymn on Joy, examples of Dr. Prideaux' style and skill:—

Lo! at His call have I error forsaken,
He is my path and Himself is the goal;
Bounty ungrudged from His Hand have I taken,
Richest salvation received for my soul.

Beauty excelling is mine and I die not—
Deathless is life in the land of the Lord;
All who are faithful, He saith—and I lie not—
Fully and freely shall have their reward.

We could wish Dr. Prideaux had given us the original text as well as his elegant translations.

S. R. C.

THE SAFETY OF ST. PAUL'S. By the Rev. S. A. Alexander, M.A., Canon and Treasurer of St. Paul's Cathedral. London: *John Murray.* 2s. 6d. net.

The alleged insecurity of Wren's great Church has been a matter of concern to Churchpeople all over the world and from far and near have come contributions, large and small, towards the work of restoration. It was a happy inspiration which led Canon Alexander to tell the story of what has been done since the work began in 1913. In the Appendix we have descriptions, dimensions and estimated weights which give us some idea of the real "greatness"

of the Cathedral as well as of the magnitude of the task of strengthening the fabric and we learn that the total weight of the Dome and its supports is no less than 67,270 tons and the Canon writes of "the silence of its brooding Dome and the glory of its uplifted Cross, planned . . . to be a witness to the sense of a Divine Presence in humanity." The four illustrations help to make the narrative more vivid. We are reminded that part of the Cathedral has been closed not because the public were in any real danger, but that the work might be done under favourable conditions, but we are not told when we may expect to see the work completed. Evidently much remains to be done. We owe it to those who are gone as well as to those who are yet unborn, that it should be *well* done.

S. R. C.

THE A B C OF CHRISTIAN LIVING. By Rev. Cyril E. Hudson, Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of S. Albans. London: S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d. net.

A new volume in "The Churchman's Popular Library," these pages have been penned with the conviction that the end of human life is fellowship with God and the nine chapters deal with the fundamentals of our faith. The author stresses the truth that "no enthusiasm for the Kingdom can be a substitute for devotion to its King." He pleads for more, and more intelligent, Bible study—there are, he says, "few more urgent needs," and he argues that it is inconceivable that such "isms" as Christian Science and Russellism could appeal to men and women with any intelligent appreciation of the Bible, while we are urged to put "as much mental effort into our religion as the Christian Scientist and the Spiritualist and Theosophist are expected to put—and do put—into theirs." This will show the practical character of this little book on Christian living. We very warmly commend it to our readers.

S. R. C.

Elizabeth June, Her Mother's Diary, edited by Margaret Cropper (S.P.C.K., 1s. 3d.), is a mother's record of her child's development till her death just after her seventh birthday. It is intended chiefly to illustrate a child's "insight into our relations with God, which is at its loveliest in quite little children."

Christianity and Nature, by John T. Bird, C.M.G., M.A., Chaplain of the Forces (Retired). *George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.* 3s. 6d. net.

In a number of brief chapters the author illustrates the truth that our knowledge of nature through scientific research not only does not diminish but rather increases our sense of the spiritual significance of the universe. The second part contains a number of spiritual analogies from nature, astronomy and general physics.

Quotations from many sources, apposite and relevant, bring out the force of the analogies with greater clearness.

Science and Faith, by W. G. Radley, B.Sc. (*Morgan & Scott, Ltd.*, 1s.), contains a reassuring message that "Modern scientific knowledge gives new force to the Book's message" to seek God.

A medical student one day said to Miss C. L. Maynard: "You see you *want* to believe, and I don't. To *want* is an unfair weight in the scale, and upsets the even balance of truth. You first make your creed, and then believe it. You see what you want to see. It is like touching the scale with your hand." Miss Maynard examines her belief in *Then Shall We Know* (S.P.C.K., 2s. 6d.), and calls to the bar as witnesses, the testimony of Ancient History, the results of the consideration of our chief mental faculties, the findings of Science, and the implications of Religion. This evidence forces her into the position "that now we know in part." The writings of Sir Oliver Lodge and Professor J. Arthur Thompson have greatly influenced these chapters.

Then she rises from this survey of worldly knowledge to a consideration of the Almighty and finds God is a Person, that man is a Person, that Prayer is a link between these personalities, but is again forced into the position that a knowledge of God is impossible without knowing Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, and to the Conclusion from which the title of the book is taken, "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord." This book is the outcome of deep reading, and a real faith which is not afraid to face difficulties.

Since Darwin's two books were published in 1859 and 1871 suggesting that Creation was not catastrophic but evolutionary, and up to quite recent times, many theologians have repudiated this theory and there has been a conflict between Science and Religion. Miss Constance L. Maynard in *Progressive Creation* (S.P.C.K., 6d.), gathering together the findings of recent literature on this subject believes that there is no conflict and that Science and Religion are fighting on the same side and that the theory of Evolution can be held with faith in the Bible as the Word of God. Her own faith in the Bible has remained unshaken and she claims this as her qualification for speaking on the subject. The book, although small, is thought-provoking, and will serve well as an introduction to this interesting subject.

CHURCH BOOK ROOM NOTES.

DEAN WACE HOUSE, WINE OFFICE COURT, E.C.4.

The Church Congress.—As in previous years there will be a large stall at the Church Congress Exhibition at the Drill Hall, Portman Road, Ipswich, during Congress Week, when the publications of the League and books recommended by the Committee will be on sale. Clergy and other members are specially invited to visit the stall (which they will find in Block "B"), to inspect and purchase the literature on view, and to mention it to their friends, particularly drawing attention to the books and pamphlets on "The Deposited Book" and the doctrine and teaching of the Church. The Exhibition will be open from October 3rd to October 8th.

We would also draw attention to the excellent series of calendars, motto-cards, and framed verses written and issued by the Rev. R. F. P. Pechey, which will be on sale. These are artistically illustrated and beautifully arranged. They are suitable for placing on a desk or wall. The calendars are published at 1s. 3d. and 1s. 6d., the motto-cards at 1s. 3d. and 2s. 3d., and framed at 2s., 2s. 6d., and 3s. 6d.

Sunday School Lessons.—The fourth quarter's *Sunday School Lessons on the Collects illustrated from the Epistles and Gospels*, by the Rev. Dr. Flecker and the Rev. L. E. Roberts, for Seniors and Intermediates, are now ready, price 6d. each (postage 1d.). The four quarterly parts can now be obtained at 2s. per set, post free. It is hoped that in parishes where the Lessons have not been yet used that they will be found of service for the coming year.

We mentioned last year *God's Wonderful World*, an excellent course of 52 Sunday School Lessons based on verses taken from the Benedicite (2s. net). This book gives the teaching on the Church's seasons in a series of nature lessons and the writer has aimed first to interest, secondly to instruct and thirdly to apply the lessons to the every-day life and experience of children. Stories and illustrations have been freely drawn upon. In connection with this we may also mention a reprint of *God's Whispers* (3s. 6d.), a series of Nature Studies by W. S. Herbert Wylie, M.A. This book will be found of great service to teachers and others whose work lies with the young.

Joseph Hocking.—A new series of books has just been published by Messrs. Cassell at 2s. 6d. each, in which three of Mr. Joseph Hocking's books are included. *Andrew Bocconac's Will* is a story which deals directly with Anglo-Catholicism and its effects on character. This book was first published in 1926. The scene is laid in England and Spain. The main feature of the second story, *A Woman of Babylon*, is the description of convent life and the effects of the confessional in home life. The third story, *A Flame of Fire*, is historical. It purports to be a history of the adventures of three Englishmen in Spain at the time of the Great Armada. The description of the Inquisition, the Armada and the general attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in Spain at that time is vividly drawn. An excellent description is given of some parts of the country, particularly in the neighbourhood of Grenada.

The Holy Communion.—The Rev. A. St. John Thorpe, Vicar of Christ Church, Beckenham, has just published a little book of sermons under the title of *Devotional Studies on The Holy Communion*. The sermons deal with (1) an Outline of the entire Service; (2) The Ante-Communion Service; (3) The Communion Proper; (4) The Prayer of Consecration; (5) The Words of Administration; and (6) The Post-Communion Service. The sermons are the devotional and practical outcome of the scriptural view of the Lord's Supper, which was steadily pressed by the author when he delivered them. The book is published at 6d. in paper covers and 1s. net in cloth.

Family Prayers.—A new edition of the Rev. A. F. Thornhill's *Family Prayers*, published originally in the English Church Manuals Series, has been published, price 2d. net, in paper covers. This little manual aims at providing a simple form of prayer for busy households. The services are brief and broken up into separate acts or parts of worship, such as confession, praise, thanksgiving, prayer, or intercession. The pamphlet has had a very large circulation in the past and we are assured that in its new form it will meet a great need.

A third edition has also been published of another little book of Family Prayers entitled *About the Feet of God*, by Canon Price Devereux, price 2d. This little book contains prayers for a week. All the collects are short and simple and many of them are from the Book of Common Prayer. The booklet has been specially prepared as an outline of daily devotions for use in the home or in the school.

Communicants' Manuals.—A third edition of *Helps to the Christian Life* by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, D.D., has now been issued at 6d. in paper covers, 1s. in cloth and 1s. 6d. cloth gilt. The book is now in a smaller form than the earlier editions. It is meant to be a help to Communicants and especially to those who have just been confirmed. The first part deals with the subject of Prayer and of its importance to the spiritual life; suggestions are given for private prayer at morning and evening, and various special prayers are also added. The second part gives advice about the Bible and Bible reading, and some special references on important Biblical subjects are given. The third part deals with preparation for the Holy Communion, and in this section the Holy Communion Service is pointed with explanations and advice suitable for all Communicants, and especially for those who are just confirmed.

Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. have issued a new Communicants' Manual by Canon H. A. Wilson, Rector of Cheltenham, entitled *At the Lord's Table*, price 1s. 6d. stiff boards, and 1s. limp cloth. This book is a devotional manual for the use of Communicants. The earlier part of the book contains suggestions and advice for preparation before Communion and in these the author has got off the beaten track, notably in the matter of self-examination. For instance, methods for self-examination based upon the Beatitudes, the fruit of the Spirit, etc., are quite a new departure. Both at this stage and later on, use is made of "meditations" upon the "Comfortable Words" and the example of our Lord, etc. The latter part of the book consists of the Holy Communion Service with brief explanatory notes, and suggestions for prayer both before and after reception of the Bread and Wine. The whole book is simply written. It should meet a great need and is particularly suitable as a gift for the newly-confirmed.