

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. BY W. H. MACKEAN, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Rochester Cathedral. *Putnam.* 6s.

I count myself fortunate in that I came into possession of a copy of this book before I commenced a month's course of Sermons on the movements which made the nineteenth century conspicuous for the revival of life and activity in the Church of England. Two Sermons on the Evangelical Movement had already reached what I thought was to be their final form ; and, paradoxical as it may appear, a book entitled *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement* compelled me to make a rearrangement of my material, and to add two pages to my opening Sermon. It was on account of the first chapter which deals with the years that preceded the rise of the Oxford Movement.

Dr. Eugene Stock, who, for the purpose of writing his four-volume history of the Church Missionary Society, had made himself a master of the Church history of this period, contributed to Longmans' Series of *Anglican Church Handbooks* the manual on "The English Church in the Nineteenth Century." The reading of that book, and Mr. Balleine's *History of the Evangelical Party*, and Overton's *The Evangelical Revival in the Eighteenth Century* had provided me ample material for speaking about the indebtedness of the Church to the Evangelicals ; and Dr. MacKean's first chapter was read in time to add some telling statistics. "The small place which the Holy Communion occupied in the religious life of the Church of England before the Oxford Movement has often been overstated" (p. 27) : yes, because stated without any reference to the increase in the number of Celebrations and Communicants in churches where the Clergy had come under the influence of the Evangelical Revival, the relatively few "serious Clergy." Some of us perhaps are rather weary of being told that in St. Paul's Cathedral on one Easter Day there were only six Communicants ; for what had St. Paul's Cathedral to do in those days with the Evangelicals ? Indeed it was only in 1858 that the revival of the Cathedral took place, and Bishop Tait secured the opening of its doors for evening services for the people in spite of strong opposition not only on the part of the Dean and Chapter, but also from such a good Tractarian as Archdeacon Denison.

The common fallacy that the Evangelicals were dominant easily produces the impression that they were responsible for the state of things which is justly condemned : and the statistics which Dr. MacKean gives of some representative Churches such as Islington, under Daniel Wilson, and St. Peter's, Hereford, under John Venn, should be made known : also the amazing statistics of the circulation of manuals of preparation for Holy Communion, one of which

had reached the twenty-fourth edition in 1807. The Evangelicals were not dominant (how could they be, seeing that they were unloved by the majority of the Bishops and Clergy?) except in respect of spiritual and philanthropic activity; and in those respects dominant they certainly were.

In the second chapter Dr. MacKean deals with the background of the Eucharistic doctrine of the Oxford Movement. The chapter is full of interest: here I only note two points which emerge again and again in the book.

The first point is the uncritical use that was made of Patristic and other quotations, and the ready way in which men fell into the snare of relying upon isolated words. I remember an occasion when I was challenged with some isolated words of Hooker. "Do you agree with them?" My reply was: "In the light of Hooker as a whole, yes, but as an isolated snippet, no." Dr. MacKean's strictures on the use that was made of the appeal to both the Fathers and Anglican Divines should be noted (see, e.g., pp. 43, 88, 102, 126, 132, 153); and when I read *inter alia* that "they forgot the cautious qualifications which our standard Divines had emphasised as necessary to an understanding of the Fathers," I am reminded of Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's words: "They (i.e. the Fathers) would not be so scrupulous in speaking on this subject (i.e. the sacrificial aspect of the Lord's Supper) as they would be, if they lived now. This is to be borne in mind in reading their works" (see his comments on *Malachi* i. 11, and *Hebrews* x. 12).

The second point is the divergence of the leaders of the Tractarian Movement from the position of the Caroline Churchmen (see, e.g., pp. 44 f., 48, 93, 156 f.). Dr. MacKean in a later chapter suggests, I think rather needlessly, that there is doubt about the precise doctrine of Archbishop Laud; and I suppose that he is referring to such subtle distinctions as are represented by the terms Virtualism and Receptionism. On the main point at issue, I consider that Laud in his *Conference with Fisher the Jesuit* leaves us in no kind of doubt about his being on the side of the Reformers. He rebuts the theory of concomitance (which is necessary for any conception of Christ being present in the Elements, that claims to be based upon the literal meaning of the words of Institution) by the argument that the Sacrament is *sanguinis effusi*, and blood shed or poured forth goeth not with the body *per concomitantiam*.

The fact is that amidst all the varieties of apprehension and interpretation of the Lord's Supper, the real dividing line is the question of the relation of the Elements to our Lord. Do we associate them with the Saviour as He was on the Cross, or regard them as the tabernacle of His glorified Presence? And when I have been told that the movement towards the conception of the tabernacle was in line with the teaching of the earlier Anglican Divines I have been amazed, and I find my amazement intensified after reading the evidence that is produced in this chapter.

Chapters III—V give us a careful examination of the development of Eucharistic doctrine in a Romeward direction, reached

through individual wrestlings and controversy among adherents of the movement.

Chapter VI gives us an account of the lawsuits and trials by which the peace of the Church was profoundly disturbed.

In Chapter VII Dr. MacKean criticises the new doctrine of Pusey, as the chief authority to his party on the Eucharistic belief of the Primitive Church. It is sympathetic but trenchant criticism. Dr. MacKean examines the use of phrases such as "The Real Presence" and "The extension of the Incarnation."

In connection with the phrase "Real Presence" I am disappointed to find no reference to the change that was introduced in the Black Rubric in 1662: because that change from denial of "real and essential presence" to denial of "carnal presence" is often appealed to as an argument in favour of a change of doctrine on the part of the revisers of 1662. The answer is indirectly given by Dr. MacKean on p. 164. For the fact is that the term "real presence" had been used and could be used to express doctrine which the Reformers held, namely, that the natural Body and Blood of Christ are really present in the Sacrament in respect of grace and efficacy; and a favourite analogy used by the Reformers was the presence of the sun in grace and efficacy in, e.g., a flower. In that sense Bishop Ridley, e.g., admitted the term "real presence," Archbishop Laud likewise. The change introduced in 1662 is to be explained by the ambiguity of the term that had been used in the earlier form of the Black Rubric, and not by any doctrinal divergence. I would emphasise Dr. MacKean's insistence on the necessity of clear thinking about the use of the term and the way in which it is related. For it is one thing to believe the presence of Christ in the Spirit, it is another thing to believe the presence of Christ's Body broken and Blood shed. Moreover, it is one thing to associate Christ's presence, in any sense, with the Sacramental action; it is another thing to associate the presence, in any sense, with the Sacramental Elements.

And to return to the Black Rubric, it should be remembered that the subjects about which the predications are made are, first, the Sacramental Elements, and, second, Christ's "natural Flesh and Blood": and the change of wording from "real and essential" to "corporal" is not to be interpreted in any other relation.

For a detailed examination of this point I refer my readers to N. Dimock's *History of the B.C.P.*, pp. 44 ff., 124 ff. Longmans, Edition 1910.

In Chapter VII, under the title "Maintenance of the Anglican Tradition," Dr. MacKean gives us a summary statement of the views of representative High Churchmen, Moderates, Liberals and Evangelicals, who insisted on the erroneous features of the new doctrine, or maintained the Anglican tradition. I seize the opportunity of emphasising the value in this connection of the works of Nathaniel Dimock, which were reissued in a memorial edition by Longmans, Green & Co., in 1910.

In Chapter IX the author examines modifications and extensions

of Pusey's doctrine, with a deservedly special treatment of Bishop Gore's book, *The Body of Christ*. I venture to call attention to a point in the Bishop's statement, which particularly interests me. It is the way in which he leaps, after an interval of many pages, from the principle underlying the natural Sacraments to the principle of the Incarnation as analogous to the Christian Sacraments. I can find no analogy of principle between the kiss, or for that matter the giving and receiving of the ring in marriage, and God the Son becoming incarnate.

In the last chapter Dr. MacKean directs our thoughts to principles which must underlie sound Eucharistic doctrine. I would like to see the chapter printed in pamphlet form and widely circulated.

We are reminded of the necessity of the doctrine having a rational and true basis. Yes, indeed, for the more that appeal is made to the general sacramental principle, the less reasonable is it to treat the Christian Sacraments as additions to the things which we cannot understand and explain. Man did not devise the sacramental principle in his social relationships to add to the complexities of life.

We are reminded of the necessity of exercising care in the use of words and phrases, which cause confusion through their ambiguity or disunity through their associations. Formulas of compromise may have their value, but they lead nowhere for the purpose of mutual understanding.

We are reminded of the points of agreement among all schools of thought.

We are reminded that for a true doctrine our standard must be ultimately that of the Upper Room: and that we must keep our minds centred on personal relationship, with the action, and not the Elements *in vacuo*, as the outward and visible sign.

Finally, we are reminded of the social aspect of the Sacrament, and its bearing upon such practical questions as those of non-communicating attendance and fasting communion.

So I lay down the book; and as I do so, I am conscious of having read a work of research and thought, my sense of the high value of which I cannot find words adequately to express. And as I associate it with its companion volume, *The Evangelical Doctrine of the Holy Communion*, edited by Dr. Macdonald, I think of the two books as destined to become classics for the history of Eucharistic Doctrine in the Church of England.

ARTHUR J. TAIT.

---

THE CONCEPTION OF GOD IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF AQUINAS. By George Leet Patterson, Ph.D. *George Allen, 21s.*

In a large volume of 500 pages Dr. Patterson discusses the doctrine of God in the works of Aquinas. His discussion is careful and closely reasoned, and valuable to modern students in view of the importance attached to Aquinas by Roman Catholic theologians. It is not every mind that is capable of gripping the intellectual

subtleties of Aquinas. It is not every man who has the time for the unravelling of the knotty intricacies of his thoughts. A medieval mind in a medieval setting, amply leisured and jejunely confined to scholastic philosophy would be required. Consequently, the works of Aquinas appeal more to the Roman theologian than to the Protestant, who prefers to approach God through the world of internal experience than by logical processes and dry intellectualism, having cast off the chains of subtle dialectics with other unspiritual restrictions on his liberty of thought and action.

In his approach to the Study of God by the *via negativa*, by the determination of what He is not, Aquinas follows in the steps of Philo (to whom our author makes no reference), whose treatise, *Quod Deus Immutabilis*, with many others, abounds in negative attributes of God, the "incomprehensible," the "uncreated," the "indescribable," the "incomparable," the "uncontainable," the "inimitable," the "inexplicable," the "illimitable," the "unbribable," etc., etc. In this respect Philo gave a lead to the early Christian theologians like Theophilus, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria, who says very plainly that "we may reach in some way the knowledge of the Almighty by learning not what He is but what He is not." The other way of approach, the *via affirmativa*, or of human analogy or anthropomorphism was condemned by Philo, who declared that God is different entirely from man. But, nevertheless, he laid emphasis on those positive attributes of God, His goodness, His mercy, His royal rule, His beneficence and omnipotence, which claim the devotion, love and obedience of man. He also stressed His unity, monarchy, infinity and providence. Aquinas first discusses the negative qualities of God which involve the positive, just as the positive qualities of God involve the negative. The master he principally followed was the Pseudo-Dionysius, whose work on the *Divine Names* was well known to him, who declared, like Philo, that the Finite cannot grasp the Infinite, not because of the irrationality of the Godhead, but because of the limitations of the human intellect. There are many similar lines of thought in Philo and Aquinas in spite of the fact that the former was a Platonist and the latter an Aristotelian. But whereas Aquinas makes his approach to God by cold and hard-fast principles of logic, Philo made his by philosophy, the idealistic philosophy of his day, and consequently is less dry-as-dust, more human and inspiring, and more free to develop his mysticism, which in Aquinas is held in check, even if reluctantly, by his devotion to the cast-iron teaching of a Church which allowed no freedom to the intellect or to the soul to develop or explore in its own life for its own purposes, and held her mystics, while exploiting their experiences for her own purpose, in stern control. This is why we miss in Aquinas what is to us Protestants one of the most convincing of all arguments for God's existence—the ontological, which is based on one's own religious experience, and which is put forward with such brilliancy of imagination and style in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine. His previous studies in Neoplatonism had prepared his mind for the

acceptance of that direct intuitive knowledge of the super-sensible reality, the immediate apprehension of the Deity claimed by the mystical school, but rejected by the Aristotelian, which derived all knowledge directly or indirectly from the senses. Consequently, the perception of an infinite and Spiritual Being was held by the disciples of that school of thought to be beyond the capacity of the human intellect, which was compelled to turn for comfort to the dogmas and sacraments of the Church. However, at times human nature (including the spiritual) asserted itself, and the soul of Aquinas soared higher than his logic to a knowledge of God, not of faith or demonstration, but of vision, chiefly because there were such visions in the earthly lives of Moses and St. Paul recorded in the Scriptures. Such visions were, of course, miraculously given and Aquinas finds himself in a position inconsistent with his logic, by which such visions were ruled out as *contra naturam*. In his *de veritate* q. 12 he put this with a grim humour. "For a man *in statu vite* to know God *secundum naturam patrie* is just as much *contra naturam* as it is for a babe to be born with a beard." Was he thinking of the philosopher's habit "pascere barbam"? At the same time, he allowed that the state of rapture (*raptus*) had been experienced by others, as well as by Moses and St. Paul, and, indeed, it is said that the unfinished condition of his own *Summa Theologica* was due to some strange experience which happened to himself two years before his death. The fact is, that the mind of Aquinas partly held with the Neoplatonists, and partly held with the Aristotelian school. From the latter he borrowed his theory of man's knowledge and constitution, from the former his mysticism. The gap between was filled up for him by the Christian revelation and teaching.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in this book is the Fourth, which contains a criticism of the proofs of God's existence put forward by Aquinas. There are five which represent the Deity as Necessary Being, Supreme Efficient Cause, Supreme Intelligence, Supreme Mover (Himself Unmoved) and Supreme Absolute Goodness). The two principal proofs are the cosmological and the teleological, and are generally regarded as *a posteriori*. (Dr. Patterson, however, regards the former as *a priori*, being based upon the principle of causality), while the ontological argument, which was rejected by Aquinas, is *a priori*. It had been put forward with great power by Anselm of Canterbury, who argued that God's non-existence is inconceivable, for the idea which we have of a perfect Being implies Existence. This is a subjective proof and is to-day usually expressed in this way: "We feel God, therefore He is." After all we ultimately come back to our feeling, our immediate perception, as the basis of both science and religion. And in these days when stress is laid, sometimes and wrongly to the exclusion of His transcendence, upon the immanence of God, which was overlooked by Aquinas, this is the paramount proof of His existence. As Professor Eddington says: "It was by looking into our own nature that we revealed the first failure of the physical universe to

be co-extensive with our experience of reality. The 'Something to which truth matters' must surely have a place in reality if we are to use the term 'reality' at all. In our own nature, or through the contact of our consciousness with a nature transcending ours, there are other things that claim the same kind of recognition—a sense of beauty, of morality, and, finally, at the root of all spiritual religion, *an experience which we describe as the presence of God.*" On the other hand, both the cosmological and the teleological arguments for the Existence of God are not by themselves altogether convincing. The argument from causality brings us back to a First Cause Uncaused of which we know nothing; that from "the contingency of the world" brings us to a necessary ground of which we cannot say that it is one; that from the many signs of purpose and adaptation and order in the universe may merely point to the conclusion that it has a rational First Cause that works for ends. It is the cumulative effect of these proofs that carries weight, and when buttressed by arguments from life, from conscience, and from universal consent, makes them more cogent still. Dean Inge restates the ontological argument, which we consider the most cogent of all in a form that appeals to the modern mind by bringing in the theory of "Values." We have an immediate apprehension of the intrinsic values of Goodness, Truth and Beauty (to which Aquinas makes no reference). "This apprehension is given to us. The path from the appreciation of the Good, the True, and the Beautiful to recognition of their source in one supreme Being is rather of the nature of a valid inference" than of an intuition. When we reflect upon it, we must admit that these eternal and spiritual values of the good, the true and the beautiful which Plato himself appreciated, are a testimony to God's existence. In a material universe how could truth be reached? It is a mental and a spiritual value. Beauty also is a quality that proves the existence of a mind. It can only be created and appreciated by mind. The harmonious and inevitable correspondence of the perceiving subject and the object perceived cannot be the result of any fortuitous or haphazard arrangement. Materialism which must not draw upon any spiritual or mental quality or force, on the other hand must explain everything as due to a fortuitous clashing or concourse of atoms or whirling electrons. The apparent regulation of the universe on mathematical principles suggests that there is nothing casual in its constitution, and what then of its origin? Both Plato and Aristotle felt that the world required a First Cause, a Maker, no matter how they described Him. We can explain a great deal from the World itself, but its beginning in space-time we cannot, and it cannot be explained if natural or known causes only are to be taken into account. The idea of God is logically necessary to round off our experience as an intelligible whole; to take God out of human experience would be to maim and truncate it and render it an incomplete thing, whereas the idea of God gives it rationality, and, as the rational only is real, reality. We are now spiritual beings, no matter how our past may be described, and require a spiritual environment for our

further progress and evolution. Removed from such an environment we suffer spiritual death. The environment is God, Who is therefore necessary to our spiritual life. And also to our moral life as the "ought" of conscience demonstrates. No man can impose an "ought" upon another. He can only "feel" it himself in his own inner experience and soul. This sense of responsibility to a moral law and an "ought" is only in harmony with a universe that is rationally controlled and adjusted. It fits in with the condition of things here, it is an evidence of a Mind that can impose an obligation, and a proof, however indirect, of a future life. Beauty of form and colour, harmony of sound, love and life, conscience and duty, knowledge and wisdom, faith and hope—all these are evidences to the ordinary man of the Divine Mind, Architect, Artist, Saviour, that rules and loves and lives, the Source and Giver of goodness and happiness to men. And when supported by the revelation of the Divine Son, in Whose life and character were made manifest the care, sympathy and holiness of the Righteous Father, their witness to His existence should be adequate for all enquirers into truth.<sup>1</sup>

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

---

AUTHORITY AND REASON IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. Being the Hulsean Lectures, 1931-2, delivered in the University of Cambridge in Michaelmas Term, 1931. By A. J. Macdonald, D.D. *Oxford University Press.* 6s. net.

In these Lectures Dr. Macdonald makes a fresh and interesting examination of the thought of the early Middle Ages. He takes the years from about the eighth to the twelfth century and illustrates the development of thought during this period. He points out that the early Middle Ages have constantly been described as a period of decay in learning and letters and as an epoch when European intellect was quiescent and that this opinion should be abandoned, for the pursuit of learning never ceased and there was considerable activity of thought among philosophical theologians from the time of Charles the Great to Hildebrand which produced a considerable contribution to Western intellectual development. The subjects discussed at the time have long ceased to engage the attention of philosophers, but the work of Johannes Scotus Erigena, and Berengar of Tours, demands attention. The Lectures, in tracing the development and interplay of thought during the period, display its continuity with classical dialectical and with patristic theological precedents, and close with a brief survey of the later Middle Ages. They show that there was more freedom for rational investigation and discussion in this early period than European thinkers were to enjoy for several hundred years after the Lateran Council of 1215, and that Ecclesiastical tradition ultimately tightened its grip upon intellectual freedom when

<sup>1</sup> I would recommend to all readers of THE CHURCHMAN Robert Bridges' fine poem, *The Testament of Beauty*, which deals poetically with the whole subject here discussed.



Berengar was condemned and the first Lateran Council was held.

As the terms used during the period were sometimes ambiguous, definitions of Reason, Revelation, Tradition, and Authority are given. Reason has the three-fold meaning of common sense, the exercise of the rational faculties, and the operation of the Logos on the human mind. Tradition signified any set of ideas which had received wide acceptance, and in a narrower sense it implied the content of Conciliar resolutions. Authority, in its broad sense implied the sanction of the whole Church. In a narrower sense it was later limited to the authority of the Roman Councils sitting under the presidency of the Popes. The history of the thought of the period is in effect an account of the gradual supersession of the freedom of reason by the claims of authority. At first the relation between them was undefined. The renaissance of rational enquiry in the ninth century was concerned with the intellectual proofs of the existence of God. The account of Johannes Scotus Erigena is of special interest as it corrects the misunderstanding which has represented him as setting up reason as the chief criterion of knowledge. His ultimate criterion was reason illuminated by Divine light, hence his emphasis on intuition. The source of knowledge is God Himself and the supreme human authority is this intuition illuminated by revelation. Dr. Macdonald, who is deeply interested in Barthian studies, notes in this and other points the revival of the older methods of thought in the modern German teacher's system.

Another interesting section deals with the development of Sacramental teaching. The doctrine of Paschasius Radbert became the teaching of the Church in the tenth and eleventh centuries. It was an innovation and was opposed by Rattram, who maintained that the consecrated elements are symbols and not the real Body and Blood of Christ. The Iconoclastic Controversy gave another example of the freedom of thought of the period. As the body of Ecclesiastical authority and tradition grew, the conflict between Reason and Authority developed, and the concentration of Authority in the hands of the Papacy developed through the appeals made to the central Authority at Rome. Thus, in the ninth century, the principle of Authority developed together with the parallel notion of Tradition. The conflict is further traced in the works of Gerbert, Berengar, and Lanfranc; it was brought to a head in the Second Eucharistic Conference in which the protagonists were Berengar and Lanfranc. A section is devoted to the relationship of Authority and Revelation. The last Lecture gives an account of the critics of Papal authority and the later medieval compromise. This compromise between Reason and Tradition is illustrated from the writings of Thomas Aquinas. These studies form an important contribution to the understanding of a period, of which too little is known by the general reader.

---

THE FORMATION OF THE GOSPEL TRADITION. Eight Lectures by Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D. *Macmillan*. 1933. Pp. 214. 7s. 6d.

These lectures occupy a uniquely valuable place among English writings upon Gospel problems. They open up to English readers a field of study hardly available hitherto; and the present reviewer has no hesitation in affirming that Taylor's *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* will be very widely read. Dr. Vincent Taylor is the well-known professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Wesley College, Headingley, and the lectures which form the volume under review were delivered in the University of Leeds last year at the invitation of the Vice-Chancellor and the Public Lectures Committee. Readers of *THE CHURCHMAN* will scarcely need to be reminded of literary work by Dr. Taylor such as *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth* and *Behind the Third Gospel*.

The present study is a contribution to the solution of the problem ever before Christian people—How did the Four Gospels come to be written? Dr. Taylor attempts to trace stages in their formation. The periods would be roughly (A) A.D. 30–50, (B) 50–65, (C) 65–100. (A) Recollections of the sayings and deeds of the Lord Jesus would be recounted in preaching and in worship. Most stories would be short, but for the purposes of use at the Lord's Supper the Passion Stories would gradually assume a more connected form. (B) The scattered elements of the tradition were gathered into groups. The sayings of Jesus were arranged topically for instruction and defence. (C) Gospel compilation. The name of Vincent Taylor is associated with the thesis that it was Luke who wrote the first Gospel, the volume, however, not being published till after the writing of St. Mark, when St. Luke re-wrote his first draft and dedicated it to Theophilus. The author summarises his view (and in an appendix replies to criticism of it), but his whole treatment of (C) is on the large basis of Form Criticism as a whole. The following passage, with which the writer draws his chapter to a close, is typical of his reverent treatment of the subject. "Far from losing the idea of Inspiration, we are led to see that the Spirit of God must have been at work upon a grander scale, not coercing men or using them as blind instruments, but elevating their minds to perceive, to transmit, and to interpret the best elements in the tradition. Literature has no books which can justly be compared with the Gospels, which indeed come to us from men, but in the last analysis are the gifts of God, seals of His grace and sacraments of His love" (p. 189).

But this is the final lecture. The unique characteristic of the volume is that it expounds *Formgeschichte*, or, what is styled in English, "Form Criticism." Almost the only other book in English which deals with it is Easton's *The Gospel before the Gospels* (1928), but the "Form Critics" of Germany have not been idle since 1928, and not least Bultmann's *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1921) has appeared in a greatly enlarged edition (1931). Form Criticism attempts three things: (1) to classify the material according to its

form ; (2) to try to recover the original form of the material during the oral period, and (3) to seek for the " life-situation " out of which the material springs.

Professor Taylor gives the title *Pronouncement*—stories (in contrast to the terms *Paradigmen* used by Dibellius and *Apophthegmata* by Bultmann) to those Gospel stories, long or short, in which everything leads up to a final word of Jesus, which for the early Christians must have had the force of a " pronouncement." This statement would be of practical value in the life of the Christian. The Tribute Money (St. Mark xii. 13 ff.) Taylor considers to be one of the best examples. He finds at least 20 in Mark, 7 (9) in Luke's special source, and 4 (5) in Q. Bultmann rejects these stories, with few exceptions, as unhistorical, they being in his judgment only products of Christian imagination. With enthusiasm and restraint Taylor turns his own arguments upon him and makes " the critic give place to counsel for the prosecution " (p. 86).

Dr. Taylor, so far from agreeing that the stories are unhistorical, holds them to be " among the strongest and most stable elements in the Gospel tradition." Other classifications are " Passion Narratives " (chap. iii), " Sayings and Parables " (chap. v), " Miracle Stories " (chap. vi) and " Stories about Jesus " (chap. vii).

Vincent Taylor's criticism of the excesses of the Form Critics of Germany is both reasoned and caustic. " It is fair to say that the confidence with which Bultmann tells how the Markan story came into being could be justified only by the gift of omniscience " (p. 58). Again, " If the Form Critics are right, the Disciples must have been translated to heaven immediately after the Resurrection. As Bultmann sees it, the primitive community exists *in vacuo*, cut off from its founders by the walls of an inexplicable ignorance. Unable to turn to anyone for information, it must invent situations for the words of Jesus, and put into His lips sayings which personal memory cannot check. All this is absurd. . . . The one hundred and twenty at Pentecost did not go into permanent retreat " (pp. 41, 42). The basis of Taylor's work may be held to be expressed in such sentences as the following. " It is the Form Critics who raise and face the special questions which belong to any serious study of the formative process. It is of value to discuss unacceptable suggestions if only to be confronted with the necessity of seeking for answers which are better and satisfying " (p. 43). For good or for ill the Form Critics have come to stay, and those who wish to learn something of this new phase of study will do well to work steadily through this book. It is uncommonly well and lucidly written, and at every turn one is impressed with the strength and poise of its scholarship. Without a doubt account will have to be taken of this contribution by Bultmann and Dibellius. It is now possible for them to see in considerable detail the effect which their work produces upon a British scholar of powerful mind.

R. S. C.

EVANGELICAL INFLUENCE IN ENGLISH LIFE. Golden Lectures delivered in the Church of St. Margaret, Lothbury, 1932-3. By James Theodore Inskip, D.D., Bishop of Barking. *Macmillan & Co., Ltd.* 5s. net.

The Bishop of Barking has very appropriately used the opportunity of an invitation from the Haberdashers' Company to deliver the Golden Lectures for the year 1932-3 to give an account of the Evangelical influence in English life. During the present year much has been heard of the Tractarian Movement and its influence. It was a happy thought on the part of the Bishop to bring to the notice of Church people the achievements of the Evangelicals, not merely in Missionary work overseas but in Social Service at home and elsewhere, a work which has often been done "in face of discouragement or even actual opposition from the powers that be, or from other camps in the Army of Christ." The Bishop has strong faith in the future of the Evangelical School, and believes that it should draw a great measure of inspiration from the great work which has been accomplished in the past by its representatives. It is satisfactory to have the testimony which he expresses in these words: "A long and wide experience, with opportunities for some years past of special observation of work in various types of parishes, convinces me that the best Evangelical parish priests are unsurpassed in their devotion and self-sacrifice, and in the efficiency and reality of their work. To my mind the organisation of parishes on modern Evangelical lines offers the best prospect of evoking a wide and deep response from the people. In my opinion the Evangelicals interpret and represent the Church of England as a Reformed Church more nearly than does any other school." The Bishop's lectures include a useful survey of past religious movements in England illustrating the proper use of the term "Evangelical." He then traces the history of Evangelical teaching and shows that the primacy of the Cross in the dogmatic system of Christianity has been the central feature of Evangelical teaching. He then makes clear the Evangelical position in regard to the Church and Ministry, and shows that the teaching of such scholars as Lightfoot and Hort represents the Evangelical view, while the Tractarian theory of Apostolic Succession breaks down in the light of history and experience. A chapter on the Sacraments shows that the Evangelical interpretation of them does not fall in the least behind that of any other section of the Church. A historical section deals with John Wycliffe as the Precursor of the Reformation, and goes on to a useful explanation of the Reformation, showing that the English Church has kept close to the constitution of the early Christian Church. Some phases of religion in England in the seventeenth century are considered, and then the power of the Evangelical Revival is forcibly set out. It is shown that many of the important features of our Church life to-day are the outcome of the work of the leaders of the Revival. He brings sufficient evidence to refute the oft-repeated statement that the Oxford Movement was complementary to the Evangelical Revival. The influence of Evangelical

thought is further emphasised in an account of the great work done by William Wilberforce in the Abolition of Slavery, and a chapter of special interest contains an account of England's debt to Lord Shaftesbury for the social work which he accomplished. That work was the outcome of the Evangelical inspiration given to him in his early days by Maria Millis, the housekeeper in his early home. Her name should be a household word among Evangelicals. As the Evangelical School has been so largely associated with foreign Mission work, it is appropriate that the closing lecture was devoted to the work overseas. Evangelical Churchmen owe the Bishop of Barking a great debt for presenting such a full statement of Evangelical influence in English life, and we trust that his book will prove an inspiration to coming generations of Evangelical Churchmen to maintain and even surpass the great work of their predecessors.

---

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.  
By the Very Rev. R. H. Malden, B.D. *Oxford University Press.* 3s. 6d.

This small volume of eighty pages consists of four lectures given by the Dean of Wells, who has been moved to publish them by the interest they seem to have created. They contain a useful summary of the various stages which mark the origin and development of the Papacy as we know it; and of certain aspects of the history and position of the Church of England as these appear to the author. Though necessarily very much condensed, the book is readable and lucid from beginning to end, but it can hardly be regarded as an adequate presentation of the events it records. In the pages dealing with Elizabeth's reign there is no reference to the plots against her life which had the approval of the Papacy; what the writer says of Transubstantiation gives no true idea of what that doctrine really teaches, though he does approve its condemnation in Article XXVIII; the reference to Newman's Tract 90 would almost imply the author's agreement with his effort to make the Thirty-nine Articles harmonise with the decrees of Trent; the Papacy is said to have become, as time went on, "more selfish in its policy and more exacting in its demands. As we grew to manhood we resented them more and more," but there is no indication of the appalling doctrinal and moral corruption in the later Middle Ages which made the Reformation a necessity not only in England, but on the Continent. The references to persecution and to the Inquisition are quite misleading; and it is simply not true to say that "If (n.b.) the Roman Church has persecuted more than any other, that is merely because it has had more opportunity" (p. 41). We are, moreover, told that "For more than three hundred years we have found room for those who are now known as *Anglo-Catholics* and *Evangelicals*" (p. 69). Whatever may be said in regard to Evangelicals, it has been amply demonstrated that the teaching of those who are now known as Anglo-Catholics is a complete novelty in post-Reformation Anglican

theology, dating only from the rise of the Tractarian Movement. We have sometimes wondered in reading this book whether the perversity shown by the writer is due to sympathy with views which he discusses or to an exaggerated desire to appear impartial, candid and judicial. He tells us that he sometimes thinks that if he had been brought up in the Church of Rome he might have remained there, though he would have had to put up with a great deal which he disliked very much. It is this perhaps which makes him say on the first page, that if a general council of the whole Church could be held, the Pope would be the proper person to summon it, a proposition which would certainly not be everywhere accepted as axiomatic. But we think that if he possessed his present knowledge, he would soon find his way out of the Church of Rome and would emerge with somewhat clearer ideas as to the differences between that body and the Church of England. At present he seems to have a rather tepid preference for the English Church apparently because on the whole he does not know of any which works better.

W. G. J.

ANCIENT HEBREW SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOM AS INDICATED IN LAW, NARRATIVE AND METAPHOR. By R. H. Kennett. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1931. *Humphrey Milford, O.U.P.*, 1933. 6s. net.

This posthumous work was edited by Professor Burkitt, who, as he mentions in a brief preface, was the first pupil of this brilliant Hebraist. The book, including the two indexes made by Professor Kennett's last pupil, Mr. G. A. Yates, consists of 114 pages. The work is full of detail, dealt with in an interesting fashion. Professor Kennett's method is almost unique. With scarcely a reference to an author, living or dead (unless it be occasional citations from Robertson Smith or a modern traveller like Roscoe), the Professor weaves his web of Hebrew "Life and Custom" by means of about 1,400 references to the O.T. text.

Birth, childhood, education and marriage are all dealt with in Lecture I. Lecture II is upon houses and furniture, food and clothing, mourning and death. The final lecture (III) in its written form runs into 44 pages and treats of such diverse subjects as warriors, flocks and herds, hunting, agriculture, land division, workers in wood and in metal, mechanics, barbers, fullers, perfumers, physicians and administrators of justice.

In discussing the size of the ancient Hebrew family, Professor Kennett argues that the figure *seven* (mentioned in 1 Sam. ii. 5 and Jer. xv. 9) was commonly regarded as the maximum number that a woman might be expected to bear. "Jesse indeed had eight sons and . . . two daughters, but it is not stated whether they were all by one wife" (1 Sam. xvii. 12, 1 Chron. ii. 16). The present reviewer believes that in modern times the greatest number of children from a single pair is thirty (negro). Professor Kennett does not allude to the number of arrows taken in a Semitic quiver (Ps. cxxvii. 5), but we may be sure that it was more than eight or ten. In

interpreting Am. vi. 10 (" he that burneth him ") the professor rightly compares 2 Chron. xvi. 14, and holds the reference to be to the burning of *spices* and not of the corpse. An allusion is made on page 13 to ancient Hebrew kindness to children, and on page 66 to animals. There is strong reason to believe, with Kennett and Volz independently, that the sieve of Am. ix. 9 is of the sort which allowed the *grain* to pass through, holding back any stones and large rubbish collected from the threshing-floor.<sup>1</sup> This point involves an entire difference in the interpretation of the parable from that which has been generally held. The last lecture closes with a rather unique story of a trial by ordeal witnessed by the late Mr. Austin Kennett (Dr. Kennett's elder son), when Administrative Officer for the Egyptian Government in Sinai. A man accused of murder was acquitted after licking a spoon hot and sooty from the fire three times over, his tongue being clean and healthy by the time the spoon had completely cooled. Num. v. 11-31 provides for an elaborate trial by ordeal.

Even when the reader finds himself differing from Dr. Kennett, he realizes the power of a strong mind when directed sincerely to the interpreting of the O.T. Kennett's work and witness against sacerdotal conceptions of religion are well known. It is a matter for satisfaction that some of the lamented Regius Professor's MSS., hitherto unpublished, are being published by the Cambridge University Press at once. The volume is to include reprints of some of his smaller published writings, amongst which will appear his book upon the *Last Supper*.

R. S. C.

---

THE HEART OF THE BIBLE. By Jeannie B. Thomson Davies, M.A., in three volumes. Vol. I. *The Literature of the Hebrew People*. Allen & Unwin, 1933. 5s. net.

This is a delightful book, and in its way unique. We at least know no other which combines reading the Bible with a concurrent explanation of the passages selected. We do not mean that it is a commentary in the usual sense of the word. Far from it. Two hundred and eighty pages of fair-sized print would not contain that. Its aim is less comprehensive and simpler. This is to present portions of the Bible in the order in which they were originally written, with preceding explanations of how it was that they came to be composed at all.

Mrs. Davies is a teacher of much experience in mathematics, and evidently a Nonconformist, who has acquired a keen sense of what young people really need, and of the best manner of instructing them. This volume is the first of three, and deals with all the Old Testament as literature, regarded from the point of view of a moderate Higher Critic. It is in some ways to be regretted that she chose (perhaps under compulsion) to present the Bible extracts in the

<sup>1</sup> Reference may perhaps be permitted to the note on the passage in Cripps: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos*, pp. 265-9.

Authorised rather than the Revised Version, yet sometimes it is well to sacrifice meticulous accuracy, if by so doing one can get readers to understand what the Bible they use (presumably the A.V.) really means. Mrs. Davies has here given us indeed the Heart of the Bible, so far as this is to be found in the Old Testament as literature.

A. L. W.

---

THE SEVENTH AND SIXTH CENTURY PROPHETS. By E. W. Hamond, M.A., formerly Principal of the Jerusalem Men's College. With a Preface by Dr. Cyril Norwood. *Student Christian Movement Press*, 1933. 4s. net.

This is one volume of a series, parts of which have been already published, and the present writer finds it rather difficult to review one when he has not even seen the others. But it is interesting, alike in its origin and in its godfathers. For Dr. Cyril Norwood, the Head Master of Harrow, recommends it; and the late Professor Kennett gave advice in an earlier volume. Also the author has lived and taught for some years in Jerusalem, and so is able to view his subject with rather different eyes from those of mere arm-chair critics.

This volume is concerned solely with the period of, roughly, 700-540 B.C., starting just after the death (presumably) of Isaiah, and ending with the writings of the Great Unknown, usually called the Second Isaiah, immediately before the Return. The method that Mr. Hamond adopts is to give a clear account of each part of the period, and to add long and copious extracts from the Prophet immediately under review. These extracts seem to be original and generally trustworthy translations. They have useful Notes, and excellent historical Tables are added. Candidates for examinations in this period of Bible History will do well to study this volume.

A. L. W.

---

THE NEW KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Sir Charles Marston, F.S.A. *Eyre & Spottiswoode*. 5s. net.

The opening up of Palestine and other regions in the east to the work of excavation has given an opportunity for the reconsideration of many views that have been put forward in connection with the historicity of the Old Testament. In *New Knowledge About The Old Testament*, Sir Charles Marston gives not only important information in regard to the actual work of excavation but also sets out some of the conclusions that can be drawn from it. It is well known that he has taken an active interest in the work, especially in connection with the researches of Professor Garstang on the site of ancient Jericho. He devotes his opening chapter to the geography of the Holy Land, and the second to the sources of information. In the third he considers "The First Religion and the Flood," and goes on to tell of the work of Dr. Woolley at Ur. Two chapters are devoted to the Phoenicians and Hyksos. A large portion is



then occupied with the results of the Jericho excavations and their bearings on the date of the Exodus. Sufficient information is given to show the interesting character of these results, a fuller account of which is given in Professor Garstang's book, *The Foundations of Bible History*. The date of the Exodus has been assumed by many to be 1220 B.C. Others have placed it in the year 1487 B.C. Sir Charles states his case for the acceptance of the date 1447 B.C. A number of important conclusions depend upon this date and these are stated in detail. The result of this work of excavation will have to be seriously considered in dealing with the chronology of the Biblical history.

---

JOHN WESLEY AND THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: A Study of his Social and Political Influence. By Maldwyn Edwards. *George Allen & Unwin*. 6s. net.

This book is distinctly valuable for two reasons: first, it reveals to us John Wesley's amazing activities in spheres outside his definitely evangelistic or preaching work; secondly, it gives for almost every statement made a carefully dated reference drawn from Wesley's own multifarious printed remains.

It is divided into four main sections: the first deals with Wesley's "Political Philosophy"; the second and third describe his position and action in reference to "Political Events" and "Political Movements"; the last contains an estimate of his Political influence. The book is by no means a prolonged eulogy. Frequently it takes a curiously detached position; in fact, in several instances the writer seems to go out of his way to show where he thinks Wesley's judgments and actions were wrong. This entire absence of partisanship and hero-worship certainly adds to its value.

In politics Wesley began and ended his long life (1703-91) as the strongest of Tories. To him the British Constitution and the authority of the King (as they were at the time) were sacrosanct. In his order to his preachers to abstain from all reference to politics in the pulpit, he made one exception: should they learn of any attack on either the King or the Constitution they must at once repel it. A striking example of Wesley's patriotism is found in his conduct during the American struggle for independence. At first, because he considered the claims of the colonists to be just, he strongly sympathised with them; but when war broke out he threw all his influence on to the side of the mother country.

While Mr. Edwards does not admit the claim (put forward by J. R. Green and others) that it was Wesley who saved England from a revolution similar to that which took place in France, he is quite prepared to admit that Wesley's power over the multitude of his followers during a time when revolutionary ideas were in the air exercised a strongly steady influence.

To Roman Catholic Emancipation Wesley was bitterly opposed—though he was always courteous to individual Roman Catholics. He used to cite the decree of the Council of Constance—which has

never been formally rescinded—that “no faith was to be kept with heretics.” He also felt that those who recognised the supreme authority of the Pope could feel no obligation of allegiance to a temporal monarch. Consequently he saw in every Romanist a potential enemy of the King.

Mr. Edwards’ chapter on “The Abolition of Slavery” is extremely good. Into this movement Wesley threw himself heart and soul; he preached sermons, wrote many public letters and published a powerful pamphlet on behalf of the cause. “Give the credit of abolition to the Evangelicals,” writes Mr. Edwards, “but remember that Wesley was their spiritual father.” The following figures are another proof of his influence: the various Non-conformist bodies, including the Roman Catholics, obtained 122,978 signatures to a petition. A similar petition, signed only by Methodists, contained 229,296 names.

Wesley was an extremely keen educationist, though his insight into the nature and needs of children could not have been great; for in the original daily time-table drawn up for Kingswood School no time was allotted to play, and besides water no other drink was provided at meals. The stress that he laid upon education is proved by the fact that when the Education Act of 1870 was introduced there were no less than 910 Wesleyan Elementary Schools containing 166,405 scholars. And he did not confine his educational efforts to children; he found time to publish—chiefly for the benefit of his preachers—a Christian Library of fifty volumes, which gave in a convenient and condensed form some of the great masterpieces of literature.

Mr. Edwards next deals with Wesley’s efforts in “Humanitarian Reform.” He attacked the various social evils of the eighteenth century—and they were both many and great—rather indirectly than directly. By converting men and women to a Christian life he produced in them a sense of individual responsibility and this led to individual effort. Converted people had their eyes opened to social evils and their hearts fired to the alleviation or removal of these. The variety of the social evils which Wesley attacked and the number of good works he set in motion is astonishing. He was active in prison reform, he opened dispensaries for the sick, and in times of special distress he organised schemes for relief. Through the sale of his various writings he made large sums of money. In the course of his life he probably gave away not less than £30,000; while “beyond what he required for his immediate use, it is doubtful if he ever was the possessor of more than £20.”

There is much more in Mr. Edwards’ book to which we wish we could draw attention, but we have written enough to show what a wealth of information it contains, not only about John Wesley himself, but about the social and political conditions of England in the eighteenth century—a century in which to a large extent the seeds (both good and evil) were sown of which to-day we are reaping the harvest.

W. E. C.