

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

## THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. Part i: THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., and Kirsopp Lake, D.D. Vol. ii: Prolegomena ii; Criticism. London: *Macmillan & Co.* 24s.

The first volume of "Beginnings" was published just two years ago: that book dealt with the Jewish, Gentile, and Christian Backgrounds of the Acts. A whole series of volumes is contemplated; part i, "The Acts of the Apostles," will be completed in two further volumes, comprising text and commentary. It is a formidable undertaking, in some respects a great undertaking, and if only its positive value were as great as its probable bulk, a great service would have been rendered to the whole Christian Church. It is interesting to read some of the press notices of the first volume; one reviewer says it is "one of the most valuable contributions to New Testament research which have been written in English in recent years"; another speaks of it "as the last word of scholarship." Prof. Headlam, in a slashing and damaging review in the *Church Quarterly*, holds a different opinion, and—sorry as we are to have to admit it—we are disposed to agree with him.

The question before us now is whether vol. ii shows any notable advance on its predecessor. In some ways, yes; in others, no. The book professes to be a study of the Acts in the light of the results of modern criticism; and indeed these "results" are everywhere in evidence. Whether they are likely to be *final* results is another matter: we rather think not, for—so far as we can follow them—they seem to be based on a good deal of ingenious theorizing about facts, rather than (in every case) on the facts themselves. We are not concerned to deny that some of the writers of this composite work—a co-operative affair, like so many recent books—have presented us with a most impressive number of facts, which anyone, if he feels inclined, can verify for himself. Such data are of great value, and they constitute the important part of the book. What we are inclined to find fault with are the deductions from those data; these are many and various, and sometimes contradictory.

Let us for a moment examine the contents of the book. It is divided into three main sections: (1) composition and purpose of Acts, (2) Identity of the Editor of Luke and Acts, (3) History of Criticism. There are four appendices: the first, by Mr. G. C. Coulton, deals with the story of Francis of Assisi; the second details the story—not unknown in Cambridge—of Margaret Catchpole; the third, by Prof. Burkitt, is entitled "Vestigia Christi"—it is quite brief; the fourth is a full-dress "commentary" on Luke's Preface, from the pen of Prof. H. J. Cadbury. This last is a piece

of work as exhaustive as it is excellent, and we are not sure that it does not constitute the *pièce de resistance* of the whole volume.

Now let us analyse the contents in rather more detail. In § 1 there are five chapters: (a) The Greek and Jewish traditions of writing history; (b) The use of the Greek language in Acts—a most careful and scholarly production, in which the linguistic data are marshalled with tact and learning; (c) the use of the LXX in Acts; (d) the use of Mark in the Gospel according to Luke; (e) the internal evidence of Acts. The last section (mainly the work, we should imagine, of Prof. Kirsopp Lake) runs to nearly 100 pages, and is the longest section in the book; it is clever, ingenious, and speculative. We may be dubbed obscurantist, but we find little that is new in the disquisition that seems to be really proved, and a number of assertions or suggestions that are, at the least, highly problematical.

In § 2 there are four parts: (a) The Tradition; (b) the case for the Tradition; (c) the case against the Tradition; (d) subsidiary points. Mr. C. W. Emmet, the author of *b*, makes out a very good case for “the Tradition,” and his argument is clear throughout.

In § 3 Prof. McGiffert writes a careful summary of German Criticism of the Acts, and we are glad to have such a convenient summary to refer to. One is struck with the sheer amount of clever guess-work indulged in by German critics; one learned professor sets up a number of theological ninepins for another equally learned professor to knock down; whereupon the process is repeated, leaving the reader bewildered at the chaos. When all is said and done, the old traditional view is quite as good as, and possibly more respectable than, the guesses of Tubigen or Berlin. Does it not stand to reason that, in the case of a book 1,800 years old, all attempts to assign different writers to this portion or that, to pitch upon the final “redactor,” to surmise the various sources—literary or oral—from which the book was compiled, must, in the nature of the case, be extremely uncertain?

A chapter on “British Work on the Acts” is contributed by Mr. J. W. Hankin. It is a poor “show,” on the whole, much of it occupied with an account of the provenance of the English Bible; though what this has to do with the “Acts” is not quite obvious. One rather gathers from Mr. Hankin’s account that English scholars have shown more judgment, though less ingenuity, than their German confrères. Readers will, no doubt, wonder what on earth the editors intended by inserting the essays on Francis of Assisi and Margaret Catchpole; in which case they must turn to the editorial preface. The reason given is “psychological”—“we have thought it well to illustrate the way in which the figures of history were soon invested with new characteristics, so that in the subsequent development of thought concerning them these new and relatively unhistorical features became more important than the historical facts. How this could happen can only be explained by the psychology of authorship.” In other words (to put the matter bluntly) as the two figures of Francis and Margaret collected a large quantity of false history and dubious legend about them—like snowballs rolled along

the ground by boys—so we are to suppose that the figures of Peter and Paul in the Acts collected all sorts of legendary matter about them, which matter was quasi-consciously adopted (and adapted) by “ Luke ”—or whoever wrote the book—on the ground that “ the psychology of authorship impels him [the author] to change problems into propositions.” Wonderful, indeed ! and the document born of such “ unconscious ” cerebration has managed to impose itself as genuine history on the Christian Church for well-nigh two millenniums. It *may* be so : but—*credat Judaeus Apella ; non ego.*

E. H. B.

### A PRIMARY CHARGE.

INTERPRETERS OF GOD. By Frank Theodore Woods, D.D., Bishop of Peterborough. London : S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d. net.

Shorn of what is more immediately local and diocesan, this volume contains the main part of the Bishop's charge at his primary visitation, and in the circumstances we turn over its live pages with rather more than ordinary interest. To see one of our youngest and most virile Bishops, whose early associations were entirely and avowedly Evangelical, adapting himself to his environment, is certainly an interesting study. That Dr. Woods is consciously doing this would seem to be clear from one of his observations: “ I have tried to detach myself from all party points of view or prejudice of past association.” This admission reveals his courage and independence. But he is more than courageous ; he has a perfectly prodigious capacity for work, a wide outlook, a sound judgment, and, better still, definitely spiritual ideals. If there is any ecclesiastical bias discernible in these pages, it will not be found in the direction some of his old friends may expect to find it, but rather in an opposite direction. Thus it is a little surprising to learn that the Bishop sympathizes with “ those who feel that the true sacrificial view of the Eucharist is more worthily expressed in the canon of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI ” and that likewise he is one with those “ who desire to link the Prayer of Oblation with the Prayer of Consecration in the present office,” and that, as he admits elsewhere, he would like to see the Epiclesis “ restored in our canon.” It will thus be seen that he has not been wholly unsuccessful in his effort to shake off the prejudices of past associations, and we can only stay to observe that with many loyal Churchmen there are principles involved which they distinguish from prejudices.

The Bishop tells us that “ the need for ritual action in worship is a deep-rooted instinct in human nature.” True : but surely there must be some limits ? The Diocese of Peterborough is by no means free from extremists, but we look in vain for any indications of the wishes of their Diocesan as to limits to be observed. While he is willing to sanction reservation for the sick “ where circumstances make it advisable ” he yet condemns “ the cult of the reserved sacrament ” in a thoughtful, well-reasoned argument, concluding with these words : “ It is difficult to see how, in the long run, the ideas

behind this cult . . . can consort with New Testament teaching on the Holy Spirit, and it is worthy of note that it is in that part of the Church where the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is notably weak that the practice tends to prevail."

In the chapter on *Worship* the shrewdness and insight of the Bishop are revealed. But we are not sure that we always understand him. For instance, upon the subject of elasticity in our services, he says: "I find . . . that there are clergy who depreciate any departure from or addition to the prescribed routine of Matins and Evensong." What are we to make of this? Does Dr. Woods suggest that the clergy should become their own Liturgiologists and modify the regular services according to the dictates of their own fancy? Are we no longer bound by an Act of Uniformity? Yet it seems as if the Bishop is reproving those clergy who feel conscientiously bound to follow the Prayer Book!

Then there are some sarcastic remarks about "the juicy and sugary morsels provided by Barnby, Stainer and Dykes." But this is rather merciless, considering the debt we owe to these composers. Then are we to understand that the Bishop's remark about *The English Hymnal* as containing "both words and tunes far more healthy and virile than most of those to which we are accustomed in other collections" is to be taken as expressing his general approval of a book which, if we mistake not, has been forbidden by at least one Bishop who could hardly be described as an Evangelical?

The chapter on *Reunion* is a masterly statement of the whole position, an urgent plea for fellowship rather than federation, and the Bishop emphasizes the fact that the local Churches of the New Testament were one—"the only thing that separated them was distance, not faith or order"—and that each local Church represented the whole body, not some particular section of it.

The sympathetic understanding of the Bishop is shown in the chapter on *The Village*, and it deserves to be read and re-read by every country clergyman in the land, though not every one will agree with the proposal to form village dramatic societies or approve of simple Nativity plays at Christmas or see the possibility of a communal meal following Holy Communion. All the way through, the tasks with which the Church is confronted are boldly faced and calmly discussed, in a sane, statesmanlike way.

We have purposely left till the last a few observations, and they must unfortunately be very few, upon the opening chapter, headed—*The Supreme Interpretation*. It is a setting forth of Him who came to interpret to us the character of God. Here are the spiritual ideals to which we have referred, and we feel convinced that even those who may not see eye to eye with the Bishop on some points will feel that his message rings true for all who in these difficult days have to be, in their measure, interpreters of God.

S. R. C.

## AN AFRICAN ARCHDEACON'S REMINISCENCES.

STORM AND SUNSHINE IN SOUTH AFRICA. By the late A. Theodore Wirgman, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of Port Elizabeth and Hon. Chaplain to H.M. the King. London: *Longmans*. 7s. 6d. net.

Archdeacon Wirgman was a well-known ecclesiastic in South Africa. Few readers of the ecclesiastical press were unfamiliar with his communications which represented the type of Anglo-Catholicism prevalent in the Province where he worked. He was rigid in his views, had the power of giving frank expression to them, and was a hammer of all that came in conflict with his convictions. The Bishop of Grahamstown says of him: "Full of loyalty to the Church he loved, he welcomed honours and dignities for himself, because, as was finely said at the time of his death, they brought honour to her." He said himself: "The entanglements of Church and State, which are the evil heritage of the Tudor Reformation, and the hopelessness of any definite solution in a Church burdened by a Secular Court of Appeal, which the conscience of such a saintly leader as Keble could not, as he quaintly put it, bring under the obedience due to authority enjoined in the Fifth Commandment, drew many of us to wish for work in a part of the Church which was disconnected with the State and was freed from the Erastian taint which clung to the Church of England." He left us for South Africa, where he found his spiritual home.

We have a full account of the controversies in South Africa, and the story of the Grahamstown Cathedral case is told at length. He does not write as tenderly as might be expected of those who were opposed to his views, but, after all, it is given to few controversialists to see the honesty and strength of what they dislike. We are glad to have his statement of the incident that has the result of making South Africa the preserve of one type of Churchmanship—a type which somehow has placed the Church in a position of comparative numerical inferiority—if nothing else—in that part of the Empire.

Dr. Wirgman has much to say of social and political life. He lived in days of stress and change. He was a strong Imperialist. In an *obiter dictum* he says: "Naturally, I regarded the British Parliament from the point of view of a Colonist who had not forgotten Majuba." Practically all the great names in South African recent history occur in the book, and from this point of view it may have permanent value, for the Archdeacon was shrewd, and in politics could see "the other side of the hedge." Cecil Rhodes was his hero. On one occasion Bishop Gaul, who was then Archdeacon of Kimberley, wrote a letter of protest against the proposal to hold sports on Christmas Day "at hours that interfered with Church services." Rhodes' obsequious satellites at once began abusing the Archdeacon's impudence and meddlesome interference, now that all the arrangements were complete. Rhodes was silent for a moment. He then said, "No, the Archdeacon is quite right, though a bit peppery. Don't you forget that I am a parson's son, and I

understand. Cancel the whole programme at once, and consult the Archdeacon about the hours to be left free for Church services." This was at once carried out, and it showed that Rhodes respected the Church. This, of course, was an outward matter, but the words he used about a short prayer in a letter to the Archbishop of Capetown give one a glimpse of his inner thoughts. He wrote as follows: "I often think that prayer represents the daily expression to oneself of the right thing to do, and is a reminder to the human soul that it must direct the body on such lines." These are not the words of the cynical Theist depicted by Canon Scott Holland. They express one side of prayer with some accuracy.

President Kruger and other Boer leaders are described, and we smile at the eccentricities of Oom Paul. Botha receives the praise that is his due. He met Lord Roberts for whom he conceived something like a veneration "as a great man, the greatest soldier of his day and time." But we must bring our notice of an interesting and quotation-tempting volume to a close. Archdeacon Wirgman never misses an opportunity of speaking his mind. He does so at times with a strength and directness that may give pain to those who survive him. He is, however, always sincere, and we think more kindly of the writer of the chatty reminiscences than we do of the rigorist theologian and ecclesiastic. What a mercy that most of us have two sides to our nature—one to show our friends, the other to scare our opponents!

---

### THE LATE BISHOP MOULE'S LETTERS.

LETTERS AND POEMS OF BISHOP MOULE. London: *Marshall Brothers*. 3s. 6d.

Canon Battersby Harford has made a selection from the Spiritual Letters and Poems of the late Bishop Handley Moule, who was as greatly beloved as he was trusted as a spiritual counsellor. Quoting Prof. McNeile, Canon Harford holds: "To write a letter carefully can often be an act of divine service," and those of us who received letters from the late Bishop know how carefully he wrote and what sympathy he threw into his communications. The eighty-seven letters, printed in whole or part, cover a great deal of ground. Some make no appeal to a reader of one type, whereas they will go straight to the heart of another type of man. Dr. Moule's genius for expressing shades of meaning make him a spiritual guide of rare excellence, and no one can lay the book down after reading the letters without feeling "Here at least is a man who interprets life *sub specie aternitatis*!" Chapter II. is the record of a hatched piece of mischief between a schoolgirl and her brother who wrote to different Bishops for advice on points of doctrine. Poor Bishops, as if they had not burdens enough! Dr. Moule did not scent a schoolroom ruse to draw him, and wrote with frankness on such questions as Private Confession, Future Punishment and more intimate matters of the soul. We here have a glimpse of the humble servant of God, which is much more enlightening than many pages

of biography. He informs his correspondent: "Private telling of our soul's needs and sins *may* be a great help, if done to a wise and good clergyman, in special cases. But it is not meant for *food*; it is only medicine for quite special times, if ever, in our soul's history." On future punishment he writes: "It is, I humbly believe, lawful to understand much of the language of the Bible about physical agonies in eternity as picture or parable of the remorse of the spirit. And, lastly, we are *never* asked to say of one single human soul that we *know* it is unpardoned and lost for ever. God knows more of His mercies than the deepest-sighted Christian knows. But oh, let us reverently take the Lord's warnings to *ourselves*."

But it is as a consoler of those in trouble that Dr. Moule excels. It almost seems that he pours out his inmost soul in his effort to get close to the sorrow-stricken, and every word is weighed before it is put in writing. "The heavenly peace of the Living Lord Jesus be with you," meant for him something that he had experienced and wished to pass on. There is a bleeding sincerity about his sympathy. His poems which complete the volume are marked by that tuneful simplicity which was characteristic of the man when he let himself go to say what he felt. Many will value this precious volume in which heart speaks to heart.

---

### MODERNISM IN RELIGION.

MODERNISM IN RELIGION. By the Rev. J. MacBride Sterrett.  
New York: *The Macmillan Company*.

We were inclined at first to pass this book without notice. Its honesty of purpose, however, prevented our doing so, for there is no doubt as to the sincerity of the old University Professor who gave himself once more to the writing of books. He had been a pastor of a prominent Episcopal Church, his open mind gradually became more and more wedded to Modernism as he conceives it, with the result that he has published his thoughts *de omnibus rebus* in a very lively and interesting style. Minor inaccuracies deterred us from thinking seriously of the book, which abounds in mistakes, some of which are serious. Apart from these as a clue to the working of many minds, attention should be paid to the principles at work in the philosophy of Mr. Sterrett. He looks upon a Modernist as one who recognizes that he is heir of all the ages, but feels and knows that he ought to be the slave of none. Surely that is the Christian position—we are slaves of no passing phases of thought, we are bond slaves of Jesus Christ. But this does not imply that we have not a special reverence for the age when Jesus lived and taught, and His apostles proclaimed what they learned from Him. We agree that the chief use of the Bible is devotional, but unless we have a conviction that its message is true, we do not see how it can devotionally be of value. There must be objective reality in the Revelation, if that Revelation is to be of devotional value to our life and thought. Even the Creed, beloved of the writer, means more than its words imply if it is to be of real use. "I believe



in the Father of all ; and in Jesus the Revealer of God and the Saviour of men. I believe in the life-giving spirit ; in the fellowship of the children of God ; in the forgiveness of sins, the victory of love, and the life eternal. Amen." We do not think that Mr. Sterrett is a complete Modernist—he still holds by much he learned when he was a youth. He is a man who has failed to synthesize what he believes with what he fails to understand. He has not grasped the fact, "*omnia abeunt in mysterium.*"

---

### THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

The *Church Quarterly Review* has not suffered in range of vision or in varied interest since it has been edited by Members of the Faculty of Theology, of King's College, London. The April number, which lies before us, has a long and arresting article by the Chaplain of King's College on "Anglicanism and Modern Problems," in which the present situation is dispassionately reviewed: "The Modernism which treats Catholic dogma as a *corpus vile*, from which, as an outworn and inadequate thing, the true rational and adequate statement of Christianity is to be distilled, is an ephemeral spurious Modernism. The Catholicism which claims exclusive adequacy for transcendental concepts is an arrogant cult whose true sectarian character cannot be hidden by a name. An enlightened moderate Anglicanism will endeavour to assist Catholic and Modernist alike to adequacy of statement, but claims to exclusive adequacy it will deliberately resist. It will resist them in the interests of a wider Catholicism and a truer Modernism than such claims can express." This is true, but whither does it lead us, and where are we to find this synthesis of moderate Anglicanism? Dr. Aveling writes generally on "The Science of Psychology." Dr. Relton has a learned and thought-provoking article on "Immortality and the Resurrection," in which he makes good use of Señor Unamuno's well-known but rather tardily translated "The Tragic Sense of Life in Men and Peoples." Prof. Cock writes on "The Problem of Prayer"; the Rev. W. J. Ferrar on "A Philosopher to His Wife," and the Bishop of Worcester continues to find time to give us the fruit of his research into the conditions of the ministry in his diocese six centuries ago.

But one article has outstanding interest, as it deals with the vital declaration of the Lambeth Appeal: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body." This had been attacked by the Revs. Darwell Stone and F. W. Puller in a booklet, "Who are Members of the Church?" The Archbishop of Armagh expounds the Lambeth view, and subjects to a remorseless ethical and logical examination the arguments they put forward. He says:

"I think I may venture to say that it was clear in the mind of the Conference that in adopting this position we were taking a

definite step forward along the lines marked out by the teaching of our Lord and the principles of His Kingdom. We realized fully that, though what we expressed was the belief of many individuals in the past, yet it had not been presented to the world as the confessed conviction of the whole body of authority in any branch of the Catholic Church. And my belief is that it was just this fact—the fact that we were able to found our Appeal on this great conviction—which filled us with a new sense of the Divine presence and assistance. We realized that God the Holy Ghost is as truly in the Church to-day as in the first ages of Christian history.”

Step by step he displays the Scriptural and historical basis of the position adopted, and subjects to analysis the claims made for any narrower conception of the Church. His Grace concludes :

“ It appears, however, that the rigid Anglo-Catholic is narrower in his view of membership of the Church than is the Roman Catholic theologian of to-day. Dr. Stone denies such membership to the validly baptized, who have deliberately ‘ adhered to some schismatic body.’ Even the word ‘ deliberately ’ will not save Dr. Stone from a more than Roman exclusiveness ; he leaves the sincere believer in Christ, no matter how splendid his faith or how effective his labours, if he belongs to some Nonconformist body, to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Such is the result of a narrow *a priori* doctrine interpreted by a pitiless logic. Start with the conception of the Church as a corporation possessed of a monopoly, and the whole system unfolds itself inevitably. But this is not the conception of the Church to be found in Holy Scripture, nor is it in accordance with the mind of Christ.”

The article, which is brief, deserves to be read in its entirety, and the attempt to reply to it by no means weakens its conclusive effect upon the reader’s mind.

---

### JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES.

The April number of the erudite and varied *Journal of Theological Studies* contains two articles in French, the second of which, by Mgr Batiffol, raises a point of considerable importance on “ la prima cathedra episcopatus du Concile d’Elvire.” He contests the late Mgr Duchesne’s view that the expression may mean “ simple-ment le siège episcopal par opposition à des *plebs* ou paroisses organisées dans les villes ou les villages,” and holds that “ Rome était vraiment le point de convergence de ces lettres de communion : c’est en communiquant avec Rome que les Églises dispersées dans l’univers communiquaient entre elles.” The argument deserves careful reading, even if it does not sustain the weight placed upon it. Dr. T. Stephenson discusses Canon Streeter’s views on the Synoptic problem, and Dr. Brooke gives us his conclusions on the Pastoral Epistles which are working their way back into the rank of acknowledged Pauline documents. As usual, Dr. Burkitt arrests attention by his contributions on “ Pistis Sophia ” and “ Toga in the East.” The other Notes and Studies appeal more to specialists.

The Review Section and the Chronicle on "Old Testament and Related Literature" are worthy of a Journal that always adds something to scholarship and dare not be missed by students who wish to be abreast of the thought of our time. As books go at present it is an excellent five shillings' worth for any man who desires to keep up his reading and to receive real mental stimulus.

If not too late, we may add that the January number contains an important article by Professor Bacon, on "Marcion, Papias and the Elders." We are not prepared to admit his conclusions on the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, but are thankful that he acknowledges its date and origin. Is he not rather too positive when he writes, "the date for John's martyrdom cannot well be later than 62"? An Essay by Provost Bernard in *Studia Biblica* does not well fit in with this view. But the gem of the number is a review by Professor F. C. Burkitt of a Rationalist Press Association book, *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem*. We have seldom seen a more thorough-going exposure of pretentious self-conceit, and nothing could excel the manner in which the Professor discloses the deficiencies of dogmatism based on ignorance of the first principles of historical criticism. It is unnecessary to add that all the articles reach a high standard of scholarly excellence.

---

#### MISCELLANEOUS NOTICES.

The Rev. J. E. Roscoe has published a shilling volume through Messrs. Skeffington entitled *Presentations of Christianity* (Ancient and Modern). We gather they are newspaper column articles, and as such they are readable and much better informed than most contributions on the clergy and the secular press. Their value would have been greatly enhanced by a list of books to be consulted—as it is they whet our curiosity and leave us without the means of satisfying it. At any rate they will focus the mind of the well-informed on leading presentations of the teaching of Christ.

---

The Rev. C. E. Douglas issues through the Faith Press (2s.) four sermons on *The Redemption of the Body*—being an exposition of his own view of the Catholic doctrine on the subject. The four addresses are interesting, and if at times they contain somewhat irrelevant paragraphs they make good reading. Mr. Hakluyt Egerton supplies an introductory examination of the Bishop of Oxford pamphlet. He makes several good debating points, but we wish that he were a little more respectful to those who differ from him. He describes the Bishop of Oxford as "a quiet headmaster and a quiet Bishop, confirmed in prudence by his reading of history, an administrator rather than a theologian, yet mindful of the Church's need for an enlightened and instructed clergy." "That unintentional misdirection makes Dr. Headlam's interesting (though debatable) opinion wellnigh as irrelevant as Mr. Major's statement." "One scarcely knows what to say to poor Professor Watson." This is not the way high argument should be conducted.